



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

39 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXIX No. 6 - 1:30 p. m., THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1990



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, October 18, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement.

Today is Person's Day across Canada. Person's Day marks the first official recognition of women's rights and privileges as persons in society.

The recognition of Person's Day serves to remind all of us that on the 18th of October in 1929, women were as committed to the principles of equity and fair treatment as they are today. On that date not only was the British North America Act required to recognize women as persons, but from that time forward women have come to expect equality and fairness from their own Governments.

Although the women of Canada had to wait more than 10 years before the Privy Council of Britain finally recognized them as "qualified persons," I do not believe that issues like economic equality, training, day care and services for battered women can wait. Equality and fair treatment play a very important role to this Government. We are determined to work with the women of Manitoba to achieve true equality.

Certainly equality must be reflected in our decision-making bodies. I am pleased that we have an increase in the number of women elected in the Legislature—from nine to 11 in the past election—and I would like to salute today my female colleagues in the House.

I know as well, Mr. Speaker, that we had many strong women candidates in all Parties, a fact that certainly celebrates women as persons and the determination of women to participate equally in the decision making.

* (1335)

I believe we have truly made gains in the past years, but the events of the last few weeks have shown that we still have far to go. Women are

persons and will be recognized as such in every walk of life. As a society we must all work to ensure that they can, safely and with the full protection of our community institutions.

I look forward to working with Manitobans to ensure the safety and security. I salute the women of Manitoba and look forward to helping fulfill the promise of those early suffragettes.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba women have always been in the forefront of equality issues in Canada. Today Manitoba women will gather in various ways to celebrate Person's Day. There will be celebrations of past victories, a marking of milestones. There will be sadness and fear over recent events, but there will also be celebrations of a future where struggles will be successful, and we will move on to a future of promise.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in response to the ministerial statement, I would like to say that we, as the official Opposition, are also pleased to rise in support of the celebration of Person's Day. We know that there are many Manitoba women, as the Minister has stated, who have led the fight for equality and who continue to do so.

However, I would like to also say that where the Minister says, I do not believe that issues like economic equality, training, day care and services for battered women can wait, we certainly have proven on this side of the House that we strongly support those issues and have fought for them. I wish I could say that the Government of the Day has—

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I think we should probably decide right at the beginning how we are going to handle these Ministerial Statements. I am encouraging Ministers of this House to come

forward and make ministerial statements on a non-political basis.

Mr. Speaker, in your ruling October 24, 1989, you indicated that Ministers should make their statements more at this time, rather than to a non-political sense. The Minister's statements were non-political, fully non-political. Indeed, if the Members opposite are going to interject politics into their replies, then of course we will be forced to take those statements at a non-political time.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Opposition House Leader, on the same point of order.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): I am amazed at the suggestion by the Government House Leader that he should somehow have the ability to indicate what Members of the Opposition should say in response to ministerial statements. We have had a very clear tradition in this House, and I remember many of his statements when he was in Opposition in response to ministerial statements, Mr. Speaker, which were most definitely political in nature.

If the Minister will recall, concern was expressed about misuse of statements that were made after Question Period, by leave, by Ministers, in terms of non-political statements. This is a ministerial statement by the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson). Our critic is responding as our critic for the Status of Women (Ms. Barrett), and if she has some political concerns and our caucus has political concerns, this is the time for her to be able to make that statement.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Inkster, on the same point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, you will find through the Rules and through Beauchesne's, under no rules that I am familiar with that ministerial statements have to be non-political. There is an opportunity to make non-political statements after Question Period, and I would refer the Honourable Government House Leader to read Beauchesne's on 107 statement 348, 349 or 350.

* (1340)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Government House Leader and commented on by the Honourable Opposition House Leader and the Honourable Member for Inkster, I would like to point out to Honourable Members that our Rule 19.(4) states

quite clearly that: "A Minister of the Crown may make an announcement or statement of government policy at the time in the ordinary daily routine of business appointed for ministerial statements and tabling of reports, and a spokesman for each of the parties in opposition to the government may make a brief comment with respect to the announcement or statement and the comments shall be limited to the facts which it is deemed necessary to make known to the House and should not be designed to provoke debate at that time."

Also, Beauchesne's 6th Edition, Rule 348: "Under Standing Order 33(1) Ministers may make a short factual announcement or statement of Government policy. Provision is made for replies by Members of parties in opposition to comment on the statement. The Speaker may limit the time for reply as seems fit."

I would also at this time ask the three House Leaders to meet in my Chambers right after Question Period and this will get resolved very quickly.

* * *

Ms. Barrett: On behalf of the New Democratic Party official Opposition, I would like to respond to the ministerial statement dealing with the Person's Day ministerial statement just made.

We agree that issues such as economic equality, training, day care and services for battered women cannot wait, and we urge the Government and all legislators in this House to spend as much time talking and then acting on these issues as the women who are mothers and grandmothers who have gone before us have done.

Actions are the only thing that matter. Rhetoric is all very well and good, speaking is all very well and good, but it is the issues and the action on those issues that is the important thing to undertake.

Issues and actions must be taken by all Members of this House on areas such as non-profit, universally accessible day care; issues of family violence; issues of pay equity for women; issues of pension reform; issues that women have been fighting for for 100 years in Manitoba and throughout Canada.

I think we will all be proud of ourselves as legislators, and we can come back next year if we act on these issues instead of just speaking about them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I, along with the critic for the NDP, rise today to mark Person's Day and respond to the Ministerial Statement. I say, mark Person's Day, because I do not think we have anything to celebrate in the past year with regard to the treatment of women as persons in the Canadian society.

We have watched in this past year the massacre of university women engineering students in Montreal. We have watched with horror at the death of eight women in this province due to their former partners. We have watched in our court system case after case after case of sexually assaulted children and women, female children and unfortunately on occasion also male children who have been sexually and physically abused. We watched that while our numbers increased in this Chamber, the numbers in the Cabinet decreased in this Chamber, and that was a reversal of a decade of movement forward. So we do not celebrate Person's Day in the caucus of the Liberal Party today. We mark it, and we hope that next year we will have something to celebrate because we will have moved forward and not backward.

* (1345)

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Tabling a report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Tabling a report.

Mr. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, due to the number of requests received for copies of the 1988-89 Annual Report earlier in the year on May 28th of 1990, I had copies distributed to all Members of the Legislative Assembly. Upon this distribution, the department was then able to fill the requests received.

At this time, I would like to formally table the 1988-89 Annual Report for the Department of Highways and Transportation.

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the report for the Manitoba Energy Authority and the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board for the year ended March 31, 1990.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present the 1988-89 Annual Report for the Department of Labour, copies

of which, I understand, were distributed to Members prior to the Session. I am also pleased to present the 1989 Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Board.

Point of Order (cont'd)

Mr. Speaker: Before moving on to Notices of Motion, I would like, for the record, to advise the House that the remarks of the three Honourable House Leaders, I have taken that under advisement and I will return to the House with a clarification of that ruling.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL 13—THE RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS ACT

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), that leave be given to introduce, Bill 13, The Residential Tenancies and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives, and that the same be now received and read a first time. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of the Bill, recommends it to the House.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the comments of the Lieutenant-Governor.

Motion agreed to.

BILL 5—THE RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 5, The Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi de la taxe sur les ventes au détail, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief comment on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. Would there be leave to allow the Honourable Member -(interjection)- The question has already been put, it is a problem. -(interjection)- Order, please. The problem being I had already put the question. Is

there leave to allow the Honourable Member an opportunity to put a few remarks?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is in keeping with our commitment to ensure that the Manitoba sales tax does not piggyback on top of the GST. As the legislation now stands, the Manitoba sales tax will be added on top of the goods and services tax. Unless the Manitoba retail sales tax legislation is amended, Manitobans will effectively be paying another half of a percent of sales tax, not seven plus seven for a total of 14 percent, but rather 14.5 percent, and as such it prevents the province from making money on this insidious tax which robs the middle class and the poor as a result of Conservative tax reform in Ottawa.

Manitobans do not want the GST, Mulroney's gouge and screw tax. The least we can do in this Legislature is to ensure that we do not add to their tax burden.

* (1350)

BILL 3—THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, introduction of Bills, I move, seconded by the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), that leave be given to introduce the Bill No. 3, The Employment Standards Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les normes d'emploi, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion presented.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with our rules, I would like to make a brief introductory statement. This Bill would improve the protection for workers affected by major layoffs and plant closures. We have seen in the last number of weeks, the last number of months that a number of layoffs have been occurring to the point where it is reaching a crisis level. We saw yesterday a layoff where it is very clear that even the current procedures, which were in place, are not necessarily being followed. This would improve notice provisions. It would extend it to six months' notice of layoffs for employees of 50 or more, three months for employees between 10 to 49, would bring in severance pay for the first time in legislation in Manitoba, bring in paid job search leave and would

provide workers the opportunity to buy the plant instead of having it closed.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that Members would give this Bill consideration because it deals with a very serious situation in terms of the number of major layoffs and plant closures in this province.

Motion agreed to.

BILL 12—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 12, The Labour Relations Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail), and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, may I direct attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have from the Beaumont School, fifty-six Grade 5 students. They are under the direction of Mr. Patrick Lee. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Gasoline Price Increases Government Action

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are phoning all MLAs about the increase in their gas prices of five cents per litre over the last couple of weeks, and many Manitobans feel that the gas companies are using the Iraqi crisis in an artificial way to gouge them as consumers. We further know that yesterday the federal Tory Minister of Energy has announced a further 10-cents-a-litre increase in gas prices, and that is in spite of the fact that the price of crude went down on the world market by \$2 a barrel yesterday.

My question to the Premier is: What action and strategy is his Government going to take to ensure that Manitobans are not gouged by the oil companies in their use of the Iraqi crisis to artificially

raise the price at the pumps and hurt consumers in Manitoba?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Everything falls apart when he asks a question.

Mr. Speaker, on this side, the Government has been taking action on two fronts. The Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery), through his department, in response to the Persian Gulf crisis and the rising crude oil costs, has been continuously monitoring, firstly, crude oil prices, and secondly, retail prices in Manitoba as compared to other Canadian cities and adjacent jurisdictions in the United States, principally Grand Forks.

They have, obviously, viewed with concern the potential for unwarranted increases and have been making the comparisons between the increase of crude oil prices and the effect that has on retail prices, and have been very concerned to ensure that no additional passage of unwarranted increases and profit is made.

* (1355)

On the other side, of course, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) has been monitoring supplies to ensure that we do not get into a crisis situation as a result of reduced supplies, and has met as recently as, I believe, yesterday with his counterparts, the provincial and federal Ministers of Energy and Mines, to ensure that the scarcity of supply does not become an issue and does not again become another issue causing unwarranted increases.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Premier believes in the oil companies' assertions that the price increases have been warranted.

I would ask the Government what action is he going to take to deal with the concerns of independent retailers that have stated clearly that because of the pressure from the other parts of the industry, they have had to raise their prices even though it is not warranted. Why has this Government not taken action to deal with those assertions by the independents in our retail market? What other strategy has the Government got in place to ensure that the 10 cents a litre that Mr. Epp has promised at the meeting yesterday, that your Minister was at, is not indeed passed on to the consumers because the oil companies want to make more money?

Mr. Filmon: I hate to remind the Leader of the Opposition because he should remember it well, it

was just 1986—it was in the midst of an election campaign in which his former leader suggested that he could do something about -(interjection)- Zero, Mr. Speaker, zero is what they did. Absolutely nothing. They set up a very lengthy and extensive review by Professor Costas Nicolaou to try and somehow make good on their promise to do something about controlling gasoline pricing in this province. Nothing they did resulted in any action. The only that happened was that world crude oil prices dropped and the prices at the pump dropped as indeed they were predicted to be by the analysis being done, not only by the oil industry but by their independent authority, Dr. Nicolaou. When faced with precisely the same circumstances—and like Yogi Berra, this is *deja vu* all over again—Professor Nicolaou recommended to that administration that the only thing they could do, the only option they had was to (1) set up a gas wholesaler to improve competitive wholesale conditions for small retailers, and (2) set up a small number of retail outlets in Winnipeg.

That Government chose to do neither of those because they were not practical alternatives because Professor Nicolaou had concluded that regulation was not advisable under the circumstances that he—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Government Strategy

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, we can always expect the Tories to defend the big oil companies and not defend the consumers in this province, Mr. Speaker, always. The prices went down 9 cents a litre because there was action and there was meeting with the oil company executives because we were willing to take them on.

My question to the Premier is, there is a freeze of 90 days on the oil prices in the Maritimes. They are now running below our prices where they are usually quite a bit higher because there has been some Government intervention. The Free Trade Agreement has meant that we are losing exports to the United States of our gas. In fact, his Minister of Finance will tell him that gas is going down in the United States according to the bills of lading, considerably right through Manitoba.

My question to the Premier is, does he have any strategy to deal with the oil company gouging on gas prices? Does he have any strategy to deal with the

potential of not having enough gas and oil products in Manitoba for this winter, and will he take on the whole cartel of the oil company and not just stand up for the oil companies as he has been doing in the last week or so?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, it was in 1986 the New Democrats in this province who were supporting the big oil companies because they took exactly the same position that we are taking today. Their Premier, Howard Pawley, read the report that said that with the reduction of crude oil that was taking place on the world market, that would translate into a 9 and one-half cent a litre reduction at the pumps within a matter of five weeks.

* (1400)

Like magic, just as every day the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, when the crude oil reduction from world prices came through the system, it went down by 9 and one-half cents, as the oil companies had predicted, and Howard Pawley repeated publicly. That is precisely the situation that prevails today. With respect to regulation, their study by Professor Costas Nicolaou said that regulation is not advisable, and I quote from his study. This is because today's crude oil and gasoline markets are subject to continuous change, making regulation impractical and introducing distortion since it will not be possible to adjust prices quickly enough.

The prices in the Maritimes have been running above Manitoba continuously for the last four years, the Maritime prices. They are temporarily below because there was an application for increase before—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Eastman Crisis Centre Reopening Date

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Family Services. On September 22, the Eastman Crisis Centre was forced to close because of an inadequate funding structure on the part of this Government. The women and children in southeastern Manitoba have been without services for 24 days. Has the Minister met with the board of the Eastman Crisis Centre, as he said he would, to arrange for its reopening, and if he has met with the board, when can we expect this vital service to be reopened for the women and children of southeastern Manitoba?

Hon. Harold Gillieshammer (Minister of Family

Services): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier in the Session, I met with board members some two hours after I was appointed to Cabinet. The Eastman shelter had received an increase in funding of some 150 percent over two years. I think that the Member has to recall what funding was prior to 1988 and how the shelter was funded and how the shelter operated at that time. The increase in funding has been substantial. The department is working with the Eastman shelter to reopen it in the near future.

Funding

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Minister of Family Services. I assume that there is no specific date for the shelter's reopening, which obviously means that a final decision has not been made and women and children will still be without services. Can the Minister of Family Services explain that when he does meet and does decide to reopen the shelter what arrangements there will be to cover the deficits, to cover the costs of the shelter? Will the arrangements be only to cover the deficit for funding or will the shelter be allowed to have adequate funds to continue on its services for the rest of this fiscal year?

Hon. Harold Gillieshammer (Minister of Family Services): I think it is important for the Member to note that the decision to close the shelter was made by the board. The decision to open the shelter will be made by the board. There was a substantial amount of funding that went to that shelter, an increase over the two years, as I have indicated. We have also indicated to the board and in a press release that there will be some additional funding to assist them to reopen in the near future. That decision is a decision the board will have to make.

Family Violence Government Strategies

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): My final question is to the Minister of Justice. Can the Minister of Justice report to this House on any decisions that have been made at his meeting today with the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women and other women's organizations in the province to support those who are on the front lines in this struggle to prevent violence against women?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): This morning I had occasion, Mr. Speaker, to meet with representatives of the

Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Evolve and the Osborne Shelter, along with my colleagues the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson) and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer). We had an extremely positive meeting, in my estimation, a meeting at which all participants agreed on the need for Governments to continue to play a leadership role with regard to the issue of violence in the family, which of course includes violence against women.

I set out to the people of the meeting our Government's concern that on average there are about 1,700 charges laid having to do with violence in the family and that anything we can do in a co-operative way to reduce those statistics—and it would be wonderful if we could bring it down to zero—but certainly any reduction in those statistics is a move in the right direction.

There was substantial agreement about the way we ought to be proceeding and the direction we ought to be taking. I indicated that announcements would be forthcoming in the very near future, and the people who joined me at that meeting seemed satisfied with those responses.

Energy Alternative Sources

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines. It is clear from the answer by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) that this Government is no more willing to take on the big oil companies than its predecessor NDP Government was. There is further evidence, Mr. Speaker, that they are prepared to promote the sale of Petro-Canada, which was our only attempt to become self-sufficient in this country.

Are we going to make the same mistakes as in 1973 and 1979, Mr. Speaker? Therefore I ask the question to the Minister of Energy. What specific policies is he going to initiate to make sure that we begin to look at alternate sources of energy in the wake of this crisis?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anybody on this side of the House who likes to pay more for gasoline at the pumps, but we happen to have a crisis in the Middle East that is going to create some difficulties for the rest of the world in the supply of oil.

The Minister of Energy and Mines made a

statement yesterday, not that gas prices would be going up 10 cents a litre, but he made a statement that approximately 10 cents per litre had not yet worked its way through the system. Every dollar increase per barrel in oil represents about seven-tenths of a cent in the price of gas at the pumps, per litre.

What the Minister said was, that has not yet worked its way through the system. When it does work its way through the system there may well be an increase at the pumps, but he did not say that there would be. The Minister of Energy and Mines and Natural Resources does not make statements about the cost of gas in the future.

Mr. Speaker, as far as our department is concerned, we are concerned about the supply of energy. We have worked since August 2 in our department to make certain that there will be a supply of gas, there will be a supply of oil for the residents of Manitoba into the foreseeable future.

Home Chec

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): No one asked a question about the supply of oil or its price. We asked a question about Conservation of energy and alternate sources of energy. If the Minister would listen to the question rather than reading his notes we would all be better informed.

Let me be specific—

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. Carr: There was a program of this Government—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Carr:—to give interest rate relief to people who wanted to better insulate their homes. Will the Minister tell us if he intends to reinstate the Home Chec program?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, the Home Chec program has never been taken out of the Government program. The Home Chec program is alive and well.

Conservation

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): If I could ask the Minister to be as specific as possible, what initiatives is his Government taking to look at alternate sources of energy and to conserve the energy we now have?

* (1410)

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and

Mines): Our department is working at all times to look at alternate sources of energy. We have been, we will be and we are. In the meantime I think that research into alternate energies is a global research program. It cannot be done by the Province of Manitoba all by itself, but we are working. We are working with other provinces, and we are working with the federal Government to ensure that there will be a source of energy in the foreseeable future.

Aboriginal Language Programs Funding

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education. There are 53 ancestral languages in this country, 50 of which are in danger of extinction. The Abinochi preschool Ojibway Language Program at Dufferin School, which began in 1985 with provincial financial support, is now in danger of closing. Why has the Minister never met with the board, and why has he still not responded to a request for funding, first sent to him in February of this year?

Hon. Jim Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): It is not clear as to what Minister he was directing the questions.

Hon. Len Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I think the Member was asking the question of my department or of me.

I have to indicate that any preschool program in this province is not administered or funded by the Department of Education and Training. Our responsibility begins with school-age children who enter kindergarten and then continue from that point. So we have never funded programs at the preschool level.

Mr. Hickes: Mr. Speaker, through the Core Area Initiatives, that has been funded through the education program. Why did this Minister waste \$300,000 on an unnecessary and repetitive task force on literacy but has not responded to a program of vital use such as the Ojibway program?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand how the Member puts the two together. The Literacy Task Force has, by its own record, proved that it has been a very successful endeavour, and indeed many very fruitful programs have come as a result of the task force on literacy. I think there are people, right around this province, who are very thankful that this Government undertook that initiative to establish where the

pockets of illiteracy are in this province, and how severe the problem really is. As a result, we have some very beneficial programs.

With regard to the preschool programs, Mr. Speaker, although it was funded through the Core Area Initiative, that has really nothing to do with the Department of Education funding preschool programs. We never have directly funded preschool programs, and we are not funding them at this present time.

Core Area Initiative Education Funding

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): To the Minister responsible for Core Area Initiatives, my question is: Is it fair play to give \$1 million to St. John's-Ravenscourt through the education program, but to Core Area Initiatives not to fund this program further?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, just to give the information for the record to the Member across the way, this Government and Core Area Initiative did contribute \$67,070 to this particular program that he is comparing to, and I will state what it stated in the program which represents a creation of two jobs in support of Core Area Initiative which represents a total project cost. That was the information given to us by these people conducting the program at the time of that in March of 1990.

Pay Equity Extension Health Care Workers

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, as has already been noted in the House today, this is Person's Day, and as such it is a very appropriate time for the Government to do something about its record of inaction on Status of Women issues and take some concrete steps towards the equality between women and men. It could start by showing a real commitment to pay equity beginning in the health care field.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard): Would the Minister of Health today, on Person's Day, commit his Government to extending pay equity to health care employees beyond the 23 hospitals which arrived at an interim pay equity settlement and do so by committing the dollars to be there for this extension and directing the parties to begin negotiating an administrative solution?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): When we became Government, we of course commenced two initiatives in pay equity in compliance with the Act that was passed in this House while my honourable friend the questioner was one of the proponents of that legislation and in fact on this side of the House as a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Speaker, we have moved very diligently in co-operation with the 22 health care facilities that are funded directly by the Department of Health and the 23rd facility funded through Family Services to implement the provisions of The Pay Equity Act. For two years now we have had funding set aside for retroactive payment of the implementation costs of pay equity as we projected.

I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that probably toward the end of this month, or for certain next month, approximately 15,000 cheques will go out retroactively to nurses in Manitoba giving them a substantial increase because of implementation of pay equity by this Government.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House know what we would have done. Now it is up to this Minister and this Government to show what their commitment is to pay equity.

I want to ask the Minister of Health today if he is prepared to indicate whether or not he will do what the Act permits him to do now, which is to have pay equity extended to all health care facilities beyond the 23 who have already reached an interim agreement, and would he give a commitment to do that today in the House in order to avoid disruption, to avoid a two-tiered pay scale, to avoid further problems to recruitment and retention of health care professionals?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased my honourable friend, who was presumably an advocate of this issue when in Treasury Bench when the Act was drafted, has now recognized -(interjection)- She was not in Treasury Bench? Do I have to -(interjection)- It is with total regret that I must apologize to my honourable friend. I thought she was a supporter of pay equity.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Opposition Health Critic has identified a very, very legitimate flaw in the Howard Pawley Government's legislation on pay equity, in that by its very drafting it created discrimination within the workplace affecting nurses by only naming 22 health care facilities. We have now, I believe, achieved a

resolution through the negotiating process with the unions involved to arrive at the implementation in the 22 named facilities. Surely my honourable friend would admit that we ought to comply with the Act as written first—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with her final supplementary question.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: I do want to ask a question about the Minister's arguments about finalizing the present pay equity settlement with the 23 institutions. I want to ask the Minister. He boasts about cheques going out now.

Could the Minister tell this House why the interim settlement for the 23 hospitals which was reached back on July 13 and which only averages about 65 cents an hour for a health care professional, why those cheques did not go out on schedule for the end of September and the beginning of October, and whether or not it is in fact the case that those cheques are in the mail? Could he verify that they are in fact not scheduled to go into the mail and in the hands of health care professionals until the middle of December?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot indicate to my honourable friend whether the cheques are in the mail today or whether they will be in the mail tomorrow. I am simply indicating to my honourable friend that after a substantial period of time of negotiation as is provided in the legislation, an agreement was reached, which I believe everyone is satisfied with who is involved in those 22 facilities in the health department, and a given increase in salary has been agreed to for which retroactive calculations going back for two years are being made. Now that involves calculating those hours, an increase in pay for many, many thousands of individuals. That is being done, and the cheques will be to those people before Christmas—

* (1420)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Brandon Mental Health Centre Fire Safety

Mr. Guizar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, this Government commissioned a review of Mental Health Services in western Manitoba with the specific focus on Brandon Mental Health Centre, a

90-year-old facility that is home to about 270 patients. This review was conducted by Drysdale Consulting Company and has been available to this Minister for the last four months. A report which we have just obtained has a number of serious problems, and I will quote specifically from the report. It says, "because these facilities do not meet fire code and occupancy requirements, there is a very real threat to the patient and employee safety."

Can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell us what actions has he taken to ensure that this facility is not in violation of the fire code and to protect the patients and the employees?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): My honourable friend in the preamble to his question indicated that the Brandon Mental Health Centre is a 90-year-old facility. Mr. Speaker, it is also fair to say that over the last number of years, one could appreciate that the physical outlay of a 90-year-old building has not been as it would be, should it have been replaced with a new and modern facility such as we have elsewhere in the province.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why we commissioned the study into Brandon Mental Health Centre, because we were faced with the prospect of some substantial spending to renovate old buildings, 90-year-old buildings. In the interests of caution and concern for the patients and for the wise use of taxpayer dollars, we wanted to investigate what were the range of options available to Government to make those facilities either modern and more appropriate for today or to find alternative solutions for the patients of Manitoba. That report has given us some advice and some guidance which we hope to act on—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Health.

Crisis Intervention Services

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, one of the problems identified in that report is the lack of 24-hour crisis intervention program for the whole of western Manitoba. Services are only available from Monday to Friday, from nine to five.

Can the Minister of Health tell us, for the last four months what has he done to improve the crisis intervention services for western Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Liberal Health Critic, we have had a number of discussions in

Estimates in terms of the reform initiatives that we commenced as Government starting in September of 1988 with a discussion paper on the reform of the mental health system of the Province of Manitoba. Subsequent to that, we have initiated in Winnipeg and outside of Winnipeg, in a number of regions of Manitoba, a number of programs which have improved the availability of outpatient services.

Mr. Speaker, because the mental health system had not been reformed for many, many years, much has to be done to enhance services in the community. We have started that long trek, and we will continue to make improvements to community based mental health services in Winnipeg and throughout rural Manitoba.

In-patient Services

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, the report says that there are no in-patient programs for children at the Brandon Mental Health Centre. Questions are coming. Do not worry. Hold your horses.

Mr. Speaker, when is this Minister going to take some action to make sure that we have in-patient services for children for western Manitoba at Brandon General Hospital. We should not be waiting for two years of inaction from this Minister.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my honourable friend's in-depth knowledge of what is, in his idea and others', needed in the health care system. Those directions and initiatives are very real.

Mr. Speaker, we now spend some \$200 million in the Province of Manitoba providing services in mental health throughout this province. The unfortunate reality which we have come to grips with through our reform of the mental health system is that the vast majority of that kind of service and those dollars spent are in institutional care.

Mr. Speaker, the entire enlightened mental health advocacy community says we must change that, and we are moving directly to do just that including—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Fishing Industry Rainbow Smelt Infestation

Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake): My question is for the Acting Minister of Natural Resources. Recently rainbow smelt have been discovered in Lake Winnipeg. Because this fish may seriously deplete

the numbers of other fish species, particularly whitefish, the dangers that the rainbow smelt poses to the commercial fishing industry in Manitoba could be devastating.

What action, other than research, will the Acting Minister take to ensure that the fishing industry in Manitoba will not be detrimentally affected by the presence of the rainbow smelts?

Hon. Jack Penner (Acting Minister of Natural Resources): On behalf of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), I will take that question as notice and make sure that he has the correct information for the Member as soon as he is able to be back in the House.

Government Initiatives

Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I would like notice taken of my supplementary questions then. Given that the presence of the rainbow smelt could place the commercial fishing industry in Manitoba in jeopardy, does the Acting Minister have a plan of action to ensure that jobs are not lost and that the fishing economy in Manitoba is protected?

Hon. Jack Penner (Acting Minister of Natural Resources): Well again, Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and make sure that the information the Member is requesting will be provided.

Water Quality Zebra Mussel Infestation

Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake): I have a second supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Acting Minister also tell this House what immediate action his department is taking on the threat to our drinking water posed by the presence of zebra mussels, and what is this Government going to do to prevent the spread of zebra mussels in Manitoba, a mollusk that has devastated water supplies and quality in the Great Lakes?

* (1430)

Hon. Jack Penner (Acting Minister of Natural Resources): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Minister of Natural Resources is quite aware of the problem in the question that the Honourable Member is asking, the problem that is prevalent right now in the Great Lakes, and I am going to request that the information be brought to this House as soon as it is available.

Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Government Action

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, today it was nice to see the Federal Minister of the Environment finally shamed into committing himself to an injunction application against Saskatchewan. Somehow, despite two court orders and four years of wrangling, however, we have the Rafferty dam 95 percent completed, and the water supply of Manitoba just stays away from being affected by that dam completion. It has truly been a case of "After you, Alphonse", various Governments in this province not doing anything with respect to the Province of Saskatchewan's intent.

My question is: Does the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) have any hope that the Rafferty dam will not be completed before the federal injunction application can be heard, and what assurances has he gotten from Premier Devine that if completed, that dam will not be put into operation until a full review can be done of the entire project?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): We have always attempted to make sure that the downstream effects of this installation would be considered in respect to Manitoba's problems and concerns that could flow from the impounding of the Souris River. The fact is that we have been in constant contact with Ottawa, trying to pressure them into taking the responsible road and in exercising their jurisdiction in relationship to environmental assessment.

In terms of what assurances do we have that the downstream effects will be controlled when this dam begins to impound water, we are at the same time working to bring the three jurisdictions to the table to give us what the final input will be into the operating regime of the dams, Mr. Speaker. I recognize that I am not speaking fast enough, but it is very critical to the future water quality of this province that the operating regime be included as part of the assessment of this project.

Mr. Edwards: For the same Minister, will this Minister explain why this Government did not take action to stop the Rafferty dam at least by May of this year, when we told them that Saskatchewan was not simply increasing the safety of the project, but in fact was going full speed ahead building the Rafferty dam? This Government knew that as early as May. We are now in—

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

Mr. Cummings: The objective of forcing the federal Government to accept its responsibility in enforcing their part of the environmental assessment legislation to deal with the court order correctly and to force Saskatchewan to live up to its aspects of the construction that were to be limited to safety factors not to exceed—he is quite correct, Mr. Speaker, we have expressed some considerable frustration at the fact that the federal Government has consistently refused to live up to its obligations in this area.

Environmental Assessment Government Position

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Finally, for the Minister of Environment, does this Minister and his Government support the new thrust of the federal Environment Act amendments which essentially mean that you study at the same time as you build, or you study after you build? Does this Government support that thrust, and what have they done to bring home to the federal Minister of the Environment that they do not agree with it, if in fact they do not?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, that is a ridiculous suggestion to say that we would support study while construction is underway. We have consistently said that the environmental assessment cannot be recognized as being fair, complete and proper, if it is done at the same time as the bulldozers are running.

The fact is that we need to have an agreement between the provinces and the federal Government of this country so that we can do environmental assessments on the proposals in advance of construction. That is what this province will live up to within its boundaries, and that is what we have consistently said to Ottawa.

Manitoba Telephone System Board Member Replacement

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) has time for one short question.

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Labour representatives have been on the board of commissioners of MTS for many years now and have provided valuable insight and knowledge to

the board. Why did this Minister remove the last labour representative on the board? Is this firing part one of privatization plans hinted at earlier this week by the chairman?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for the administration of The Manitoba Telephone Act): Mr. Speaker, a member of the board who has been there since 1985, an employee rep, has been replaced by another employee rep of the Manitoba Telephone System, so one employee rep has been replaced by another employee rep. That is under the jurisdiction of the Minister and under the jurisdiction of The Crown Accountability Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank that member for her duties over the last five years. She is the longest standing member. Other Manitobans have the right, and other employees of the corporation have the right, to contribute to the running of the board in that corporation.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to going into Orders of the Day, I would like to draw Honourable Members' attention to the gallery to my left where we have with us this afternoon a delegation of councillors from Tokyo. They are from The Tokyo Metropolitan Assembly. We have with us Mr. Sanzo Hosaka who is an assemblyman, also Mr. Bunsei Kawamura who is an assemblyman, and their delegation.

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): I would seek leave to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to call the Members' attention to the proclamation of this week, October 14 to 20, as Foster Family Week in Manitoba. This is a time to recognize and appreciate the work and dedication of the approximately 1,000 foster families in Manitoba who have opened their homes to some 3,000 children.

It has been said that foster parents are the backbone of the child and family service system,

and I believe this to be true. My department will continue to acknowledge their success in serving the needs of children and facilitate their work in whatever ways we can.

This is also a time to salute the work of the Manitoba Foster Family Association which maintains a high level of excellence in the delivery of service and support to foster parents through training and education parents. Each year the association selects a foster family of the year to honour for their committed and caring service.

William and Anne Scott and family of Thompson have been selected for that honour this year. I am certain all the Members of this House would join me in congratulating the Scott family on their success in fostering children. Thank you.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to request leave to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Wellington have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Ms. Barrett: I also would like to add our congratulations to Foster Family Week and particularly on the 61st Anniversary of Persons Case which, as we all know, has made life better for all families as well as women in this country. Today is the 61st Anniversary of the Persons Case, and I think it is only fitting that one of Manitoba's own pioneering women was recently presented with a Governor General Persons Award.

Irene Grant is the only Winnipeg recipient of this award and only one of six Canadian women so honoured this year. When Irene Grant left the Navy in 1945 after having served her country in the Second World War, she wanted to return to her career as a teacher; however, she knew that she probably would be forced to choose between marriage and a career because in 1945 women teachers, unlike their male counterparts, were automatically fired when they got married. Nevertheless, she persevered and made the decision to get married, and because she "had what they needed" as the superintendent of schools in Winnipeg said at the time, the Winnipeg School Board kept her on and broke that long-standing tradition. I know all women in Manitoba, particularly in the education system, applaud her for that pioneering action.

Mrs. Grant has continued over the last 45 years

to work on behalf of women in her role as a teacher, as a wife and mother of three children, and as a farm woman. She has been a member of the Women's Institute since 1945, a member of the Business and Professional Women's Club since 1945, which club was the organization that sponsored her for the Governor General's award and also active in the Manitoba Teachers' Society. Since 1945 she has lobbied for changing the retirement age for women to 65. She has continued her lobby and her work to provide pay equity in provincial and federal Governments, Government jobs, a fight which continues today, as well as working for pension for women employees.

* (1440)

I would also like to pay tribute to our mothers and grandmothers on this day who have fought for the vote, fought for being called persons, and who continue to fight for equal opportunity and protection before the law.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Irene Grant on her well-deserved award and thank her on behalf of all of the women in Manitoba for her untiring work for justice and fairness for all.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate our caucus with the comments of the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) on behalf of foster parents.

As someone who has fostered off and on since 1969, I know something of the trials and the problems that one encounters in that particular profession. It is not always easy as the Minister for Highways (Mr. Driedger) says, and there are more than a thousand families in this province who give freely of their time and their energy and their love to ensure that a great many children have got a normal family setting to go to when their family is incapable of caring for them. I think we owe them a great deal of thanks and support and all our support as legislators in the work that they do.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort

Garry (Mrs. Vodrey) for the address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the Session, the Honourable Member for The Pas.

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I want to start my address today by first of all congratulating you on your reappointment by the Legislature to the honourable position of Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as you are probably aware, I am not exactly a stranger to the Manitoba Legislative Buildings. I have come here on numerous occasions before meeting with Government Ministers, officials, Opposition Members, negotiating or discussing issues which impacted upon my people.

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

During my orientation as a new MLA I told my colleagues that now I actually have a seat right here in the Chamber I would still miss my favourite spot up in the public gallery where I watched many proceedings in this Chamber.

During the times that I sat up there, Mr. Speaker (Mr. Rocan), you impressed me, as I watched you perform your duties, as a person who has a good sense of fairness, generosity and empathy. You displayed those characteristics once more during the two weeks prior to June 23 where under very difficult circumstances you discharged your responsibility, in my estimation, in an extremely professional manner.

I also want to congratulate those Members who have been appointed as Deputy Speakers.

Next I congratulate all of those Members who, like myself, were elected to the Legislature for the first time.

Congratulations also go to those Members who were re-elected to office in the last election.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in my former office as chief of my band, The Pas Indian Band, who is a signatory to Treaty 5, I had the pleasure of working with many of those Members, Members of all three Parties. Therefore, I look forward to working with all of them during the time that I am going to be sitting here as a Member of the Legislature representing The Pas riding.

I would also like to pay tribute to those people who are not here now. Some have decided to retire from public office. Some were defeated in the last election. I particularly want to pay tribute to our

former MLA and friend, Harry Harapiak, who represented our riding in an honourable way for several years.

Madam Deputy Speaker, allow me then also to bring greetings on behalf of all our members in my constituency, to you and to all Members of this Assembly.

Also at this time I want to acknowledge all of the people from the constituency of The Pas, who have bestowed upon me the honour and privilege of representing them in this Assembly.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

The Pas riding is comprised of the Town of The Pas; The Pas Indian Band right across the river from the town north; Young Point, a little community just south of The Pas; Umpherville settlement, a little community just adjacent east of The Pas; Carrot River Valley, the farming community right adjacent west of the Town of The Pas; Ralls Island, another farming community to the east side; Valley View Trailer Court, a little community south of The Pas; Big Eddy, a Metis settlement; Cormorant; Wanless; Rocky Lake; Clearwater Lake; Moose Lake; Easterville; Grand Rapids; Norway House; Cross Lake; and yes, our riding also includes The Pas Correctional Centre; Egg Lake Rehabilitation Centre and the hospitals.

To all of those people who reside in those communities, I pledge myself again today, as I have done during the nomination process, during the campaign, and finally when I made my speech immediately after the election that I will always give my best effort in representing their interests in this Assembly.

Our constituency area was changed just prior to the last election. It now includes the communities of Cross Lake and Norway House. The community of Pelican Rapids' Shoal River Indian band were moved over to the Swan River riding. Our constituency is comprised approximately of 11,000 registered voters in the last election, of which over 68 percent are of aboriginal descent.

* (1450)

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

I come here with humility, Madam Deputy Speaker. I know that I am not better than anyone else here. I am just one child among many to our Mother Earth. I know who I am however, what I am

all about, where I have come from, where I am at this very moment. Knowing who I am, where I come from, and knowing where I am at today, I also know where I want to go and where I am going to go.

I am an aboriginal person. I was born here on this land. I am indigenous to this land. My parents, my grandparents and their grandparents were born here and were indigenous to this land. You see this is my ancestral homeland. This is also the ancestral homeland of my grandfathers and my grandmothers. This is where my roots are. I have a history here. This is where my history is. I also have a way of living. I always did, and I still have a way of living today. I have a culture. I have a culture and heritage.

I also speak my mother tongue. In spite of what I have gone through in the past, I am proud to say that I still speak my mother tongue today. I am proud of who I am. I am proud to be an aboriginal person. That is one thing that I will never allow anyone to take away from me, nor allow myself to lose it. I am all right. This is what our elders have taught us.

When I speak these words—by the way, Madam Deputy Speaker, I speak for all aboriginal people, because I know those are the very words that they have been speaking since our white brothers and sisters came to our homeland.

(Inuktituk was spoken)

(English)

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have heard His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor read the Speech from the Throne, and since then I have read and studied the speech document the best way I knew how. In my own way, I have made some observations and I have tried to formulate some commentary.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this past summer has been extremely long and hot. It has been a period of time when Canadians across the country, Canadian people, have really been doing an unprecedented amount of soul searching and trying to find themselves. It has been a period when many Canadians, Canadian people, were trying to identify and clarify their relationship with aboriginal people across this land.

Indeed, Madam Deputy Speaker, many Canadians discovered themselves in this respect for the first time. Many Canadians liked what they found or discovered, while many more disliked what they saw. Many of those people who were unhappy with whoever was staring at them from the mirror

were able to come to grips with it, with themselves and come to some reconciliation with themselves.

However, many more decided to opt for the denial process. You see, we as aboriginal people knew all along who we were and what our relationship was with the mainstream society and its Governments and what we would do and what we wanted. It saddens me that the throne speech made no reference to establishing a new relationship with aboriginal people of this province. Other than a vague mention of consultation, we all know what years and years of consultation with aboriginal people has achieved.

Madam Deputy Speaker, perhaps this Government has not come to the realization yet that the aboriginal political landscape in this country has been changed permanently by events of this past summer and is never ever going to be the same again, or is this Government part of that segment of Canadian society that has chosen the denial process? There is no mention, for example, of any plan to settle treaty and aboriginal rights such as treaty land entitlement.

This Government should be mindful of recent Supreme Court decisions, such as the Sparrow and Sioui cases at the Supreme Court level, and more closely to home of course is the Flett case at the Manitoba Court of Appeal.

The Supreme Court of Canada decisions not only dealt with specific cases on treaty and aboriginal rights, hunting and fishing, but they went beyond those cases when they wrote their decision. For example, they decreed that, in cases where an aboriginal or treaty right was involved, decisions should be made in favour of the aboriginal people wherever there was any doubt.

* (1500)

From now on the courts have been told by the highest court of the land that the law be interpreted liberally when dealing with aboriginal and treaty rights. It says so right in the court decisions. The courts went on to say that aboriginal people be consulted before any development comes into their treaty area or even onto their traditional land use area.

The decision went on to chastise the federal Government for not protecting the interests of aboriginal people when it comes to development like hydro, forestry, mining, road construction and so on,

or whenever agreements are made between provincial and federal Governments.

The Supreme Court decision, the panel of judges who made that decision made it very clear that in the future whenever agreements are being made between Governments, that the interests of aboriginal people be taken into consideration and that agreements should be formulated and agreed to in such a matter. The Supreme Court decision also made it very clear that the federal Government, the Department of Indian Affairs in fact has a trustee and fiduciary responsibility over treaty aboriginal people. So it is with interest that I listen to His Honour, when talking about this northern commission. It is my hope that when in fact this northern commission is established people from the north, aboriginal and non-aboriginal alike, be part of the commission because, as I said before, this Government should be mindful of the Supreme Court decisions and their implications in future developments.

What do aboriginal people want in self-government? It has always been an issue that has either never really been understood by anybody, those in provincial and federal Governments. Sometimes I take the view that they do understand what aboriginal and self-government means, and because they understand that it means transferring of power and authority or sharing power and authority with the aboriginal people, perhaps that is why it has been so difficult to get any kind of an agreement or even getting the provincial and federal Governments to recognize that aboriginal people have the inherent right for self-government.

You see, Madam Deputy Speaker, aboriginal people were here first. Then came our brothers and sisters later on, much, much, much later on. History, documentation, findings have shown that we were here thousands of years before our white brothers and sisters. During the time that we were here by ourselves, we had our own forms of government. We had our own institutions. We had our own spiritual and educational institutions. When the treaties were signed, we never signed away those rights that we are fighting for so desperately today.

What do aboriginal people want in self-government? They want that right to be recognized by all levels of Government and by Canadians throughout this land. They want that right to self-government, to be enshrined or entrenched in the Constitution so that it could never be done

away with by subsequent legislation or other legislation or by any policy.

If governments were to do that, it would mean recognizing the inherent power and authority at the aboriginal level. It means sharing the authority and power, the resources, the land and everything. I do not think that is what the provincial and federal Governments' intentions are, not just yet anyway.

Governments have always used the excuse that because they do not understand what self-government means, they are not prepared to entrench it in any constitution, or they are not prepared to enter into any agreements or negotiations with aboriginal people.

I find that confusing sometimes, Madam Deputy Speaker, because when I look at legislation such as free trade, policies that come out from provincial and federal Governments, in almost every case Canadian people do not really understand what those policies, Bills, legislations mean, but they go through anyway, they get passed by Governments.

For example, in free trade, federal Governments, including provincial Governments said, yes, we agree with free trade, we agree with the concept, even though we do not know the full ramifications of free trade. The concept is good. It is good for Canadians. Let us go ahead and do it, and we will worry about the details once the Free Trade Agreement has been implemented. Madam Deputy Speaker, as we all know today, the implications and the ramifications of free trade we see all over us, and there are a lot of negative implications.

Along came Meech Lake. Again people were against Meech Lake. People were against free trade. Nobody really knew what the proposed amendments meant. There were a lot of gray areas, but Governments decided to go ahead anyway. They were not saying to Canadians, we do not want to sign this or we do not want to pass this because we really do not know what the implications are. Things went ahead anyway. We did not know what Meech Lake was all about.

Thanks to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) and the 61 chiefs of Manitoba—not Brian Mulroney, not Clyde Wells, not Premier Bourassa. Thanks to the Member for Rupertsland and the 61 chiefs of Manitoba, Meech Lake was stopped.

So when Government's First Ministers asked the aboriginal people: How can you expect us to enter

into agreements with you; how do you expect us to entrench something in the Constitution when we do not know the full implications of such a move? Madam Deputy Speaker, it is my humble opinion that is just an excuse. First Ministers were never really interested in entering into any meaningful dialogue with aboriginal people to recognize their inherent rights to self-government.

* (1510)

Madam Deputy Speaker, I also get asked the question many times when I talk about aboriginal self-government, people ask me, what is it that you want? Are you going to be a separate state? Are you going to be on your own away from everybody? My answer invariably is: it means aboriginal people having their own land base, which is one of the basic requirements of a government. It means having people, which also includes institutions, whether they be religious, cultural, spiritual, education, social services, and judicial systems. We need our own institutions, institutions that will develop the people to go along with the land base.

On top of that, aboriginal people are saying to Governments today and to Canadian society that there has to be an economic base. I think those are the basic elements that aboriginal people have been talking about for many, many years.

The example that I always like to use in order to try to make my point or to try to make people understand is the example of a car. You see, Madam Deputy Speaker, for many years aboriginal people have not been at the controls of anything. Aboriginal people have been controlled right from the time that they are born and even after they are dead; that is how much control and suppression that is being placed on aboriginal people. In the same breath we wonder, how come there has not been any development, how come aboriginal people do not go to school, and how come aboriginal people do not go into business? From there we make all kinds of assumptions and then conclusions.

I always use the example that if you are not in the driver's seat you are not at the controls. If you are just a passenger in the vehicle, then you go wherever the driver wants to go and you go as fast as the driver wants to go. If the driver is going to go very slow, that is how slow you go. If the driver stops, then you stop.

A couple of years ago the Free Press did a documentation of aboriginal development over the

past 20 years. I think the conclusions made from that special edition of the Free Press was that aboriginal growth and development had been so painstakingly slow, had taken so slow. Given all the money that was given to aboriginal people, people thought that by now they would be so developed and they would be just like the rest of society.

I agreed with that conclusion. Yes, the growth and development of aboriginal people has been too slow, but I also say to people: Can you imagine the pace of growth and development that would have taken place in the aboriginal community if aboriginal people were given some kind of control, even partial control, over their own lives? In spite of all those controls, aboriginal people were able to advance the way they did.

I know when I speak about my band—again, I use the example that 20 years ago, I was just out of high school, and I visited my chief, the late Gordon Lathlin, and when I went to the band office, which was just a little two-bedroom house, he so proudly showed me his Government office. He had three staff, and he very proudly told me what his budget was, all of \$20,000.00. That is 20 years ago.

Today my band, I think, has undergone a lot of growth and development. Today we have people who are graduating from high school, from universities. Today we are beginning to have better homes. We now have sewer and water. We have economic development, business development, and we have individuals who are actually getting into business for themselves.

So even though that report was bleak—the Free Press report is what I am talking about—I always get the satisfaction that in spite of all the roadblocks and obstacles that have been placed there, we nevertheless have grown tremendously and developed tremendously. Even when we are given some control or partial control, people must not forget that we are still in a catch-up situation.

I also want to speak about seniors, Madam Deputy Speaker. I regard seniors, our elders with the greatest respect. They are our teachers. They were the ones who developed this country or made things easier for us. They looked after us. Like I said, they taught us. So today when I look around, I am saddened by the fact that we institutionalize our elders too much. When I visit our elders on our reserve, one of the things they always say to me when I walk in is, I bet you are coming here to put

me in a care home. I am not going, I am sorry. So I think programs and services for senior citizens is very, very important.

I would also like to have seen more done for women in the throne speech. We need more resources for day care centres. We need more resources for crisis centres. All this week we have been talking, debating, asking questions, or looking into the situation that women find themselves in today. I know where I come from the people there who are involved in women's crisis centres are trying to get more resources. They are trying to expand their facilities, and they are also trying to lengthen the stay that their clients have in the crisis. They are also telling me that they want to extend the period of after care. In other words, the longer they can stay in a crisis centre and the longer they can receive after care, quality counselling, the better it will be for them.

I also want to talk a little bit about the North, I think Government Ministers have heard me say this before, and the Opposition Members have heard me say this before. When we talk about hydro, forestry, mining and so on, people always tell us in the North that we have come here to harvest all of these rich resources, and once we have harvested them then we are going to ship them out. Then maybe we will be back someday to get some more. I mean, that is the attitude that northern people have, and I do not blame them, because whenever there is any development taking place, people come in, they hire the northern people, go and cut the trails, clear the bush, muck the ditches, blast the rocks, and a plant goes up. Then everything is finished and then goodbye after that.

We are lucky sometimes if we get one technical job to take advantage of once the plant is finished. So what I would have liked to have seen is that a northern heritage fund be established for the North for northern development. That is what I would be recommending to this northern commission whenever it gets established, because I think it is time now that the northern people are recognized for what they contribute. I know people always say, well, natural resources belong to all people of Manitoba. Well, northern people always say, resources come to the south, we never complain. If that is the notion that people are going to take, well, whenever resources come to Winnipeg, why not send some up North, because we sure need it.

* (1520)

The farming community, the Port of Churchill, the railway, communities along the way are mostly aboriginal people. They use the railway as transportation, communication, a development tool, and they also use it for jobs. They also use it to cut the cost of living down.

The Keewatin Community College—I know our travel council lobbied for local input, but the way the Keewatin Community College is going to be privatized or a board of governorship developed, I am concerned and our people are concerned in my constituency that jobs will be lost. We recognize the concept of local input. After all, we lobbied for that. It is a good concept, but I think, at the same time it is being implemented, those jobs benefits will have to be protected.

Fishing is also another important issue in the North. I know I am being told to sit down, but I will mention forebay and northern flood. We need roads up North in Cross Lake, Norway House and Cormorant.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to thank you for giving me the time to speak and for listening to me. Thank you very much.

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): -(interjection)- Did you want to speak? Oh, well, you should have spoken yesterday.

It is a pleasure for me to join in the throne speech. It is a pleasure for me to, once again, for the third time, come back into this House after a very grueling election. Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to congratulate you on your appointment and those other Deputy Speakers who have also been appointed, and to the Speaker, through you, Madam Deputy Speaker, congratulations for being reappointed. -(interjection)-

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) tells me to stand up. Well, I guess I was born this tall, and I cannot help that. -(interjection)- I was born to be that tall. That is right. Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to congratulate all 57 Members who were elected, and congratulate those who were elected for the first time. This is quite an experience to be elected to represent their constituencies in this Chamber. It is an honour and it is also a very big responsibility that every Member takes on to represent their constituents well and to represent them with dignity and honour and honesty. I hope

that we see that, although at times we sometimes get discouraged over the lack of it.

I would also like to congratulate the two new Ministers we have appointed, the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik). I think these are two men who are going to do an excellent job for us. I think we have already seen their abilities in answering questions and they are going to do credit to this Government and credit to keeping this Government in power for a very long, long time.

I was very impressed, Madam Deputy Speaker, with the Mover and the Seconder to the throne speech, the Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), the Member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose), their maiden speeches in this Legislature. I think they did an excellent job, as do all of the new Members on all sides and that, as they get up to speak, while it is a very nervous time for new Members, they have all done very, very well and I congratulate them on that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the election was a very interesting one. For some time before the election, the Liberals and the Liberal Leader kept on saying that Portage was a swing seat. -(interjection)- I do not know why the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux)—

An Honourable Member: Swinging our way.

Mr. Connery: —says hear, hear, but the Member for Inkster obviously is not politically astute. It was a swing seat because really we swung the door right shut in the Liberals face. In fact, we went from a 1,200 majority the previous election to almost 2,000—I think it was 1,944. For a swing seat I do not think they even came close.

In fact, Madam Deputy Speaker, we only lost one poll in the election, so I think that augurs well. There is room for improvement, that is right; next time we would not lose any polls, but I think it is appropriate that I thank, first of all, all of those people who voted for me in the election. There were somewhere around 4,400 people who voted for us; I want to thank them. I also want to thank all of the supporters who worked so very hard. In fact, we are just sending out letters now, thanking them and inviting them to a reception to give more formal and personal thanks. There were over 200 letters that have gone out to individuals who worked for us in the campaign, and to them I want to say thank you for a very devoted job and probably one of the best

campaigns that you will see in the Province of Manitoba. The degree of professionalism, the enthusiasm that that group exhibits, the organization I think is one that all constituencies can look up to.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I do want to make special note of the efforts that my wife put in, walking with me door to door, knocking on doors and talking with people. I will tell you, my wife has done an excellent job for me, not only in elections, but in between elections. She will attend functions in the constituency if I am not able to attend. I can say that when I was elected, really the people of Portage elected two MLAs because my wife has been that kind of support to me and to the constituency. -(interjection)-

That is right, my wife got me elected and I am very pleased about that.

I would like to comment on the finances. The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) continuously says that our money comes from corporations. Madam Deputy Speaker, I can tell you that the money that came to support my election came from grass-roots people. It came in small amounts of money—\$5, \$10, \$15, \$20.00. Sure, there was the odd one that got in over \$100 but no corporate donations. Grass-roots people wanting good administration and knowing that the Conservative Party was the Party to put in. That is the Party they did put in, so I want to express thanks to all of those people who contributed financially. I do not know what the final tally is, but we are going to have collected something like over \$23,000 in the constituency toward the election. That is significantly more than what we had to spend to get elected.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it was interesting in this election, we had to take on basically the whole federal scene. In fact, at one of the debates we were at, I questioned whether we were in a federal election or in a provincial election, because all of the issues raised by the NDP and the Liberals were federal in nature.

Not only did I have to take on the unpopular federal Government, Mulroney, and the closing of the air base which I still say was a disastrous decision, we also had to take on Jean Chretien, whom the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) thought was going to save her in this coming election, brought him out and traipsed him

up and down the avenue, stood him on a few pedestals, and I think their support went down.

They brought in Eugene Whelan, the ancient Minister of Agriculture, and I know at a meeting he conducted they had 49 supporters and our snitch, so that was 50 they had at the meeting. Then they brought in senators. They brought in several of the Senators to campaign for the Liberals in Portage la Prairie and they brought in M.P.s.

What bothers me is why the Liberal Leader of Manitoba (Mrs. Carstairs), the Leader of the third Party, the Second Opposition—maybe next election not even here—would support John Chretien. Because John Chretien is not somebody who is going to support Manitoba and support western Canada. Why would she not have even at least supported Lloyd Axworthy whom we know at least supports Winnipeg and western Canada? So I do not understand why we would not be supporting a native son, but there is a romance or something for Jean Chretien that is there.

* (1530)

What does Jean Chretien do? The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) stands up here in the House and says she is concerned about education, and yet she supports Jean Chretien who lowered the EPF funding from I think it was 52 percent to 41—major changes. He was also a Cabinet Minister when John Turner, as Finance Minister, started this country into the financial chaos that it is in today because he tried to spend the country's way out of a recession and it did not work. So I really have some questions.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think that the Conservative Party can stand in this House proud over the campaign that we conducted. We conducted a class campaign. We stuck to the high road. We stuck to the provincial issues. Our ads were of high quality. We had a made-in-Manitoba election. We hired Manitobans to conduct our election.

What did the Liberals do? They went to Ontario. I am sure after the Ontario election they must have had a fit knowing that the brain power they were having running their campaign was the same one as the one running the Ontario one that got thrashed, so I think it was time.

The NDP, they went to British Columbia. There is nobody in Manitoba capable. Even right in our own

campaign in Portage la Prairie they had to bring in somebody from Ontario to run the Liberal campaign.

Now I know, Madam Deputy Speaker, there are quality Liberals in Portage la Prairie, but they would not support this Party that is in here today. They would not support the Liberals because I know who they are and there were no Liberal signs, and they did not support the campaign. Can you imagine a campaign that shows profits? How demeaning—how demeaning can you be to other politicians? That is why we heard more criticism at the door for the type of campaigns, and that is why politicians are held in so low esteem is because we saw that kind of campaign.

The Liberals had the worst one, but the NDP are not totally out of the water. I will tell you the local NDP candidate was not very—quality in his speeches that he made. So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I can tell you that there were many times I bit my tongue and chewed the inside of my cheek to keep from responding. We could have responded in some of the things they were saying, but I did not think it would have been appropriate.

Madam Deputy Speaker, when we came into power in 1988, what did we inherit? We inherited a financially bankrupt Government from a Government that was morally and technically bankrupt if indeed they really did have any morals or scruples to start with. You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, they are not sitting here. I do not see them here at this moment, but the Member for Churchill, the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard S. Evans), the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) were all Members of that disastrous Cabinet that almost ruined this country. Well, not almost, because it is turning around now. This was the Government that was really so bad that—what was it?—16 out of 20, or 17 out of 21 years that the NDP were in power. So this is what we had to inherit and had to try and turn around.

You know what galls me is that they stand over there and they say, we are for the people. Well, what hypocrisy for them to stand up and say, "We are for the people." I was reading the newspaper today, and on the front page it said—what were the loans that the Government is in debt on now?—three something billion dollars of student loans that are not being repaid, other students complaining

because of those loans not being repaid. They are getting a surcharge.

Two Members of this House, one of them when he got caught in '86—the Leader of the NDP Party immediately paid his. I would say to the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), now that you have an income—and maybe you had difficulties, I do not know—go out and get a loan now that you have a steady income for four years and pay off the student loan. That is why I say I get sick and tired of that holier than thou attitude standing over there saying they are for the people. Their only image is I. They have the Hawaiian disease and what is in it for I.

You know, it was interesting—and I am not sure what year it was, it was '86 or '87 when there was a clamour for the income tax papers that the three Leaders had put in for the—it was '86 or '87. We were still in opposition. All three Leaders agreed to put them open to public scrutiny, and the interesting part, when it came down to donations, the Leader of the Conservative Party, the now Premier (Mr. Filmon) of the province, had donated something like \$2,500.00. This is in Hansard. The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs), to her credit, had contributed very close to that amount. While all three Leaders had similar incomes, the Leader of the Party concerned about people donated \$160.00. Can you imagine? From a Party that says they are concerned about people, and he gave a whole amount.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, what it makes me say is that NDP stands for New Democratic Pretenders, or you could say New Democratic Preys, not with the "a", with the "e", because I think it is the preying on people. I get up and I say this in all sincerity, because I believe that they look upon people—while they say they are for them, the people are chattel in their eyes. They are looking for what they can get from those people, and that is a vote.

What year was it, '86 or whatever when they sold—I wonder if the new NDP Members know that their Government sold all the Government buildings, except I think this building, in an effort -(interjection)- well, now you know something. No, they did not sell the Legislature, but they sold all of the buildings. I forget the exact amount—something like \$400 million was it?—\$420 million in that area they got for the Government buildings. Most of you did not realize that. Why did they do it? They needed more money. They were on a spending binge, and they

did not want to have to go and borrow more, so they sold our buildings.

They had to pay on those shares that they sold, so we still had the cost, but temporarily it got them out of a bind. That is the sort of deceit that I think is not what we want to see -(interjection)- Pardon -(interjection)- Oh, they spent it. You know they are excellent at that. I do not know how many of you remember the tax grab of the century, 1987 provincial budget -(interjection)- Yes sir, that was quite a year. I have not looked at the tax returns lately. I do not know if line 224 is still at the same place, but I would hope the new Members would take a look at it where we put on the new tax grab on line 224 of your income tax return, the 2 percent flat tax before your personal exemptions, before exemptions for children, before medical deductions, and before charitable donations. Can you imagine a Party that would do that, and they say they are for the people? That leaves me a little bit wanting.

It goes on in here and, of course, I will update some of these things because it said, the greatest tax grab in the history of Manitoba, an additional \$369 million in one year, an increase of 20 percent. This new 2 percent flat tax on their net income, line 224, before all of those other deductions that should have been there, they added another 1 percent sales tax. The land transfer tax on new homes or homes was put in, 7 percent tax on take-out foods, and the payroll tax was increased by 50 percent up to 2.25 percent.

At the same time, and for those new Members so that they would know when you start supporting the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), your Leader, he was part—he was in the Cabinet when these things were being done. He increased Hydro rates 9.7 percent, telephone rates 11.5 percent, Autopac 9 to 30 percent, and not like the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) who stands up and says, Autopac rates suggested 5 to 30, 5.5 was the average you see. It is that misleading thing that he is so good at, misleading and distorting the facts trying to leave an image that is not there. I think that is disgusting that we see that sort of thing.

* (1540)

Also, Workers Compensation fees, three years in a row it is in here, but it ended up being five years in a row of 20 percent increase, and they had forecast another two years of 20 percent. Fortunately, we were elected and we have turned

that around. That is the legacy of the New Democratic Party. -(interjection)- Well, a mess, I think to say that, and one Member says that it was a mess when we took over, is being kind.

How did all of these things come about? Some of the new Members maybe do not remember it. How many of you remember MTX? This is a Government-in-waiting over there that wants to get back in to create some of the same chaos that was there for all those years. MTX, \$27 million loss of taxpayers' money that could be going toward hospitals, day care, education—gone. Manfor, it says \$31 million, but I think in the long wash out it is an awful lot more than that we lost at Manfor. MPIC they lost \$60 million. Can you believe, \$60 million, and they want to govern this province again?

What about—I mentioned Workers Compensation, and in this one here it shows on the books that they had an \$84 million deficit. When we came into power and looked at the books, it was \$232 million deficit. In 1981 there was a \$26 million surplus. By the time we took over in '88, it was \$232 deficit. That is the Party that wants to form Government again, and I would suggest to their new Members that you look very carefully at how hard you work to get them in because you are helping to pay that bill, if indeed you are paying.

What about Flyer Industry? Now, there is a very interesting one. Flyer Industry, they lost \$100 million on Flyer Industry. So they turned around and sold it to a Dutch company, a company that I would say is doing very good now, creating a lot of jobs, paying income tax and contributing to the welfare of this province, contributing to education, hospitals and so forth. What was their sale? They gave them \$3 million just out-of-pocket and then guaranteed another \$8 million. That was the NDP sale. Can you imagine? Give \$3 million and guarantee \$8 million to get rid of something, but it still was cheap for the taxpayers of Manitoba in the long run.

The interest charges on the province's debt, it says, will cost taxpayers \$489 million this year, a 400 percent increase since the NDP took power in '81 and we are talking about '87. Well, what is it now—\$550 million on interest on the deficit that they put up.

What has that done to the opportunities that we could have today? If we had a fiscally responsible Government in place that spent wisely, we would have \$550 million. Well, let us just say \$400 million.

There would still be some debt, but let us say \$400 million.

What could we do for the betterment of the people of Manitoba in day care, the crisis shelters, highways—all of those things we could have done a lot -(interjection)- pardon?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Would I build highways!

Mr. Connery: The Minister of Highways is doing a super job, but give him another \$50 million and highways would go really good. I will tell you, one of the best Ministers of Highways that this province has seen in a long, long time.

Let me tell you a little bit about Ministers of Highways. When the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) was the Minister of Highways, what did he do? He paved the road to Waterhen where his cottage was, and he said to me, when I brought that up, that the people of Waterhen were happy. Absolutely they would be. Why would they not be?

What about the people in the other parts of the province who really need it and were important to go to? He paved the road to—in 1981 every citizen's share of the provincial debt was \$4,000.00. In 1987 it was \$9,500.00. Can you imagine the debt going up \$5,500 per person in that disastrous period of time that the NDP were in power? That is the NDP legacy.

If they were ever to get back in again, that would be the continued legacy, because they do not know—actually how many of them on that side have ever created a job or made a payroll cheque to somebody? I look around and I do not see—so I guess maybe that is why they do not understand how it can be done. -(interjection)- I make no pretensions. As individuals I like them as people. As people I like all people in this House. It is their policies and their philosophy that I do not like. When I say it, I am talking about policy and philosophy.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the constituency of Portage la Prairie, in this last year and a half, has been probably one area of Manitoba that has been hit quite hard. It has been hit by the threat and closure of the Canadian Forces Base, which contributes about 20 percent of the economic activity to the community. We are also having the closure of Campbell Soup, which will take place in the spring of 1991.

I can accept the closure of Campbell Soup because it was done in a business way with

business rules. They were consolidating their plant production.

When Campbell Soup announced that they were closing, I flew to Toronto with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) to speak to their head office in Toronto. They were saying then they had three plants, one in Quebec, one in Portage and one in Toronto. The one in Toronto was large enough to produce all of the soup that they are producing, and soup sales are flat. There is no increase in those soup sales.

At the same time they were closing I think it was four or five soup plants in the States. They were consolidating their production for economic reasons, to become more viable. They even closed their initial plant, their first plant in Camden, New Jersey.

Campbell Soup was a good corporate citizen to the City of Portage la Prairie. They contributed to the community. Their employees came and left part of themselves in Portage, and we really respect what they have done for the community.

We really feel quite sad to see this company leaving Portage la Prairie and Manitoba, because let us keep in mind these big companies, like McCain, Campbell Soup and all of them, while they contribute to the local community, they contribute as much or more to the whole province. So it is not just our own local communities that suffer; it is the province as a whole.

I guess the one that I really feel most, I guess, vexed about is the closure of the base. I still will not accept the way that it was done, but Madam Deputy Speaker, I can tell you one thing. We worked very hard with the community to first of all try to keep the base open and, secondly, once we found that it was going to close, that we would work to bring in the privatized training.

I helped finance and worked with the Portage in Motion people, a large group of very sincere people who have worked to help keep the base and now are working to get the privatization. We attended rallies and spoke with them. I went to Ottawa with the Premier (Mr. Filmon) with the group from Portage to meet with the Minister of Defense, Mr. McKnight, to try to convince him that what they were doing is wrong. Unfortunately, we did not have success in doing that.

Let me talk about the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) when she talks about how she was going

to help Portage la Prairie and how she was so incensed with the closure of the base—and it is in Hansard if one wants to peruse last year's Hansard—where the Premier got up to talk about things that he had spoken with the Prime Minister. The first thing he talked about was the base closure in Portage, and she jumped all over him. Why was she wasting time doing that? There were other more important things on her agenda that day, and there were no votes to be got in supporting the keeping open of the Portage base.

The Premier, I can tell you, through all of these times with the base closure has been very, very supportive to Portage la Prairie. He came out, he attended rallies. He has spoken to the group, he has met groups in here in the Legislature. He went to Ottawa with us. He has met with the Prime Minister on many occasions and has represented the concerns of Portage with the Prime Minister on many occasions. He also has sent a personal letter to every company that is interested in locating with the privatized training, giving his personal support and the support of the Government.

* (1550)

Madam Deputy Speaker, we do have good news in Portage la Prairie. First of all, the good news is that we have a very strong, resilient people in Portage. A lot of the stock comes from pioneers, that their great-great-grandparents came and were the first to till some of the soil in the area around Portage.

We have Western Combine which is contributing some 90 jobs to the local area. They are constructing rotary combines that are being shipped all over North America. It is with some pride when I see these trucks pulling out of Portage knowing that there is something that was put together in Portage la Prairie and is going all over North America, some 90 jobs. There were \$3 million of forgivable loans put in by the federal Government and \$2 million by the provincial. The province made a strong commitment there in helping to ensure that those jobs would be in Portage la Prairie.

We can look at Can-Oat's, the Kent Family constructing a \$16-million facility to process oats in Portage la Prairie. This will give us some 60 new jobs starting next spring when they come into production. It is interesting, if you are going around the perimeter or through town; it is just on the west side of town. I would encourage all Members, as they go around Portage or go through Portage and

stop and have lunch and do some shopping, whatever, to take a look at the mill going up.

We also have a new extended care home thanks to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) who is always under criticism from the Opposition, but the Minister of Health who was with us in the House today, I give him much credit for this new facility, an extended care home that will take people out of hospitals and will help reduce care and also contribute to the well-being of Portage residents, our senior residents. I had the pleasure of the Minister of Health, along with the Honourable D. L. Campbell and myself, turning the sod on the opening of that. I will tell you there was a fine gentleman at the age of 95—I think he is today—with faculties that most Liberals would still be honoured if they had—but I tell you, a very fine man. A very fine man and we will acknowledge that. He was there saying that maybe in 20 years he might have need of that facility. He was 95 when he said that so—(interjection)—I said they would be very proud, this modern bunch of Liberals, to have the faculties that he has even now.

Madam Deputy Speaker, no matter what happens within a constituency, Government cannot bail out a constituency or an area, a city, a town. It has to come from within. We have in Portage la Prairie a very strong, resilient, innovative group of people that in spite of all of the problems that have been thrown at them in the last year and a half are working together. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) mentioned umbrella groups during the election about this being a commitment. Portage already had done that, put together an umbrella committee made up of all of the groups in the city, whether they be civic groups, the chamber of commerce, all of the groups that are working to co-ordinate the efforts of Portage la Prairie. Remember, Governments are only facilitators. The desire has to come from within the community, and I can tell you that Portage has that desire and because of it will succeed.

Some of the things that our community is so successful at—how many of you remember last year when we had the World Junior Curling in Portage la Prairie? Curlers from, I am not sure of the exact number, but it was eight or nine countries billeted in homes, there for some 12 and 13 days. When they were leaving, they said that this was one of the best World Junior Curling that they had ever seen, and for some of them it was their third event at World Junior Curling. Over 200 workers put on that event. I would say, Madam Deputy Speaker,

that once again congratulations should go to co-chairmen, Cliff Bagrie and Lauree Clifford, and the 200 workers who worked with them to put on one of the finest events.

What about the Western Premiers' Conference we had last spring? My staff worked very quickly and closely with me to get that conference in Portage la Prairie and it was—well, I think I must congratulate the Premier and whomever on the wisdom of sending it to Portage, knowing that we are able to stage a function of that magnitude—

An Honourable Member: I guess they had a good Member.

Mr. Connery: They had a good Member, I guess, but I would say the credit goes to the people of Portage la Prairie, and that is why we would get it. The one day that I am so very proud of was right after lunch where we had some, I do not know, 300-400 students or more in the park where they had an opportunity to first of all listen to speeches made by the four western Premiers and then an opportunity for those Premiers to mix with those students and walk through. This was a great day. They called it, the Leaders of Today meet the Leaders of Tomorrow, and it really was.

That evening, there was a banquet of some 600 people, and many people here were at that event. It was a showcase, and so I do say that I am so proud to represent a constituency that is able to do these sorts of things.

Just last week, we were able to announce the Southern Diversification Initiative. Madam Deputy Speaker, I cannot say how important this is, not only to the City of Portage la Prairie and the constituency, but to all of southern Manitoba. This is a \$30 million grant, or money put in by the provincial, 30 million by the federal Government, and whatever those other communities can put in, hopefully, another 30 million, to get on with the job of sewer and water infrastructure in these rural communities. It is so vital, because we have to have that sewer and water infrastructure to allow some of these rural communities to continue to expand.

Agriculture is one of the most important industries in Manitoba today. In spite of the depressed prices and the poor sales, agriculture in rural Manitoba is undoubtedly No. 1, and we look at it from a provincial basis. I still think it is one of the most important economic drivers that this province has. It truly is the cornerstone of our economic viability.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there is an urgent need for Governments, and especially the federal Government, to sit down and develop some strategy, some safety net where the farmers can be protected, not from their own doing, but from the doings of other countries. The basic problem of the farmers in growing wheat and oilseeds in Manitoba and in Canada today is the competition and the low prices that are being put out by the European Common Market and the United States in that competition.

There really is a need for the federal Government to come in with some sort of program that will ensure that those sorts of depressed prices are mitigated. The farmers just cannot afford to do it, and as a province we cannot afford to fight the treasuries of the European Common Market. What have we done as a Government is to try to help out the farmers. Well, we have reduced the school tax on farm land. That was a significant amount of money. It is not just a one-year forgiveness, it is ongoing every year that farm tax has been taken off. -(interjection)- Twenty minutes, okay.

Well, I guess other people do want to speak, Madam Deputy Speaker, but we also gave 24 million in drought relief which triggered \$62 million in federal relief, the tripartite programs that we have in place for so many of the crops and also the reduced loans to young farmers that are given through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have taken most of the time allotted to me, and there are others who want to speak. Maybe when we get into the Budget Speech Debate, we will have some additional time. I would like to talk on environment and decentralization and a whole host of other things that I think that our Government is doing in a very positive way for the people of Manitoba. I thank you for the opportunity to say a few words.

Congratulations, once again, to all of those Members elected back into this Chamber.

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Madam Deputy Speaker, it is my pleasure to participate in my third Throne Speech Debate. Only in politics, after two and a half years in a profession, is one considered to be a veteran. In no other profession is one given power and is power taken away so quickly by the judgment of the people. May it be known to all those new Members of the House that we are never more

than an election away from obscurity. It is the knowledge that we are never more than an election away from obscurity that ought to humble us all.

As I have learned from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) on more than one occasion, this is a humbling place and something we ought to always keep in mind when we are in the full flight of rhetorical flourish, but we think that we have righteousness on our side. Perhaps occasionally we are wrong. Occasionally, the people will express to us that they believe we are, and the power that we think that we hold is actually a very flimsy thing. It is at the whim of the electorate.

Let me begin by congratulating the appointment of the Deputy Speaker. You have a responsibility to try to make some kind of order out of this chaos. It is a responsibility that I know you will take seriously. I congratulate you on your appointment, and through you to the Speaker of the House, congratulate him on this second vote of confidence from Members of the Chamber. We know him to be a man of integrity and of honour, and I suppose the highest compliment we can pay to him is that he is a good Speaker who performs his duty with all of the finest in integrity.

Let me also congratulate new Members of the House. You have been given the responsibility of safeguarding the interests of your constituents, a job that we all seek to do with all of the powers given to us. To the Pages, congratulations to you on your appointment. You are given the opportunity to witness democracy firsthand with all of its awards and all of its blemishes, and I am sure that the experience will serve you well in your future careers.

* (1600)

I would like also to thank a number of people and a number of groups of people. First, and I think more importantly, to the people of Crescentwood who have put their confidence in me to represent their interests in this House for the next two or three or four years, and I will do it to the best of my ability, to all of those who worked on the campaign, I thank them. We are running for our jobs, we are running for our careers, but the people who spend so many hours of their time as volunteers supporting us are making sacrifices in their own families and sacrifices for which they are not paid. I know all Members of this House appreciate the kind of volunteer effort and energy that contributes to the election of all of us.

A special thank you to my wife Ruth and my three children, Rachel, Ben and Rebecca. For five weeks during the election campaign, they did not see very much of their father. It is something that we all have to struggle with in this profession, and they did so with good grace, humour and understanding. I am very appreciative as always to them.

Finally, a thank you to my Leader, Madam Deputy Speaker, a Leader who has in the good times and the bad shown great strength of character, great courage, honesty and candor. She is an inspiration to many of us who look to those qualities in our political Leaders.

A word on Crescentwood—I know it is customary for newly elected Members of the Legislature to speak for a few moments about the characteristics of their ridings. The reason I do this is because the constituency now is totally different from the one I represented in the last House, the constituency of Fort Rouge. Members of the Chamber will remember such names as Gurney Evans and Cy Gonick, members of the Conservative and New Democratic Parties who represented the old riding of Crescentwood in the 1940s, '50s and '60s.

The riding has been substantially changed and has, perhaps more than any other urban riding in this House, a number of distinct neighbourhoods and communities. There is the Fort Garry community, which in itself is divided on either side of Pembina Highway, a very old neighbourhood. It is a neighbourhood, as a matter of fact, that I had the pleasure of living in for six and a half years. The Wellington Crescent part of south Winnipeg, Fort Rouge, Earl Grey, Crescentwood itself and the Grant Park area.

In the course of campaigning over the past five weeks this summer, Madam Deputy Speaker, I saw the tremendous diversity of the people who live in the riding of Crescentwood, from \$1 million homes on Wellington Crescent, to subsidized housing on Taylor Avenue, people who work in the professions, those who are unemployed, young families, students, Native people, those who represent virtually every ethnic minority in this province. Crescentwood is truly a microcosm of the society of Manitoba in which we live, and it is my pleasure to represent them.

We live in a time in dynamic and rapid change. As we look around us globally, we see the democratization of eastern Europe. We see the slow

but steady march to freedom in South Africa. We see the belated awakening of much of the world that we must respect our environment as a necessary condition for the survival of our planet, but at the same time there is the scourge of famine and disease which is savaging many countries of the developing world and particularly in Africa. We witnessed the dictators of the left and the right who seek to deny freedom and justice in too many nations of the world. We have the hot spots in the Middle East and in Central America which threaten our peace and our security.

At the same time, we see the buildup and the threatened use of deadly chemical weapons which hang over us like a dark cloud as we witness the trouble spots around the world. In the midst of all of this, we see that Canada remains the envy of the world. We see that Canada remains to all those who are aware of this progressive society, that we do better than most in preparing for the future, for our environment, for our children, to eradicate poverty and disease. In the midst of this dynamic change, we as a nation are experiencing our own fractures and our own divisions that will have to be addressed within the next few years if we are to survive as a nation as we know it.

As we look at the throne speech that was read by the Lieutenant-Governor about a week ago, it is as remarkable for those things which are not mentioned as for those things which are.

Incredibly, the whole issue of education was not given a single word in the Speech from the Throne. A priority of the Government itself is for the provision of a high quality educational system for the people of Manitoba, and there is no mention of our public school system in the throne speech. Why was it left out? Was the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) consulted on what would be in the throne speech? Did the Minister of —(interjection)— the Minister of Education, from his seat says, absolutely. Then he should be ashamed that the priority of education enunciated by his own Premier (Mr. Filmon) and other Members of his Cabinet are given absolutely no attention in the Speech from the Throne.

I would have felt better if the Minister had said he had not been consulted. At least then we would know that the Minister of Education had some idea that education ought to be a priority and it was just that the Premier was not listening to him.

Also, remarkably, Madam Deputy Speaker, at a

time when the price of energy is skyrocketing worldwide, at a time when the crisis in the Gulf has seen the doubling of the price of a barrel of oil in only the last two months—and if there should be, by circumstance, a shooting war in the Gulf, the price of oil will skyrocket even more—there was not one mention in the throne speech of energy.

That is to say, this Government has no plans for the conservation of energy. Apparently, it has no initiatives to take on the search for alternate sources of energy. It has absolutely nothing to say about the crisis, a crisis which is not unique in our time, a crisis we know about too well from the experience of 1973 and 1979, yet with the mistakes of the past squarely in front of us, still in this throne speech there is not so much as a one-word reference even "en passant" to the problems of energy conservation and the search for alternate sources.

How about the issue of urban affairs? Manitoba is unique in all provinces of Canada in that more than 50 percent of the population of this province lives in the metropolitan area of Winnipeg. Yet, this throne speech does not contribute one line, not one syllable to the issue of economic development for the City of Winnipeg, for the reform of our municipal political institutions, to the amalgamation of Crown corporations or arm's length institutions into a single downtown revitalization agency. Absolutely silent on all of those important issues that face the citizens of Winnipeg in a province where that city makes up fully 62 percent of the population.

Neither is there any mention of the whole issue of tourism. The reason that I am highlighting these issues is that my Leader has seen fit to give me responsibility for them, yet there is no mention of them in the throne speech. I guess that means that I will be busier than I thought I might, because the Government itself seems to have no interest at all in at least three of the areas for which I am responsible. Manitoba has a wonderful tourist potential and very often those people who visit our province from elsewhere in Canada, from south of the border or from around the world have a higher opinion of us than we sometimes have of ourselves.

That is to say that this Government again shows absolutely no initiative, no sense of direction to find ways in which we can promote ourselves as a province. If the Government has any ideas, if the Government has initiatives or proposals, why then were they not mentioned, again, at least with the reference of half a line in the throne speech?

The throne speech says nothing about energy at a time when a critical problem of energy supply, of energy pricing, of alternate sources of energy in front of us, the Government has not a single word to say.

The Government says nothing about the future of the city of Winnipeg. It says nothing about changes to The City of Winnipeg Act for this Session, and it has nothing to say on the whole issue of tourism. If you look at the tone of the throne speech, you are reminded of a fund-raising letter that was written to Conservative supporters that talked about phase two of the Conservative agenda. Madam Deputy Speaker, phase two is written clearly, not between the lines. The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) is clapping because he agrees with me, that phase two is there, not between the lines, but in black and white in the throne speech.

No matter that the important issues facing the province are entirely ignored, what is not ignored is phase two of the political agenda of this right-wing Conservative administration. What is that right-wing agenda? If you look at the detail paragraph by paragraph of the throne speech, you know that it was written for the Tory friends in big business.

* (1610)

To keep Members of the business establishment happy with the pronouncements of the throne speech was far more important to this Government than looking toward services to people, because the references to the economic climate, the references to deregulation of business, the issues to supporting the business sector in the province far outweigh any reference to health care, to education, to family services, or to services to people.

That, Madam Deputy Speaker, is the real agenda of the Conservative Government, agenda that we were able to in part suppress in a minority situation when under the close scrutiny of the Opposition. When the Government knew that it could fall any day on a vote within this Chamber, we were able to put the brakes on the real Conservative agenda, but now the foot is squarely on the accelerator gaining momentum with a majority mandate for them to be able to do those things they wanted to do in the last Legislature, but could not because of the constraints put upon it by an aggressive Opposition.

If you were to ask the people of Manitoba what is in it for us, in the throne speech, how do the priorities of this Government as articulated in that speech

speak to us, what would Manitobans be expected to say? They may ask a series of questions. Will this right-wing phase two Tory agenda improve the quality of health in our province? Will this agenda emphasize preventive medicine? Will it reduce the reliance on acute care beds? Will it result in the building of new personal care homes? Will it enhance the home care program so that seniors and others can stay in their homes as long as possible rather than having to enter acute care beds in the hospitals, which takes away their independence, takes away their dignity, at the same time being a tremendous drain on the financial resources of the state?

Is there any mention of a pharmacare card proposed by Members on this side of the House so that seniors will not wait weeks for reimbursements for their pharmaceuticals? No.

So Manitobans who ask themselves the question, how are we better off by this throne speech on health care, there are no answers.

I have already made reference to education. How will the quality of education be improved by the phase two right-wing agenda of this Tory Government? There is no evidence of that in the throne speech either.

In the whole field of family services, at a time when stress is growing in our community and in our society, at a time when people are finding it more and more difficult to cope, at a time when families need help from child service agencies more than ever before, do we have a commitment from this Government to help women who are deprived of the shelters they need? Do we see any commitment to help children who need child care agencies for nurturing and care? No, again no priority given by this Government in the phase two of the Tory agenda.

We wonder why the Government states in its political rhetoric that health, education and family services are its priorities when there is no evidence of that in the actual commitments made in legislation or at initiatives and proposals. We do see some mention in the throne speech, Madam Deputy Speaker, of federal-provincial relations. I would ask any Member on the Government side to show us through argument or through action that this is not the worst time in federal-provincial relations in the history of our province. We also add the spectre in the last Session of the Minister of Health nationally,

and the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst) for the Province of Manitoba almost coming to blows, almost to fisticuffs over an issue that affected the province and the Government of Canada.

You know, it is not that they were not talking, it is that they were so angry with one another that the talking almost became a brawl. That was symbolic and symptomatic of the deterioration in relations between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba which has characterized the way in which this Government has approached Canadian Government issues.

Look at some of the facts which are there for all to examine in the light of day. How well have we done through the Western Diversification Fund compared to other provinces? Any objective analysis shows that we are doing badly. The fund was set up so that the western provinces could begin to diversify their economy, to create jobs. Yet Manitoba's share is very very poor compared to that which has been given Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

How about the renewal of the economic regional development agreements? Those agreements negotiated under the previous Liberal Government in Ottawa that went a long way in providing new stimulus for economic development in Manitoba; yet they have not been renewed. There are hundreds of millions of dollars on the table, and the jobs that could be created by use of those monies are going begging because this Government cannot come to any relationship that is a positive, or has potential of creating new jobs for Manitobans.

If you look at the transfers from the Government of Canada in health care and education through the established program financing arrangements, you see that here again we are lagging behind. How aggressive is the Premier (Mr. Filmon)? How aggressive has the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) been in trying to secure Manitoba's fair share of the national pie? -(interjection)- The Minister of Finance says mostly formula, it is a formula that is negotiated, and at the negotiating table the Minister of Finance and the Premier should be much more aggressive than they have been in securing Manitoba's interests.

We had a promise that the Prime Minister made at least twice, maybe three or four times. Once in the Parliament of Canada, and once on the floor of the United Nations promising a centre for

sustainable development for the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg. It has been announced so many times, you would think that the Government would be shamed into giving it the resources that it had been initially promised. I think it was \$100 million dollars at the United Nations. It is now down to some \$5 million a year or so later. What can this shadow of its promised self be when the Government refuses to give it the resources it needs to become truly a world centre for sustainable development?

Speaking of the environment, we were looking through some Hansard notes from this last week, and the New Democrats were flailing away at the Government for its inaction on the Rafferty-Alameda dam, and Bill Blaikie, the Member of Parliament for Birds Hill said, and this is in Hansard, and I quote: . . . but the fact remains that I have no desire to defend the passivity with which this issue was dealt by the NDP Government of that time. It was far too passive on a variety of environmental issues, and I believe it is one of the reasons it met the fate it did in 1988, and I continue to quote: I could spend a lot more time than the Honourable Member has documented. The way in which the Government of the Province of Manitoba at that time in my judgment did not pay enough attention, and did not have the political will I was just talking about that is necessary to deal with the tough environmental questions that has to be dealt with.

Madam Deputy Speaker, these are not words from a Liberal who may be expected to be critical. These are not words from the Conservatives, who predictably will be critical of the NDP administration, but these are words for a New Democratic Member of Parliament, who is ashamed of the record of the NDP administration in Manitoba on environmental issues, does not seek to justify their policies, does not seek to apologize for them, but really wipes his hands of any responsibility and says in black and white in the pages of Hansard that really it was a poor performance contributing to the defeat of the New Democratic Party in 1988. So when we hear the NDP stand up in their self-righteous way and criticize the passivity or the inaction of the Conservative Government in Manitoba, we only need remind them that their own Members are not very proud of their own record.

There is some mention in the throne speech of a task force on constitutional affairs. I had the privilege of being part of the Meech Lake Task Force which,

in our view, created a very progressive and comprehensive view of Manitoba's position for constitutional reform. It was not a document that we were able to press as far as we would when the Premiers met in Ottawa that fateful week in June, but it absolutely gives us the core of a constitutional position arrived at in a non-partisan way or a multipartisan way by all Parties in this House.

The Premier has promised to create another task force on Senate reform. We welcome that, and we will see that in the Order Paper now that there is a proposed resolution that calls for the Province of Manitoba to move as speedily as possible towards an elected senator from the Province of Manitoba. What we see happening in Ottawa now is a disgrace, with the Prime Minister of this country stuffing the Senate with Tory cronies in order to pass a wretched piece of legislation that is opposed by 80 percent of the Canadian people, which is only going to fuel the fires for Senate reform, particularly here in western Canada.

* (1620)

We are asking the Government of Manitoba to do what it can beyond sending arrows across the bow. We are asking them to introduce legislation into this House which will say to the Prime Minister of Canada, we are not going to wait for your snail's pace of Senate reform. We are going to do what we can by creating legislation enabling the people of Manitoba to choose, through election, their own senator who will speak for all of the people of Manitoba, rather than the Tory hacks who have been appointed over the last couple of weeks.

Senate reform is important to Westerners and important to Manitobans, because it is a national institution, a federal institution which must speak for all of the regions of Canada and put a brake on the excesses of the majority of the House of Commons. That is why we in the Liberal Party support an elected Senate with equal representation from every province, so that small provinces—not alone but in combination together within a national institution—can take federal policy and allow it to reflect legitimately regional interests.

Manitobans have seen far too often that the prevailing majorities in the House of Commons pay no attention to the interests of our region. Need I only mention the whole case of the CF-18 fiasco to remind Members of the House? We know that Members of the Chamber, such as the Minister of

Finance (Mr. Manness), believe in an elected Senate. Why then will he not go the logical next step and introduce the legislation we need to make that a reality in Manitoba?

Senate reform is not the only item on the constitutional agenda. It is time that federalists began to speak on behalf of all of Canada. We know that we cannot count on Prime Minister Mulroney to speak for all of the regions of this country. We know he never speaks on our behalf as Manitobans.

We must create federal institutions which reflect the regional makeup of Canada. We have to begin setting the framework, setting the stage, creating the foundations for making the arguments that are going to make Canada an attractive option for the people of Quebec. It is not enough to say I love my country, although most Canadians do. It is not enough to say we are interested in the aspirations of the people of Quebec, of the Quebecois. It is our job as Canadians from all regions to show to the people of Quebec that Canada is in their interests, that we are stronger together than we ever could be apart, and to take that growing tide of nationalism in the Province of Quebec and turn it around by the force of argument, the force of argument that has been offered by every Prime Minister since Sir John A. Macdonald, except Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, who is not interested in the federal system, who is not interested in a stronger and more united Canada, who panders not to the national interest but to his own narrow political interest. We have had enough of that and I am sure that the people of Canada will express, in the only way they can, to the Prime Minister of this country, how deeply they feel about a united country and how they reject his solutions.

The arguments are not difficult to find. I am sure that when the task force begins to make its tour across Manitoba that the arguments will be presented, not so much by the politicians, but by the people themselves as they were during the whole Meech Lake process.

More than any other issue that came through loud and clear in that debate was that it is in Manitoba's interests to have a strong national Government and a united Canada. It is in our interest because we share resources. We share political institutions. We share the value of freedom in democracy, and what we share as a people far outweighs those things which divide us. If only we had the political leaders to remind us instead of a political leadership which

seeks, by rolling the dice in the words of the Prime Minister himself, to divide us as Canadians.

I think Manitobans can take a great deal of pride in the role that they played, not the role that the politicians played, not the role that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province played, but the way in which we consulted the people of Manitoba and we were better because of the consultation.

They provided us with the emotion, the persuasion, the reasonableness, the national view that comes from those very people whom we attempt to create these institutions for. That is why the position that the Manitoba Task Force put forward had so much moral strength because it had behind it the value of consultation with the people themselves, unlike the Prime Minister's approach which was to impose his own narrow vision which was rejected obviously by so many of the people of Canada.

One more item on the Constitution, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), when arguing the merits of his drunk driving legislation, said that if the courts were to strike down that Bill, he would consider using the notwithstanding clause in the Constitution so that his legislation would prevail over the rights of the individual entrenched and enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

What an admission from the Minister of Justice of a province. What an admission from a politician who had just consulted the people on the Meech Lake issue. What an admission that he has the arrogance to impose his own view, the view of one Government at a moment in time in spite of the objections of the judiciary, in spite of the entrenched values of individual freedom that we fought so hard for in this country in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

It was not the finest moment for the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), especially when you consider the promise made by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province that the notwithstanding clause would not be used in the life of his Government, and as soon as a piece of legislation is in trouble, the Minister of Justice says, well, I may use the notwithstanding clause. Is that the value, is that the respect for individual rights coming from the chief law enforcement officer of this country?

Madam Deputy Speaker, I cannot hope to speak as eloquently on aboriginal issues as those in this Legislature who are from the aboriginal community.

Just today we heard the eloquence, the simple and quiet eloquence from the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) on aboriginal issues as we heard last June from the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper).

The time has now passed when we can ignore the interests of aboriginal people in the constitutional future of Canada. It is because of the principles of justice that they have shaken us through the events at Oka this summer, before that through the debate over the Constitution, and for many generations, that their demands are simple and their demands are reasonable. The issues of Native land claims and the issue of establishing a self-government structure within which Native people can legislate for themselves and to be judged by their own people is now a time for us to act.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are a couple of very simple objectives for us on this side of the House in the upcoming Session of the Legislature. The first is to try to be a responsible, reasonable and articulate force of constructive opposition to the plans put forward by the Government. The Government is not always wrong and certainly the Government is not always right. It is our job, given our own capacity to judge those pieces of legislation and those initiatives that we think are good for Manitobans, and when we do we will say so and support the Government.

At the same time it is the job of the Opposition to do more than simply oppose. It is also the job of the Opposition to put forward constructive alternatives. Every once in a while we do that, Madam Deputy Speaker, and the Government even listens. To his credit the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) last Session took more than a few ideas that came from this side of the Chamber and we can be specific. He now agrees with us that a smaller council for the City of Winnipeg is in the interest of 62 percent of the people who live in this province.

He now agrees that there ought to be a single downtown redevelopment corporation, although he fought it every single step of the way. In the case of the North Portage Development Corporation, we asked questions in this House for five weeks asking the Government through the Minister of Urban Affairs and then the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to bring in front of a legislative committee the chief executive officer of the North Portage Development Corporation so we could hold in account for the way in which they were spending the taxpayers' dollars in Manitoba.

* (1630)

At the time, Madam Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) did not think that was such a great idea. I do not know why. It was not decisions made by this Government that were being attacked. It was decisions taken by the former Government, but still there was an attempt to conceal decisions that were made by corporations spending 100 percent tax dollars from Manitoba, from Canada and from Winnipeg.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) calls in the provincial auditor to review the situation. The Provincial Auditor has a look at the situation and says, yes, they ought to come in front of a legislative committee. That is the way it should be. Why did we have to call in the Provincial Auditor for a Conservative Government to make the admission that there ought to be full disclosure and accountability for the use of public funds? There I think is an example of how an Opposition can be constructive and can help in the formulation of public policy.

I am very proud and pleased to participate in the Thirty-Fifth Legislature of the Province of Manitoba. I stand before you with the humility of knowing that at any moment the people can decide that someone else is better equipped to serve the people of Crescentwood. I will do my best to put forward those ideas which we think in the Liberal Caucus are in the best interests of our province, and I look forward to working with you and other Members of the Chamber to make Manitoba an even better place to live. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Before I begin I would like to thank my honourable colleague for Broadway (Mr. Santos) for letting me speak ahead of him since my parents are in the gallery this afternoon, and my wife.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Speaker on his reappointment. I have been reading Hansard for the last two years and so I know that you have been fair and wise in your treatment of Members and your rulings. Welcome back to the position you deserve.

I had planned to recommend to my caucus that we move from an appointed Speaker to an elected Speaker. Having been reading federal Parliament's Hansard for the last 10 years, I know that this practice has changed there from an appointed Speaker to an elected Speaker. I think there is merit

in this idea. I think the merit lies in the fact that, when the Speaker makes a ruling if he is elected rather than appointed, Members on all sides of the House would feel obliged to support his or her rulings because they were elected to their office rather than appointed. I hope that my colleagues will agree with this recommendation, and that it will be discussed and debated in this House.

Today I will discuss three topics. I will talk about the Burrows constituency. That is traditional. Second, I will discuss my political philosophy. Third, I will apply the Speech from the Throne to the people of Burrows, and hopefully I will tie all three together.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the other 56 Members of the 35th Session of the Manitoba Legislature, both those who were re-elected as well as those who are newly elected. Having run twice, I can testify as to how hard all of us worked to get here. I would particularly like to thank the workers in the Burrows constituency. There were many, many of them. I would not be here without their hard work. I would also like to thank my family, especially my wife, Carol, who is not quite as political as I am, but who nonetheless threw herself into the fray and worked very hard, and also to our two children, Nathan and Tanissa who worked very hard as well. In fact, I think there are probably some parallels between them and the Member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson) who grew up in a very political household, and as he mentioned, worked in many election campaigns.

Since other Members have set a precedent, perhaps I will follow it and mention that it was a very successful election campaign in Burrows. In fact, I think we laid to rest a couple of myths. One of them was that the Liberal Party was on a resurgence. I think we laid that myth to rest. Not only did we replace the Member from the other Party in Burrows, but we won every poll in Burrows as well as the advance polls, the hospital vote, and we are waiting to see if we won the prison vote as well, which we did last time.

Since other Members have also referred to their Manitoba roots, I would like to do the same. My great-grandparents, John James Anderson Fraser and his wife, Christina McKay, came from Ontario in 1879, travelled through St. Paul, Minnesota, to Upper Fort Garry. From there they travelled by Red River cart to take up land at Arrow River, Manitoba, and then moved to Breadalbane Township where they homesteaded on the banks of the Assiniboine

River north of Virden. With the arrival of the four Fraser children, the district was able to start their first school. Some of their descendants still live in Manitoba, in Winnipeg and in Brandon. My wife's ancestors, the Sturbys, emigrated from Ukraine and homesteaded near Gardenton, Manitoba, before moving to Gronlid, Saskatchewan.

It might be of interest to you and to other Members, Madam Deputy Speaker, to know how I became interested in politics. Like the Member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson), I grew up with current events and politics at the dinner table and, I might add, Conservative politics at the dinner table. When I was 11 years old, I met the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker, shook his hand and got his autograph. If I could have voted in the 1950s, I probably would have voted Conservative.

In 1967 I attended the Conservative Party national convention in Maple Leaf Gardens in Toronto as part of the "Keep the Chief Delegation." The Tories paid for the buses and the free pizza, and we young Liberals filled the buses and were treated to vintage Diefenbaker about to be defeated as the Leader of his Party. Now a Trudeau supporter, I was soon to experience another conversion. Twenty years ago on October 16, 1970, the Prime Minister invoked the War Measures Act. As a student of history and a civil libertarian, I knew that the War Measures Act had been wrongly used against Japanese-Canadians in 1942. I believed that the use of the same Act which suspended civil liberties for all Canadians was not justified or needed in Quebec in October 1970. On October 16, 1970, I changed allegiance from the Liberal Party to the New Democratic Party, which has been my political home ever since.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I invite you to come me on a tour of Burrows. Listen as I discuss the causes of hurt and despair, not just the dreams and aspirations of the people of Burrows. Burrows in its cultural and economic diversity is not unlike other inner city constituencies, but is quite different from many suburban and rural constituencies. Another difference, I believe, is that the residents of Burrows are more tolerant and accepting of differences. We have had group homes approved with no public outcry and which continue to exist with no complaints from their neighbours.

If you accompany me down our main business thoroughfare, Selkirk Avenue, the diversity is readily apparent. You will hear, in addition to

English—Ukrainian, Polish, German, Cree, Ojibway and other languages. We believe that in diversity there is strength and that all ethnic groups make a positive contribution to Canadian society.

If our tour, Madam Deputy Speaker, took us on a bird's-eye view of Burrows, two largest physical structures would be readily apparent. They are the CPR marshalling yards and the Health Sciences complex. I could talk about them at length and about the number of employees and the economic benefits but I will not. I will say, as the past chairperson of the Inner City Committee for Rail Relocation, move the railway yards, move the CPR yards, move them out of the city, mainly for safety reasons.

The Health Sciences Centre is a huge institution, parts of which I am familiar with from visiting patients and comforting grieving families, but rather than describe the many facilities there, let me challenge the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and his Government to tackle one problem which is of concern to many of my constituents.

Several years ago, the Core Area Initiative initiated a program and several churches co-operated to sponsor a Native chaplaincy program, a training program for Native people to become chaplains. After two years of supervised training in the general hospital, half a dozen very competent individuals graduated. The intention was that the graduates of this program would be hired by health care centres, especially the Health Sciences Centre. However, to date, none have been hired.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

When one-third of the patients in the general hospital at any one time are Native it is unconscionable that none of the chaplaincy staff are Native. I hope that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) can correct this problem.

Mr. Speaker, while I am grateful that we in Manitoba have an independent Boundaries Commission, unlike Saskatchewan, where the boundaries have recently been gerrymandered in anticipation of the next provincial election, I am disappointed in one respect with the changes that were made to the boundaries of Burrows constituency.

* (1640)

In 1988, before the boundaries change, Burrows included North End Community Ministry, where I worked from June 1980 to September 1990.

However, the eastern boundary in the north end was moved two blocks west and thereby left out this historic mission and ministry building which was owned and operated by the Methodist Church from 1909 to 1925 and by the United Church of Canada from 1925 to the present. On the exterior of this building is an historic sites plaque which pays tribute to my predecessor of 81 years ago who at the time was the Reverend James Shaver Woodsworth.

So it is an honour for me to follow in his footsteps, first of all by working out of the same building and second, by entering the political arena, and for the Party which succeeded the Party he helped establish in 1933, namely, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a connection between working with the poor as I have done for the last 10 years, and seeking elected office. For the past decade part of my job and part of the mandate of North End Community Ministry has been advocacy with and on behalf of the poor and a ministry to society. This has included making representations on behalf of the poor or enabling them to make presentations to all three levels of Government.

Although my time and energy has gone into two issues, solutions to housing problems and welfare reform, the actions of Government impinge on every aspect of life for marginalized people in the inner city.

Many of the impacts of Government are negative on the poor, and the lack of positive initiative arouses one's righteous anger and a sense of injustice. The desire to be a strong voice for the poor was a major motivating factor in my seeking this office. I hope I can fulfill the high expectations people have in me.

The new boundary on the south side of the constituency has been moved from the CPR yards to Notre Dame Avenue. This change means that the former mission, Maclean Mission on Alexander Avenue, the mission at which the Reverend Stanley Knowles worked before he was elected to Parliament in 1942 is now in Burrows constituency.

Mr. Knowles is fondly remembered and still revered by many people in that part of Burrows. I was very pleased to receive a letter from Stanley Knowles before the election and another one congratulating me after September 11th.

Many, many times I have met constituents whose

lives have been influenced and often changed for the better by their involvement in Stella Mission, Maclean Mission or Robertson House. I am pleased to have two out of three of these institutions in Burrows constituency, and I was pleased during the election campaign to speak to so many constituents who had such fond memories of the good times they had at the missions, especially in their childhood.

Mr. Speaker, many people who voted for me and to whom I am grateful are aboriginal people. I went to high school with students from the Six Nations and one of my best teachers, Peter Hill, was from the Six Nations. He greatly encouraged my interest in history and politics at an early age, for which I am grateful.

When I lived in Saskatchewan I was involved in the public debate around Indian land entitlement. That is one of the reasons I am in Winnipeg. Many members of my congregation considered that I was on the wrong side, the side of aboriginal people. While living in Manitoba I have been involved, mainly through lobbying and educational efforts, on aboriginal rights issues, namely implementation of the Northern Flood Agreement, aboriginal rights in the Canada Act and land entitlement.

This past summer witnessed an important and historic social and political movement, of which the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) and the peace camp were the most visible expressions. After centuries of colonization and oppression Native people collectively rose up and said, enough is enough. When left out of the Meech Lake Accord, Native people with one voice, in spite of being different nations and different cultures, said, never again.

This time as never before Native people have non-Native allies. In 1981 I took part in a demonstration outside and inside the Manitoba Legislature in support of aboriginal rights in the new Constitution. There were two or three hundred Native people present and half a dozen non-Native people. By contrast when I came to listen to speeches at the peace camp, I estimate that 10 to 20 percent of those present were non-Native people.

It is not enough to have allies outside the Legislature. It is more important to have allies inside the Legislature. A good start has been made by electing three more aboriginal people to the NDP Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, many Native people in Burrows voted for me and my Party in the provincial election. I appreciate their support and I promise to stand in solidarity with aboriginal people as they seek to extend aboriginal rights in the Constitution, to implement self-government and to attain the same levels of education, employment and income as other Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about a particular segment of my constituency. These are the people with whom I have been working and the staff I have left behind have been working, my colleagues, an inter-agency group and many, many volunteers in the community have been working. We have all been working to better the lives of and for justice for those who have been marginalized by our society. Burrows constituency sadly shares a number of characteristics with other inner city constituencies. The problems of these people are overwhelming. There is a lack of a sense of community. People feel an inability to be heard and to control their lives. Some people feel they are not valued for who they are. People feel alienated and powerless. There are external forces which continue to oppress—racism, stereotyping, classism, sexism and the inability of society to appreciate differences.

Mr. Speaker, we must always remember that no matter how many problems individuals have or families have, they are still people and deserve to be treated with respect and dignity. These are people to whom we should listen because we have much to learn from them. They have many gifts to offer us. Native people in particular can teach us much about sharing and inclusiveness because these values are so important to them.

Mr. Speaker, there are many problems characteristic of the inner city which are present in Burrows constituency. The most oppressive problem is poverty. The most visible manifestation is food bank outlets of which there are 175 in Winnipeg—175 places that receive free food from Winnipeg Harvest food bank.

Mr. Speaker, in a society as affluent as ours, it is a disgrace that Winnipeg Harvest food bank exists at all. The use of food banks in Canada, which began in 1981, can be directly linked to the collapse of the social safety net. According to Graham Riches, this is the result of, and I quote: Government's insistence that inflation and deficit spending must be curbed through restraint by reliance of private sector led economic growth; by a

lack of commitment to full employment; by the alleged public perception that state social spending is too high and by the breakdown of political and public support for a tax based system of social security which provide adequate safeguards against the risks and contingencies of unemployment, sickness, accidents, pregnancies and so on.

In other words, food banks represent a retreat by Government from public services designed to compensate people against all those interruptions to earnings, livelihood and living that march in social security for Canada addressed over 40 years ago—end of quote.

Why do people use food bank outlets? Over the last 10 years, I have interviewed and talked to many people who came to North End Community Ministry seeking food, most of them women with children. The reasons for running out of food were varied, but all were related to inadequate income. Frequently, the reason was that people were forced to use social assistance money intended for food, personal needs and household needs to supplement an inadequate rental allowance.

Often the need for food was necessitated by a landlord who refused to return a security deposit without just cause. The result was that the family was forced to use money intended to pay for rent or for food to pay for the next security deposit. Every month, there was a discernible pattern which proved that the problem was inadequate income. This pattern can be testified to by the staff at Agape Table soup kitchen, the 175 food bank outlets and the users themselves. The pattern is that the number of users increases greatly a few days before Family Allowance cheques are received and a few days before provincial social assistance cheques are received.

The fundamental problem is an income gap between the time the food runs out and the time the next cheque arrives. Mr. Speaker, I have often asked people what it is like to have to ask for a handout. They say that they feel embarrassed and humiliated to have to ask for food. It is totally unacceptable that poor people in our city should have to depend on voluntarism and individual charity when federal legislation, the Canada Assistance Plan guarantees that Canadians' basic needs, namely food, shelter and clothing, shall be met.

* (1650)

Mr. Speaker, it is to represent the poorest of the poor, to raise the issues of hunger and poverty and an inadequate income and substandard shelter which compelled me to enter the political arena. I will relentlessly pursue these issues until they have been resolved and there is no more hunger, poverty and substandard housing.

Mr. Speaker, my political philosophy, which is also my political theology, can best be summed up as follows: I believe that the needs of the poorer have priority over the wants of the rich, that the rights of workers are more important than the maximization of profits and that the participation of marginalized groups takes precedence over a preservation of a system which excludes them.

Let us look at each statement and see how it applies to people in Burrows, especially those who are workers and those who are marginalized by our society. What does it mean to say, the needs of the poorer have priority over the wants of the rich?

Mr. Speaker, I could quote reams of statistics to prove that poverty is a very serious problem in Canada. However, I will very briefly quote the appalling statistics on how, increasingly, women are disproportionately represented amongst the ranks of the poorer. This is known as the feminization of poverty. The National Council of Welfare, in its 1990 report said, 59 percent of adults living in poverty were women. By 1981, the proportion grew to 61 percent, in 1987, it was back to 59 percent. Recently, in Community Action, there are other indications that women are overrepresented amongst the poor.

The reasons for why this happens: the participation of women in the labour force reduced poverty amongst husband and wife families, thereby reducing the proportion of men among the poor; marriage breakdown places most women with children among the poor despite their employment; rising rates of marriage breakdown increase the risk of younger women becoming poor, single parents. Over 47 percent of all single women with children were poor in 1977. By 1988, it was 56 percent. The presence of children increases the risk of poverty largely because of their impact on the mother's employment potential. Never married, single-parent mothers had a poverty rate of 75 percent. The poorest elderly women are widows who centred

their lives on their husbands and children and did not acquire adequate savings and pension income.

In Canada today there are tax laws which favour the rich and welfare laws which keep the poor in grinding poverty. The best example that I can think of is the one used by Linda McQuaig in her book, "Behind Closed Doors." It is the example of John Turner who bought a house in an expensive area in Toronto and sold it eight years later for a capital gain of \$635,000, because there is no tax on the sale of a principal residence, he paid no tax on \$635,000 of profit on the sale of his house when he moved to the Opposition residence in Ottawa.

By contrast, Mr. Speaker, if one is on provincial social assistance in Manitoba, the work incentive is \$50 per month. One can earn more than that, but it is deducted, dollar for dollar, from their social assistance cheque. In effect, that money is taxed back at the rate of 100 percent.

In this country, there are tax laws for the rich and very different laws for the poor which keep them poor.

Mr. Speaker, a Government which believes that the poor had priority would implement social assistance reform and raise the rates to at least the poverty line. If the poor have priority, the tax laws would be changed so that rich do not get richer mainly through the tax system.

Tax loopholes and tax expenditures should be closed and ended. A good place to start would be tax expenditures for housing.

According to David Hulchanski, a housing expert at the University of British Columbia's School of Community and Regional Planning, quote: For every \$100 that Ottawa spends directly on housing, it spends \$200 to \$300 indirectly through the tax system.

What does it mean to say that the rights of workers are more important than the maximization of profits? Mr. Speaker, just today I spoke to a person employed in a large insurance company in Winnipeg. Her division obtains, for the company, a 22 percent return on investment, but the new chief executive officer of the holding company, whose head office is in Montreal, wants a higher return on investment and, therefore, there is pressure on employees, unfair pressure on employees to cut costs and increase profits, not to provide better service to customers, but to increase dividends to shareholders in Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, my Party will be very vigilant if this Government tries to change the labour Act or any law that infringes on the rights of workers, individually or collectively. We will be here to stand up for the rights of workers and to see that their rights are put ahead of the maximization of profit.

What does it mean to say the participation of marginalized groups takes precedence over the preservation of a system which excludes them? I believe it means empowering people and enabling them to take control over their lives and communities, and having a hand in decision-making.

Mr. Speaker, there are excellent examples of organizations which practice this principle. One of those located in Burrows constituency is the MAPS Housing Co-op where the people who live in the housing are on the board of directors and control the organization in a way which would never have been possible in most of the public housing in Winnipeg and certainly not in any of the private-sector housing in Winnipeg.

I believe that this principle must be applied to this institution, our Legislature, as well. We have seen the Government try to ban taxi drivers, aboriginal people, students, and now this week, parents and children from this building. I believe that this building belongs to the people of Manitoba and therefore should be open to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look briefly at the Speech from the Throne and especially to analyze it and see how it will affect my constituents in Burrows. This throne speech made reference to "individual action" and suggested this was why changes of Government have occurred. While it is true that major changes are taking place in the world, especially in eastern Europe, these changes are not the result of individual action, but rather the result of collective action and people working together for substantive change.

I believe we can change Manitoba and especially the quality of life for aboriginal people, poor people, the elderly, women who are victims of domestic violence and the homeless. We can change society for the better. We can bring about change, just as rapid change happened in eastern Europe, if people rise up and collectively demand progressive, social, economic and political change in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech referred to "our tremendous good fortune." This phrase is the

arrogant assumption of those who are part of the dominant culture. Centuries ago this land belonged to our aboriginal brothers and sisters, but it belonged to them in a way that is quite different and quite foreign to non-Native culture. Aboriginal people saw themselves as stewards or trustees of the land which they occupied for thousands of years for the benefit of future generations.

However, as a result of colonization, the good fortune, the resources were transferred from Native people to the new immigrants. The land and the resources were appropriated for the use of new European immigrants, and Native people left with almost none of the good fortune which they once enjoyed. For example, in Treaty No. 1 Native people seeded 16,700 square miles in southcentral Manitoba, primarily excellent agricultural land. What did they get in return? In return the Crown set aside reserves for the bands party to the treaty on the basis of 160 acres for each family of five, or in that proportion for larger or smaller families, a school on each reserve, prohibition of the sale of liquor and an annuity of \$3 per capita per year. That is what Treaty money originally was, \$3 per capita per year.

Mr. Speaker, the Government should have answered the rhetorical question they asked, how will we measure up when our children and their children look back on this era and what did we do with our tremendous good fortune?

Mr. Speaker, this Government has an opportunity, an opportunity they missed in the throne speech to enter into a new social contract. If ever there was a time and a need for a new social contract, it is now and it is needed between Native people and the rest of society.

In this the provincial Government could and should play the lead role. If this Government was sensitive, they would listen to aboriginal people and support aboriginal people in their quest for self-government and inclusion in the Constitution of Canada. Instead of fighting with Native people over the meaning of aboriginal self-government, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and his Ministers should listen to and co-operate with Native people and act as advocates for and with them at First Ministers' Conferences in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech talked about "fiscal responsibility." While there is a sense in which all governments must be fiscally responsible, I am concerned about the way this Government

understands it. I believe they understand it the same way that Prime Minister MacKenzie King understood fiscal responsibility in 1936. Quote from Pierre Berton's latest book "The Great Depression," he was obsessed with the dogma of a balanced budget. He raised the sales tax and the corporation tax slightly, but not the income tax, and because he was convinced that Ottawa's money was being spent recklessly he reduced grants-in-aid to the provinces by 25 per cent.

The federal Government used words in the 1930s, words like "fiscal responsibility" as an excuse to ignore human despair, yet with the outbreak of World War II, millions and millions and millions of dollars were found or borrowed to finance the war effort.

* (1700)

So when I hear the words "fiscal responsibility," it has an ominous ring to it. Today we see a lack of funding for parent-child centres, and women's shelters, and aboriginal nursery schools, and for child and family service agencies. There are people in crisis and people who need preventive programs, but their needs are not being met because this Government puts a higher priority on fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has pledged to, quote, reduce the burden of Government in the private sector. I believe this is a code phrase for deregulation. The public should be aware that there are serious pitfalls to deregulation which can be illustrated by two examples. One is the current high gas prices. This is a direct result of the federal Conservative Government policy of deregulating wellhead price for oil and the policy of having a single price, namely a world price for Canadian gas and oil.

Deregulation was a principal policy of the Reagan Administration in the United States. One industry that was deregulated was the savings and loans companies. Now that savings and loans companies have been deregulated, dozens and dozens of them are going into bankruptcy, and American taxpayers are bailing them out at a cost to the American treasury of \$500 billion. The cost of deregulating savings and loans companies in the United States is \$500 billion. So, Mr. Speaker, we will be both cautious and suspicious of any attempts to deregulate any service or industry in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech refers to

immigrants and refugees and health care, but a glaring omission is the lack of reference to a major problem. That problem is the difficulty of getting accreditation and therefore getting jobs and careers in the skilled trades and professions of their countries of origin. The throne speech refers to protecting children but only regarding pornography. There is a desperate need to protect children by increasing funding to child and family service agencies so that children at risk can be protected.

The throne speech refers to supporting families, but sadly there is no indication of what concrete plans the Government has to achieve its goal of supporting families. But if the Government had the political will, it would fund preventive programs like parent-child centres, two of which have been closed in my constituency, a program for which there is evidence of reduced family problems.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to serve the people of Burrows in the Legislature. I will do my best to serve them and their interests, individual and corporate, to the best of my ability. Thank you.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, firstly let me say that it is an honour to rise to give my first address to this House in my new capacity as Minister of Labour, and I want to thank the Premier and my colleagues for the support that they have shown me in that appointment and the encouragement and support that they have given to me in my first few weeks in this particular task.

I also, Mr. Speaker, would like to congratulate you on your re-election to the highest office of this Chamber, and your service in the previous Legislature was certainly well recognized by all Members who had the privilege of sitting in that particular Chamber.

I also want to welcome to this House all of the new Members to this Chamber who were elected for the first time, my colleague from law school days, the Member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), on his return to this Chamber. I congratulate you all and welcome you to this House. It is indeed an honour for all of us to be here serving our constituents and the people of our province.

I also want to offer congratulations to my colleague, the Minister of Family Services and Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer). He and I entered this Chamber at the same time and spent

many years together as seatmates, and it is a pleasure to be in Cabinet with him.

I also want to congratulate my colleague, the Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), and very close friend and seatmate in the House during the previous Legislature, on his appointment as our caucus Chair and wish him well in operating our caucus structure. It was a pleasure and an honour to share office space with him the last two and a half years, and I miss the camaraderie that we shared down in room 157. So I wish him all the best.

An Honourable Member: That is kind of a socialist phrase.

Mr. Praznik: I am trying to be very evenhanded in my remarks.

I also would like to thank very much the electors of the constituency of Lac du Bonnet for the confidence that they placed in me during the general election. It is a wonderful constituency to represent. Indeed, the support they showed me in the general election was encouraging to me, and I certainly am honoured by the trust they have placed in me to represent them for another term in this Legislature.

I also would like to thank my family, Shelly and Kaitlin, for their support and perseverance. My little daughter, Kaitlin, being two years old, now knows that there is a blue Party and an orange Party and a red Party, and in viewing all three Party Leaders it was her choice, at two years old, to support Gary Filmon in the election. She is starting from a very conservative base, so I do not suspect she will be drifting the other way—at least I hope not.

Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) in her remarks—and I welcome her to this Chamber—struck me as very significant when she talked about the role of opposition to oppose and that being an important role in this Chamber. That is certainly very true. That is a very good observation.

When one sits in this particular Chamber and appreciates a thousand years of tradition of our parliamentary system and how it works and functions, one always does appreciate that in any democracy, indeed in any structure, there has to be that give-and-take of opposition, there has to be that continual process of being challenged and opposed, because in any system where that does not happen those who are charged with exercising power are sure inevitably to drift into a period of complacency, and that does not serve the public good. Certainly

that role is a valid one, and that was an excellent observation on the part of the Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk).

Also incumbent on one, Mr. Speaker, in that responsibility of opposition to oppose is to have a sense of honesty, a sense of the facts, a sense of dealing with issues in an upright way and not to just skate over the surface with innuendo and comments that are geared to gain one some quick publicity, because the world in which we live is a very complex one. The issues that we deal with are indeed very complex. One should never forget that I think all of us in this Chamber, whatever political stripe we happen to hold, come to this Chamber with a basic sense of trying to do what is best for the people of Manitoba.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Watch it. Watch it. I never like to be included in the herd.

Mr. Praznlk: I am sure my colleague, the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), can never be accused of being part of a particular herd. He is truly an individualist.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) about the appointment of the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) and myself to Cabinet and a number of women in our Cabinet struck me as one of those times when Members of this Chamber often drift into these political arguments that are designed to get a quick hit but really are not all that thoughtful, because if the implication was that either myself or the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) should have refused our Cabinet spots—you know, I would remind the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) that when he was called to the Cabinet in 1986 there was another woman in the New Democratic Party, the Member for Wolseley in that day, who went on to become Speaker, but he could have offered his Cabinet seat to her or suggest that to the Premier to add to the numbers.

I would also remind him that when I look at the front bench of the New Democratic Party, despite having five women Members in their caucus, only one sits on the front row. Now I hear the Member for Concordia saying across the aisle that it is seniority, seniority and you know that. Well, you know in any process—and I believe the comment was made in this Chamber, perhaps by him, last week—that we all started on the third row. There is always a

learning curve, and there is a period of familiarization. Certainly, that is applicable to all Members.

* (1710)

I would also remind the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) that during the eight years in power of Ed Schreyer, who is always the hero to the New Democratic Party, there was not one female NDP Member during that whole eight years in this Chamber, never mind in Cabinet, but in this Chamber. Never once did they take some of their safe constituencies during that time and offer a seat to a woman candidate to augment that representation. So the lesson, I think, in that kind of—I hesitate to say you know—cheap political statement is simply that all Parties have recognized the need to see more women in politics. That process which began many decades ago is progressing along, maybe not at as fast a pace as many would see, but it is progressing along.

I am very honoured to sit in a caucus where we have four new Members, female Members, whom I have come to know and who are extremely strong individuals and have much to offer the people of Manitoba and to public debate in this process. I am very honoured to sit in the caucus with them.

Mr. Speaker, I think the message to Members on the other side is to always be careful in assuming or making those very quick statements that they are the only ones who stand on those issues, because those issues are shared, I think, by all Parties in this Legislature—I am sure, certainly by the Liberal Party, certainly by our Party, and they do not have a corner on the market in interest in seeing women advance in politics.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to discuss today in the great pleasure of being able to participate in a debate such as this is that it allows us one of the few times in this House to talk about some of our observations and things that are important to us and outside of our normal responsibilities as Ministers or as legislative assistants.

Mr. Speaker, as I listen to many of the speeches of new Members of the Opposition, and I listen to them discuss their philosophy and their political beliefs and where they would like to see things go, I am reminded of an observation that was made to me at one time by a very wise individual from my constituency. He always said that what is or what appears to be is not often what is. That is very good

advice for all of us who come to this Chamber or who participate in public debate in Manitoba.

It is so easy for any of us to get into quick rhetoric and quick answers. There are some in this House who are far better than others, and they certainly know who they are. It is so easy to get into that quick observation, quick fix, quick 30-second blurb for the media, but the long haul is what is important, ultimately, for the people of this province. Maybe not for the individual political careers of certain Members, but certainly for the long haul of the people of this province whom we are here to serve.

Mr. Speaker, when I listen to some of the comments that were made by Members opposite about their philosophy and their belief—and I do not for one moment challenge their sincerity. Not for one moment do I challenge their sincerity as to their concern for the people of Manitoba and people they represent, but there are realities there in the framework in which we all operate that they cannot ignore. If they were sitting on this side of the House, and if they were charged with administering public affairs in this province, those realities would be there very much for them and they would have the same difficulty in dealing with them.

Although it is easy from an opposition bench to get up every day and challenge the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), or the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) and say, why is more money not being spent on this now? The reality of it is: the money is not always there. In fact, most of the time it is not there. For a province that raises approximately \$4.5 billion in revenue, the challenge always is to spread that in an even way, as even as possible, to try to maintain vital services for the people of this province. That is the challenge that faces politicians in this decade and certainly into the '90s, Mr. Speaker, and into the next century, to spread those resources around.

Mr. Speaker, when I look back at my interest in politics in observing various Governments in Manitoba since the early '70s, since I first developed an interest in politics, we saw a decade in this country and this continent, the decade of the '70s—the late '60s into the '70s, possibly into the early '80s—when inflation and growth in our economy created an abundance of wealth which could lead to new programs to solve every problem that possibly could be out there. Those days have come to an end.

I know it is nice to get up and talk of the clichés about the Conservatives and fiscal responsibility and "we care about people," but the reality is, today in this province, we spend over a half a billion dollars of the people's money every year on interest for debt that was borrowed in a very brief period of time and whose effects have long gone, but the debt is there—a half a billion dollars.

When Members get up and ask for more money for a host of other things, there is the money, and that is a reality. If Members opposite some day are charged with governing this province and sit on this side of the House, they will face that reality—it is a very tough and it is a very cold one.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the people in this province, the people that elected the 30 Members on this side of the House, they were not—it is very easy to stylize Conservatives and say, you know they are all Party of the rich. My constituency is not a very wealthy constituency. -(interjection)-

Well, the Member for—if I had the Member for Concordia's (Mr. Doer) money, Mr. Speaker, I would gladly throw mine away. I would gladly throw my little bit of this world away for what the Member for Concordia has. -(interjection)- Absolutely not. This Member still grows a garden every year for the onions and potatoes, because we want to keep our finances in order. A nice typical answer on the part of the Member for Concordia. "Well, he is wealthy."

Mr. Speaker, my constituency, the people of Lac du Bonnet, particularly the people who elected me, are not people who are wealthy Manitobans. In fact, many of them are very low-income Manitobans, and they recognize that they cannot afford to be taxed any more. They are people who want to contribute to their province. Many of them are struggling to do that.

I listen to the comments of other Members about hurt being in their ridings. I have a lot of my constituents hurting very badly now because they are small and medium-sized farmers, and there just is no money for the products they produce. They are getting by on very little income if any. Some are living on what is left of depreciation and they are hurting very badly, Mr. Speaker. We know that. Hurt is not something on which only New Democrats have a monopoly in their constituencies. It is there.

The message that they sent to me during that election is they expect people to be responsible in

dealing with the issues that are there and not just spout off with rhetoric all the time. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed very much the campaign in my constituency as my New Democratic opponent was a very nice man—I pay tribute to him—a very well-meaning person. He spoke right out of the hymnal all the time that was there. No matter what issue was raised, it was a standard response.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it happened in other constituencies. I know in campaigns one gets into that, but the problems that we have to face require far more discussion and far more debate than just the standard response that comes. It is very easy to do. It captures the headlines, but in the long run, it does not serve public debate in this province. -(interjection)- I did not catch the comment from the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

* (1720)

Mr. Speaker, the only major issue that took place in Lac du Bonnet was when the New Democratic candidate in my riding, I suspect on the advice of his Saskatchewan organizer, got up and said that a Community Places grant in one community was not good, but it was good for his community club to get it. In other words, if you were in a community on one side of the riding, you should not have gotten money, but if you lived in his community, you should have gotten it. When that became an issue, not of my making but of the people in those communities, he quickly retreated, and that was the last time we heard any real public debate on any issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was probably an error on his part, or perhaps it was part of the philosophy that you can give to some and not to others, even though the program there is for all. That was the only issue that we had in the Lac du Bonnet constituency that made public debate in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, the message that I leave today to all Members of this House is that in the years ahead, the months and days and years ahead that we will be debating issues, although it is very easy to get caught up in quick rhetoric, the issues that face us as a province require far more consideration than the quick 30-second clip for the television camera. The issue that really faces us is taking the resources that are there in this province and spreading them around in such a manner that we are able to maintain what is important to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the new Member for Burrows (Mr.

Martindale) made a very eloquent speech about his political philosophy, and I very much appreciate that, but he made a statement—when I heard it I could not believe that a person would make that kind of statement today and the unfair way that he made it.

He talked about tax law, Mr. Speaker, and he talked about an exemption in the income tax law that excludes the sale of one's personal residence from capital gains tax. I would hope the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) would put on the record whether that is the policy of his Party, the belief of his Party, that that particular exemption in The Income Tax Act should be done away with.

The example the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) used, Mr. Speaker, was John Turner who made six hundred, some thousand capital gains on the sale of his personal residence, but the vast majority of people who use that exemption are average families in our country. It allows them to move from one house to another because their job is moved, because they prefer another neighbourhood, or it is closer to schools, and to do that without incurring a tax liability. If there ever was a provision of the Income Tax Act for working families, that was it. The Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), in his comment, uses probably one of the worst examples that is there and says, that is a terrible example of taxation policy for the rich. That was a policy for working families. One could say John Turner is an exception in all of this, but I would challenge them, each and every one of them, to go back to their constituencies, and I would assume that in almost all of their ridings the majority of people, live in single family residences, rented or otherwise, in most of their constituencies.

They probably represent a lot of homeowners in this province, and I wonder if those voters would agree with that philosophy or that particular policy. I think not. I think not at all.

It is just an example of how easy it is when you get into the thin veneer of rhetoric, because that is all rhetoric is, and that applies to rhetoric whether it is on one side of the House or the other, the thin veneer of rhetoric -(interjection)- Well, it tends to come from that side in great abundance, that you actually launch an attack on working families, and that is what the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) did. I challenge the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) to come forward to this House and say that is not a policy of the New

Democratic Party and that he opposes that comment by his Member for Burrows. If he does not, we can only assume that is their policy, and we should all take that back to the electors in constituencies across this province. Absolutely, because that gives an example of the thinking that is there.

Mr. Speaker, when I said about the importance of what appears not always being, the new Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), I quite enjoyed her comments, and I think she closed with a quotation from Karl Marx where she said something to the effect that from each according to their ability and to each according to need. Noble words when they have come as an individual expression of one's contribution to society, to do all that we can and to be prepared to share with others. When they become imposed by the state, when they become purely and strictly an imposition upon people in which there is no choice, the nobility of forcing people to give of everything they have to others does not become a noble sentiment at all, it becomes a tyranny.

We recognize that there has to be some of that. That is why we have a tax system. That is why we take money from all of us collectively to provide collective services. If ever we were to see a day, and I would hope the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) was not suggesting that to this House, that would be the kind of system that she is working for, for the province. If we were to see that kind of system, inevitably -(interjection)- the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) looks somewhat confused on my statement.

When our new Members get up and quote classic Karl Marx, I am sure the people of Manitoba would like to know if that is philosophy, if that is their position, or just a noble sentiment. I am assuming it was just a noble sentiment. If that is a goal to which that Member is working, Mr. Speaker, if that is the goal to which they are working, I am not sure that is in sync with the vast majority of Manitobans who are decent, honest, hard-working people who want a chance to raise their families and live in a province that has a decent amount of support services for them, good health care and education. They want the opportunity to have a decent life, and they have no problem with contributing for the betterment of their whole community. They do have trouble when they are taxed so badly that there is no room whatsoever for them to maneuver.

It is very easy to spend money. It is very easy to spend it in wheelbarrows full. I do not really know if most of the new Members of the New Democratic Party appreciate that, when we were in a minority situation in this House and Members of the then official Opposition were committing, agreeing with every group that came to the Legislative Building requesting funding, even their own Leader got up and said, you cannot bring the Brink's truck and unload the money.

Now I just hope that that advice to the then official Opposition will not be forgotten by his Party collectively or by new Members, because ultimately it is easy to borrow money, or it used to be easy to borrow money; it is not becoming that easy now for most provinces and most Governments. It used to be very easy to borrow money, it is easy to spend it. It is much tougher to spend money wisely and efficiently, and it is even tougher when the bills have to be paid and you have to tax another generation to pay the interest on money that is long spent. There are times when you want to do that; no one doubts that, but one always has to remember that those bills have to be paid. The people that we often are trying to help are the ones who suffer the most when those bills come home to roost.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the new Member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose) spoke very eloquently in this House of his role as a school trustee and handing diplomas to our graduates along with the mortgage, and it is always easy to spend other generations' resources. The challenge is to take the great amount of wealth that we do now have in our province and distribute what we have in an effective manner to provide the services. That is the challenge that is there; not to go and borrow from the future.

* (1730)

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to say a few words just about this place, because in the two and a half years that I have had the honour of being a Member of this Assembly one quickly comes to realize I think how important an institution like this is and the traditions that surround it, although sometimes as a new Member seem to be something a little unreal, one grows to appreciate why they are there and what they represent because halfway around the world millions of people in the last year have risked much to have and to be able to do exactly what we do in this Chamber on a daily basis, and that is have free debate and questioning, and

have that tug of war between competing points of view. It is a wonderful system and I think we should all—and I know we are all very honoured to be a part of that.

Mr. Speaker, to all the new Members of the House, again I bid you welcome. I am sure that these first days are often nervous days for new Members of the Assembly as they were for myself and my colleagues, but it certainly becomes a very enjoyable place.

If there is one other observation that I make as a Member serving now a second term in this House, it is that we all must keep in mind two things: one, there is certainly a partisanship here, but never should that become so personal that Members are not able to speak to one another on a private basis. I think that is utmost, because those Members who have served many years in this Assembly I am sure would offer us that same advice. The second point I make is that one appreciates fully that all of us come to this Assembly, I sincerely believe, with a desire to best serve the interests of the people of this province. We may disagree on priorities, we may disagree on methods, we may disagree on some objectives, but ultimately we all share the same desire and that respect I would hope is something that will not be forgotten in the debates and question period that go on during this Assembly.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to participate in this debate. I look very much forward to the budget next week and the debate that will take place there, and again I would like to express my thanks to the electors of Lac du Bonnet who did me the tremendous honour of giving me the opportunity to represent them in this Assembly for another term. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your re-election to your high office. I have already sensed the high regard that all Members hold for you, and I know that you will continue to do your job with impartiality and good humour. It is that good humour that will be tested as the new Members learn the rules of this distinguished Chamber. We all appreciate your guidance and, when necessary, your constructive criticism. I would like to congratulate as well the Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Dacquay) on her appointment. I congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne. They were both fine speeches, Mr. Speaker, demonstrating what can be done with so little.

What was lacking in the speech, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing for working families, nothing on the minimum wage, nothing recognizing that we are in a recession, and there is no plan to deal with the economic downturn. Nothing for women, nothing on aboriginal concerns. Education was totally ignored. A general and insensitive pronouncement by a right-wing majority Government.

I wish to congratulate all the new Members of this House, and I share with them the excitement of this adventure and am humbled with the huge responsibilities placed on us. I am especially pleased with the diversity and talent of our own caucus. It is our Party that truly represents all of Manitoba. Voters in the North, voters in rural areas, voters in urban areas have sent New Democrats to this Chamber, men and women who will put the interests of people before the interests of corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank and congratulate our Leader, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer). His vision of a Manitoba that is fair and prosperous is the draw that led many of us here today. He will make an excellent Premier in four years.

In 1985, I attended a function where the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Lois) was a guest speaker. All of us there were impressed with her intelligence, her compassion and her commitment to her ideals. Now that I have met her I have confirmed those first impressions, and I congratulate her on being named Deputy Leader. A special thanks is given from the working people in this province to the 12 NDP MLAs who during the past two and a half years have worked hard on their behalf. -(interjection)- The dirty dozen, that is right.

I and the other new Members of our caucus thank them as well. Some are still with us providing us with the benefit of their wisdom and experience. Others have chosen to leave public life, causing a void in our Party and in this Chamber. I wish them well.

I congratulate the Premier and his Cabinet, but like many before me express my concerns about the lack of women in the Government front benches. However, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this will soon change. The Cabinet is in a very fortunate position, for not only do they have their own advisors, but they also have us, and it is our job to make their jobs easier for them, and, believe me, we

will be giving them sound advice and creative alternatives.

My constituents are their constituents and I will be calling on the Members opposite to help our constituents with their unique problems. The Selkirk riding represents present-day Manitoba. It has rural and urban areas. It has the agricultural and an industrial economic base. It has the diversity of culture and of spirit. It also has areas of extreme wealth and areas of extreme poverty.

Selkirk with a population of 11,000 is the largest urban area in the riding. It has a well-developed and diversified industrial and manufacturing sector. Generations of residents have worked in the Manitoba Rolling Mills and its associated industries. The Selkirk Mental Health Centre is a key link in the economic life of the area. Several marine-related industries have their head offices in Selkirk, and Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone systems each have regional offices there as well.

Selkirk is one of the oldest towns in western Canada, receiving its incorporation in 1882. In fact, the whole riding is rich with Manitoban history. The Selkirk Marine Museum, Lower Fort Garry, Lockport locks, St. Andrew's Church are some of the many links found there to remind us of our colourful past.

The riding also consists of the communities of Lockport, St. Andrew's, Rivercrest and West St. Paul. These areas are growing rapidly as more and more urban dwellers are seeking a rural haven. I welcome them and wish them well.

I would like to thank all the residents in the Selkirk constituency for the support they have shown. I promise to work with them and for them. I would like to thank the former Member for Selkirk for her service to the constituency and to this Chamber. I wish her the best in her future endeavours. I would also like to thank the Member before her who served the people of Selkirk and Manitoba for 19 years.

Howard Pawley is especially pleased that Selkirk riding is back where it belongs, back with the New Democratic Party.

I am a Scottish Metis. My Anglo ancestors came to the Selkirk area in the early 1800s. They worked in the fur trade and on the waters, and on the land. They married native women, and I am a proud product of the joining of these two rich cultures. I was born, raised and educated in the Selkirk area. I am a farmer's son, and grew up with the economic uncertainties that face farmers every year.

I was a steel worker who realized that the union gave us a collective front to bargain for increased benefits and safer working conditions.

I was a small businessman who rode the roller coaster of free enterprise. It taught me that the principles of social democracy and business can coexist if employees are allowed to grow, both personally and financially along with the business, not simply as a tool to maximize profits.

I worked for native people in Selkirk as a community resource officer at the Selkirk Indian and Metis Friendship Centre. It was there that my deep involvement in community affairs began.

* (1740)

I was an executive member of the Selkirk and District Restitution Reconciliation Committee, and I was an organizer of the Big Brothers and Big Sisters organization of Selkirk. I was the founding director of the Maripas (phonetic) Village Housing Co-op.

I also served in an executive capacity on the Selkirk and District Environmental Committee and the Selkirk local of the Manitoba Metis Federation. Recently I was elected to the board of the Selkirk Indian and Metis Friendship Centre.

Politics, I felt, was a natural progression from my community service. It is a chance to raise those issues which concern me and my constituents, to present a vision of the future Manitoba, a vision of a caring and responsible society. Citizens of Selkirk riding share this vision.

In this election I called for more day-care spaces for shift workers, improved low-rental housing, Red River cleanup. I offered a plan to strengthen the role of the Selkirk Mental Health Centre and asked for fairer taxes and tougher environmental laws.

The voters of the Selkirk riding responded to these calls, Mr. Speaker, and I urge the Government to respond as well.

I have been very fortunate recently, Mr. Speaker, having been elected to this Chamber. I am also very fortunate to have been accepted by the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), the Member for The Pas (Lathlin), and the Member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickey) into the aboriginal caucus.

My ancestors would be proud, for the native traditions of caring and sharing, respect for mother earth, respect for our elders are also the principles that guide the New Democratic Party. It is these

traditions and principles that will be my guide during my tenure in this Chamber. Thank you.

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to put some thoughts on the record on the debate on the throne speech. I would like to do the traditional congratulations to the Speaker for his re-election to this office. I have had the opportunity to work with him in the past Session, to sit in the Chair in this Chamber on occasion and to chair some committees. I am very pleased with the many things that I was able to learn from that position.

I too would like to welcome the new Members to the Chamber, and I do not speak as a veteran of more than two and a half years, but certainly it is an honour to be an MLA, to represent the people of your constituency and to assume the tremendous responsibility that we have to share in the governing of Manitoba. I am sure that in the course of your duties over the next four or five years that you are going to find it a tremendous learning experience and enjoy the relationships which you no doubt will form as you serve as an MLA.

I would like to thank the citizens of Minnedosa constituency for re-electing me and to allow me to be again the MLA for Minnedosa. The redistribution, of course, has changed most constituencies, has changed the names of some, and has had quite a profound change on the manner of the distribution of seats in our province.

My riding is fairly similar to what it was before. It has been enlarged and it is a concern to constituents of mine. It is a concern to many people in rural Manitoba that the constituencies outside of the perimeter highway have become larger and larger as we have seen the disappearance of two constituencies in rural Manitoba. However, in my constituency we are very pleased to welcome the members of the R.M. of Strathclair, the Village of Strathclair, the Village of Elphinstone to be part of Minnedosa constituency, also the remainder of the constituency of Cornwallis and Whitehead which are added to Minnedosa constituency.

For Members who are not familiar with it, and I know that my friend from the Liberal bench is very familiar with Minnedosa, he had the opportunity to visit there many times over the last two and a half years, but I would invite all Members to take some time on a weekend or take some holiday time to come out and see a most beautiful part of the

province where the prairie meets the parkland and to visit with some wonderful people out there.

I know that Members who have not been able to visit sometimes will write letters and make their feelings known out there. I assure you, you would be far better in terms of your own education to come and visit and see Minnedosa constituency and visit the lovely people who live there. -(interjection)- My friend from Inkster has had the opportunity to eat a lot of chicken out there, and he speaks very highly of some of our restaurants. Whatever fowl he chooses to have, he is, of course, most welcome to return at any time.

Mr. Speaker, as we travelled through the constituency and the province during the recent election, it is a very common thread of thought being put forward by constituents and people in rural Manitoba and other parts of Manitoba, northern Manitoba, that they have been very pleased with the good Government that they have been enjoying the last two and a half years.

A common thread as you travelled around the province where people had such tremendous praise for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and the initiatives that he has been able to bring forward in that department. I can tell you that hospital construction, the reform of the health care system, the tremendous amount of money put into the ambulance system has been well received by my constituents and other Manitobans.

One of the areas of neglect over the last 15 or 20 years has been hospital construction. There are Members in this Chamber who have indicated that certain hospitals should not be built, that priorities should be different, that money should be spent elsewhere. I can tell you there has been a very evenhanded approach and a very fair approach to opening new beds, personal care beds and hospital beds right across this province.

Certainly the people of Minnedosa constituency recognize that and are very pleased, and when they speak of good Government, they speak very highly of what we have been able to accomplish in health care.

I am sure that Members are aware of the tremendous crisis we have in agriculture. I think it is something that we have to address, not only in the short term but in the long term. We have again received high praise for things like drought payments, interest relief, and there is a lot of interest

in a safety net program for agricultural producers. I would hope that our federal Government, that our lobby groups in the farm community and the Department of Agriculture can continue to work on a safety net program, because our communities in rural Manitoba, all our communities in Manitoba are affected by the fact that income in the agricultural community is down. These are issues that have to be addressed and I am sure will be in the near future.

I can tell you that the department, the creation of the Department of Rural Development, has been exceedingly well received in Manitoba. The attention that is being paid to rural issues and to issues such as decentralization and the job creation that is affected in rural Manitoba is something that many Manitobans have spoken to me about, something that they are looking forward to. They are looking forward to continuation of rural development, the continuation of job creation through decentralization. We hope that this moving of positions to communities across this province is going to have a tremendous economic impact on the communities outside of the Perimeter Highway.

I would like to pay tribute to the Department of Natural Resources which has been very instrumental in a number of projects in the Minnedosa constituency. I can tell you that through the judicious use of funding from the Lotteries Fund through Natural Resources that with a little bit of CED money and a project like the one at Minnedosa Lake that a tremendous amount of money has come forward from the private sector, from service clubs and through other funding that has allowed a project which addresses tourism, attracts people to our community and also has dealt with the question of water quality.

We have tremendous natural resources in our province, and that is just one small project which has been in progress and has been very successful in attracting people to our communities. Similarly, the provincial park at Rivers, with assistance from the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources and the department, the community is coming forward with ideas, with money of their own to try and enhance a provincial park that has long been neglected. Again, the impetus and the drive behind this project is placed squarely on the friends of Rivers Lake. The community is coming forward with ideas, with sweat equity, with funding, with hard work to try and enhance this.

Also, the Village of Sandy Lake has benefitted

from this department. In our communities, tourism is a tremendous asset and a tremendous provider of jobs in Minnedosa constituency. We have been able to work with local groups, the Lions Club there, with the Game and Fish Association to enhance the lake at Sandy Lake, and all of these projects that I have mentioned come under the Department of Natural Resources. Tremendous strides have been made to create jobs to provide for the tourist industry, and people are very optimistic that this is going to continue and are very pleased with that.

* (1750)

I should also mention the North American Waterfall Management Plan which was announced early in the summer. This plan is going to address concerns in all of southwestern Manitoba and it is going to bring together Natural Resources, the North American Waterfowl people and also Ducks Unlimited to work with farmers to take some land out of production, to enhance the nesting areas and, again, it is providing employment, and people in our area are looking forward to that project as it progresses.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger) is not with us today but there have been many initiatives. I am sure he is with us and thinking of us, but at any rate the highways construction is something that many Manitobans have spoken about. That after many years of neglect finally there is construction again and people have looked upon this as a new impetus, a needed link in transportation in our province. We are looking forward to new budgets and more highways construction improving our infrastructure across this province.

I would invite Members, as I did earlier, as they visit Minnedosa constituency to visit a new truck stop, a rest area, an issue that people talked about during the campaign and during the decision-making process. This is a model that we hope will be viewed favourably and used by travellers, and we look forward to many more of these being built throughout our province.

So, again, people across this province have been talking about good Government and have made that decision to have the Government that has been in control in this province for the last two and a half years continue for another four or five years.

I would like to put a few thoughts on the record about the department of which I am now the Minister, and I have had the opportunity to make

some comments in the House earlier, but I think it is important that it be recognized and said that our commitment to Family Services is a strong one. Our record, I believe, speaks for itself. We have increased spending by nine percent in each of the last two budgets. Our spending in this department, in health and in education is where we have put our priorities.

I think that while people are critical of not enough spending, I think that the tremendous increases in those budgets speak well for our commitment. Well, I think we have to recognize that there is a limit to our resources that throwing more dollars at problems we face in Manitoba is not always the solution. We have to encourage a number of our agencies, a number of people who depend on funding from Government in this particular portfolio to make good management decisions on how they set their priorities. We are going to be asking them to re-examine priorities, but the funding is certainly there to continue with the programming that has been there in the past. It does not mean we cannot have changes, and I think agencies are going to accept that challenge, that boards and management will set these priorities and make those decisions.

When we choose these priorities, we have to choose them carefully. We must be assured that our tax dollars go to the best possible use to protect Manitobans who are vulnerable, and that we take into consideration the vulnerable citizens that we have in all parts of Manitoba. I think our record is very clear on this.

To be more specific, in Child and Family Services we have introduced \$560,000 in child abuse treatment initiatives. This is more than double the funding for the Child Protection Centre. This is an initiative that has been well received by the people who work in this area.

We have strengthened laws protecting children from abuse, including making mandatory, third-party reporting of suspected abuse. I think this is one of the reasons why the reports have increased the way they have, that there is mandatory third-party reporting at this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have also negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding with foster parents, which resulted in an 80 percent increase in foster rates. This Memorandum of Understanding of course is in effect for a three-year period.

We have increased funding to Child and Family

Service agencies in the last two budgets by 16 percent and 15 percent respectively. This is a very generous increase in the budget for those Child and Family Service agencies. They are working very co-operatively with department officials now to bring forward a balanced budget and to make those decisions that they have to make and to choose their priorities.

We have strengthened measures to protect and support victims of violence. We have increased funding by 47 percent, as I have indicated before, over the last two years for services and supports to victims of family violence. This is the money that has come forward for the shelters.

We have launched a \$200,000 "Abuse Is A Crime" campaign. I think Members have made comments that perhaps this money would be better spent on treatment or be better spent in another area, but I can tell you that public awareness is very important. This initiative has been lauded by many across this province, and it is being recognized across the country that other jurisdictions are taking a very close look at that advertising campaign, asking advice and seeking to use parts of that in their province. I think that initiative, that spending of \$200,000 on this campaign, has been a very beneficial one.

We have restructured the funding to the crisis shelters so that there is some Core funding, but there is also per diem funding, which recognizes the fact that there is an increase from time to time in the number of people that those shelters serve. The Core funding is above what those shelters received in the past, and the per diem funding allows them to address the volume increase that happens from time to time.

For the most part, shelters and the department have been working together on their plans. I think that through some creative thinking and through some working together we can have shelters work together where the per diem from one shelter perhaps can be used in another shelter when they are overloaded. I think we have to do some creative thinking in that area so that funding can flow.

I would also mention that we have secured a new and larger facility for Osborne House. This is an initiative that was brought forward by the previous Minister and the Government in the last Session. This has been lauded by Manitobans from all sides,

and it is an initiative and an accomplishment that we have been very proud of.

We have also funded the province's first Native women's shelter for victims of abuse, again a far-thinking and far-reaching initiative that has been applauded by Manitobans from the Native community and others.

We have injected \$355,000 to expand the Winnipeg crisis line at Osborne House and establish a province-wide, toll-free crisis line. Again, these initiatives have taken place during the last two years and have been well received.

In the area of child care we have made a strong commitment to flexible, accessible, quality child care. We increased our funding by 45 percent or \$13 million over the last two years. We have expanded the system by 1,100 licensed spaces, including 765

more funded spaces. We have increased the salary enhancement grant for workers by 55 percent or \$4,350 per funded worker. We have injected \$600,000 for additional child care training spaces. We have placed a new emphasis on family day care and workplace day care.

In addition, we have established a working group on day care to examine funding in the child care system in an effort to ensure further improvements to our child care system—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Minister will have 20 minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House now stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Thursday, October 18, 1990

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Ministerial Statements

Person's Day
Mitchelson; Barrett 183

Tabling of Reports

Annual Report Highways and
Transportation
Driedger 185

Manitoba Energy Authority and
Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board
Neufeld 185

Annual Report Department of Labour;
Annual Report Manitoba Civil Service
Superannuation Board
Praznik 185

Introduction of Bills

Bill 13 - The Residential Tenancies and
Consequential Amendments Act
Ducharme 185

Bill 5 - The Retail Sales Tax
Amendment Act
L. Evans 185

Bill 3 - The Employment Standards
Amendment Act
Ashton 186

Bill 12 - The Labour Relations
Amendment Act
Praznik 186

Oral Question Period

Gasoline Price Increase
Doer; Filmon 186

Eastman Crisis Centre
Barrett; Gilleshammer 188

Family Violence
Barrett; McCrae 188

Energy
Carr; Neufeld 189

Aboriginal Language Programs
Hickes; Derkach 190

Core Area Initiative
Hickes; Ducharme 190

Pay Equity Extension
Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard 190

Brandon Mental Health Centre
Cheema; Orchard 191

Fishing Industry
C. Evans; Penner 192

Water Quality
C. Evans; Penner 193

Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project
Edwards; Cummings 193

Environmental Assessment
Edwards; Cummings 194

Manitoba Telephone System
Dewar; Findlay 194

Non-Political Statements

Foster Family Week
Gilleshammer 194

Person's Case Award
Barrett 195

Foster Family Week
Alcock 195

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Throne Speech Debate

Lathin; Connery; Carr; Martindale
Praznik; Dewar; Gilleshammer 195-230