



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

41 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XLII No. 5 - 1:30 p.m., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1992



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Wednesday, December 2, 1992

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Barbara Sellman, Jodi Cranswick, Richard Vawhous and others, requesting the government of Manitoba consider reviewing the funding of the Brandon General Hospital.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of George Tessier, Deborah Carr, Angela Borysowich and others, urging the government of Manitoba to pass the regulations to restrict the stubble burning in the province of Manitoba.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis). It complies with the privileges and the practices of the House and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

To the Legislature of the province of Manitoba

WHEREAS each year smoke from stubble burning descends upon the province of Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the Parents Support Group of Children with Asthma has long criticized the harmful effects of stubble burning; and

WHEREAS the smoke caused from stubble burning is not healthy for the general public and tends to aggravate the problems of asthma sufferers and people with chronic lung problems; and

WHEREAS alternative practices to stubble burning are necessitated by the fact that the smoke can place some people in life-threatening situations; and

WHEREAS the 1987 Clean Environment Commission Report on Public Hearings, "Investigation of Smoke Problems from Agriculture

Crop Residue and Peatland Burning," contained the recommendation that a review of the crop residue burning situation be conducted in five years' time, including a re-examination of the necessity for legislated regulatory control.

THEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly will urge the Government of Manitoba to pass the necessary legislation/regulations which will restrict stubble burning in the Province of Manitoba.

As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

* * *

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

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth:

THAT the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry was launched in April of 1988 to conduct an examination of the relationship between the justice system and aboriginal people; and

The AJI delivered its report in August of 1991 and concluded that the justice system has been a massive failure for aboriginal people; and

The AJI report endorsed the inherent right of aboriginal self-government and the right of aboriginal communities to establish an aboriginal justice system; and

The Canadian Bar Association, The Law Reform Commission of Canada, among many others, also recommend both aboriginal self-government and a separate and parallel justice system; and

On January 28, 1992, five months after releasing the report, the provincial government announced it was not prepared to proceed with the majority of the recommendations; and

Despite the All-Party Task Force Report which endorsed aboriginal self-government, the provincial government now rejects a separate and parallel justice system, an Aboriginal Justice Commission and many other key recommendations which are solely within provincial jurisdiction.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba may be pleased to request that the government of Manitoba show a strong commitment to aboriginal self-government by considering reversing its position on the AJI by supporting the recommendations within its jurisdiction and implementing a separate and parallel justice system.

* * *

*(1335)

I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema). It complies with the rules of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

WHEREAS each year smoke from stubble burning descends upon the province of Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the Parents Support Group of Children with Asthma has long criticized the harmful effects of stubble burning; and

WHEREAS the smoke caused from stubble burning is not healthy for the general public and tends to aggravate the problems of asthma sufferers and people with chronic lung problems; and

WHEREAS alternative practices to stubble burning are necessitated by the fact that the smoke can place some people in life-threatening situations; and

WHEREAS the 1987 Clean Environment Commission Report on Public Hearings, "Investigation of Smoke Problems from Agriculture Crop Residue and Peatland Burning," contained the recommendation that a review of the crop residue burning situation be conducted in five years' time, including a re-examination of the necessity for legislated regulatory control.

THEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly will urge the government of Manitoba to pass the necessary legislation/regulations which will restrict stubble burning in the province of Manitoba.

* * *

I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), and it complies with the rules of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

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

WHEREAS the state of Highway 391 is becoming increasingly unsafe; and

WHEREAS due to the poor condition of the road there have been numerous accidents; and

WHEREAS the condition of the road between Thompson and Nelson House is not only making travel dangerous but costly due to frequent damage to vehicles; and

WHEREAS this road is of vital importance to residents who must use the road.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislature of the province of Manitoba may be pleased to request that the government of Manitoba consider reviewing the state of Highway 391 with a view towards improving the condition and safety of the road.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 2—The Endangered Species Amendment Act

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to move, seconded by none other than the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), that Bill 2, The Endangered Species Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les espèces en voie de disparition), be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 3—The Oil and Gas and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 3, The Oil and Gas and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi concernant le pétrole et le gaz naturel et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of this bill, recommends it to this House.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey),

seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 3, The Oil and Gas and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi concernant le pétrole et le gaz naturel et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois, be introduced and the same now be received and read a first time.

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of this bill, recommends it the House.

The honourable minister has also tabled a message. Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 4—The Retail Businesses Sunday Shopping (Temporary Amendments) Act

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill 4, The Retail Businesses Sunday Shopping (Temporary Amendments) Act (Loi sur l'ouverture des commerces de détail les jours fériés—modifications temporaires), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

* (1340)

Bill 203—The Health Care Records Act

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that Bill 203, The Health Care Records Act; Loi sur les dossiers médicaux, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion presented.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, Bill 203, to enshrine the right of access to one's own medical records in law is being introduced, or should I say reintroduced this session, because it is a matter of growing public concern, the subject of a recent Supreme Court decision and a key element in any serious health care reform plan.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is based on a number of principles. The first principle is that of human dignity, and this bill acknowledges that the health care consumer has an inherent right to his or her own health care records and personal information. This bill is based on the principle of fairness and puts Manitobans on a better and fairer footing for dealing with our health care system. It recognizes that a relationship of trust and openness between the consumer and health care provider would flow from the right of access. It acknowledges that a better understanding of treatment and more active and informed participation in that treatment is facilitated by access to the medical record.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it encourages participation in and responsibility for one's own health, which can only lead to a better, more efficient, more effective health care system. As such, this bill is an integral part of any health care plan and deserves the serious and timely consideration of this House.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 205—The Ombudsman Amendment Act

Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), that Bill 205, The Ombudsman Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'ombudsman, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion presented.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, most people would probably be surprised to learn that the provincial Ombudsman does not have jurisdiction to investigate school boards. School boards are responsible for hundreds of millions of dollars of expenditures and for 200,000 students of the province of Manitoba, but there is no appeal and there is no jurisdiction in order to investigate many complaints against those bodies.

The extension to school boards will allow parents and students to have a recourse in cases where there is no appeal. I think members of this House would also be surprised in the last Ombudsman report to note that of over 700 complaints, only three related to the Department of Education and Training. That does not jive, Mr. Speaker, with

many concerns and comments that are heard out of the community concerning education.

We have the throne speech which talks about education reform and other education reform items. This is a tangible way to effectively and very cost-effectively, with very little cost, to effect some tangible reform in the education system and allow parents and students to have a recourse in cases where decisions and actions of school boards do not meet with the parents' and students' approval. It is timely, and I am sure that all members of this House will assist us in speedy passage of this bill, insofar as in the last month we had a situation where a student in school is suing a school board. We know of many others; I know of at least half a dozen others who are considering it, and this would provide some recourse to these individuals and some right of appeal to those decisions.

Motion agreed to.

* (1345)

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery, where we have with us three gentlemen from the Ukraine, Mr. Vitaliy Tarasenko, Mr. Nikolai Podberyosny and Alexander Pitenko.

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

Also with us this afternoon in the public gallery, from the Kelvin High School, we have twenty-one Grade 12 students. They are under the direction of Mrs. Bobbi Ethier. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation No-Fault Insurance

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1988, after a major increase in the rates of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, a reform committee was established chaired by

Judge Robert Kopstein. Mr. Kopstein had public hearings across the province and made a number of recommendations to the government, to the now Premier, about how to improve the Public Insurance Corporation and how indeed to save the ratepayer, consumer, money in the future years.

One of those recommendations, Mr. Speaker, was for a no-fault system, and the government was asked a number of times, on a number of occasions in this Legislature, to deal with the no-fault recommendation before them. Judge Kopstein predicted that that could save some \$40 million dollars to the consumers of this province, because a lot of the fees, up to 30 percent or 40 percent of bodily injury fees, were going to lawyers and not to claimants.

Mr. Speaker, the Tilling Gas Report that was brought forward to the Public Utilities Board predicted some \$60-million saving in the no-fault provisions if it was implemented.

My question to the government is: They have been saying for five years, they have been studying it and studying it and studying it; why has the government not brought in real reform to the Public Insurance Corporation so the consumers could see the benefit of those recommendations that were made to this Premier?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): Mr. Speaker, the Kopstein report was indeed an important report regarding public insurance in this province, but I do not think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) should be quite so anxious to attribute the massive savings that he is talking about. The fact is we have incorporated over 100 of Kopstein's report recommendations within the corporation, but the more important one and the one that bothers the public the most, as a matter of fact, is: What is the real cost of insuring a vehicle to put it on the road in this province, and what coverages and what benefits am I entitled to if I should have an accident or if I am injured?

Those are the kinds of questions that we will need to keep out in front of us in the next few months as we examine what is the real basic need to put an automobile on the road in this province as part of compulsory insurance and the benefits that are available to the injured under those circumstances,

because that is exactly what no-fault speaks to, is whether or not certain abilities to recover beyond a certain level for injuries is being considered.

Renewal Process

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think members on this side can read back the comments of outrage from the members opposite all day long, but that will not do the consumer any good at all in terms of the increases we are facing in the next couple of months.

Mr. Speaker, a further recommendation made under the Kopstein report and further contained to the government was to change the cycle of payments. It identified the fact from the private sector and the public sector that to have so many people renewing on the same date at the end of February was indeed a negative fact for the consumer and a very, very negative reality for retail business in Manitoba.

The government had a recommendation to change, from Judge Kopstein, this renewal date. On questions we have raised in the House to the government, it promised to do that. In fact, the minister promised to do this exact same measure on January 29, 1990, to go to cyclical renewals to help the economy of Manitoba. His words are right in Hansard, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the Premier why they have not implemented the Kopstein report for cyclical renewals to help our economy, to help consumers and to help the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is correct that we have said, the corporation has said, that they will move to cyclical renewals. Part of that moving forward is the redesigning and enhancement of the computer capacity within the corporation, which is a large and expensive undertaking, one that needs to be extended over a period of time so as to avoid a severe impact on the overhead of the corporation. The corporation is moving forward on that model and, with the implementation of Autopac 2000—which is presently being negotiated; it was referenced yesterday being negotiated a

compensation package for agents—we will be changing the way in which we do business in this province. There will be cyclical renewals. There will be an opportunity for the kind of service that Judge Kopstein envisioned at the time of his report.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, if there is one item that the corporation has been focusing on more than anything else, it is bringing the corporation into the '90s and on into the year 2000 to provide the kind of service that the Autopac 2000 will bring.

* (1350)

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Agents' Fees

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the only thing that is going to change the business of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is a party and a government that believes in public insurance and believes in the recommendations of Judge Kopstein. Instead of waiting five years like this Premier (Mr. Filmon) has done, drifting from issue to issue, doing nothing in terms of the recommendations he had before him—he likes to heckle in the House, but when it comes to doing anything, Mr. Speaker, he does nothing on anything before him.

Mr. Speaker, a further promise made by the Premier in 1988 is they would not interfere with the business plans of any Crown corporation. One of the recommendations Judge Kopstein made was to deal with agents' fees in 1988, some five years ago. In the business plan forwarded to the government of the day, headed by the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the business plan of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation proposed to government was that agents' fees would be capped so that they would not get an automatic increase based on this massive increase required by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. The government overrode the business plan of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation; the government refused to follow the business plan of the public auto insurance and indeed followed the lobbying they got from the brokers of Manitoba.

I would ask why the Premier overrode the business plan of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and why the lobbyists from the brokers were able to get the attention of the cabinet and not

go to the Public Utilities Board, where the rest of the public had to go to the Public Utilities Board.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I reject categorically that the agents got into the cabinet of the Government of Manitoba. That is false, and as usual, the Leader of the Opposition puts false information on the record.

I secondly suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that this is a government that has not interfered with the operations of—[interjection]

We have plenty of evidence of the fact that the NDP government, of which he was a part, set the rates, the 25 per cent increase that went in, rolled back recommendations of the board routinely, shredded the files when it was to their convenience to eliminate evidence of their meddling, direct meddling and interference with a corporation, and ran the corporation out of the minister's office and the government cabinet room. This administration will not do that.

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Political Interference

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, we are not going to take it, no big Autopac increases; we are not going to take it, no political interference in Autopac—what a bunch of hypocrites. Where are the same Tories of four years ago?

I have a very simple question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, on political interference. How does the First Minister justify buckling in to a lobby led by insurance agents, spearheaded by his own Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), on an issue that would have saved a million dollars for the motorists of Manitoba?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The member for Thompson has made a very serious allegation. He made a very serious allegation, and unless he has evidence to support that the minister was even a participant in any discussions with respect to Autopac agents, I demand that he remove that or put the evidence on the table, Mr. Speaker. That is a matter of privilege that ought to be dealt with by this House if he does not have any evidence to put forward on that.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier should talk to the minister. He has been taking

credit himself. When will the minister take action to investigate the clear evidence of political interference on a matter that would have saved a million dollars for the motorists of Manitoba, clear evidence that he has buckled in to the insurance agents and their lobby, with his Minister of Government Services taking credit for them having buckled in to the insurance agents' lobby?

Mr. Filmon: He is making a serious allegation. I demand that he put up what evidence he has that the Minister of Government Services even participated in any discussions or debate leading up to this issue. Put the evidence on the table, or withdraw and apologize.

You are turning white, Steve. Put up.

Mr. Ashton: Will the Premier investigate this matter and start by talking to his own minister who has been telling people that he has spearheaded a lobby which was successful? Why does he not start by talking to his own caucus members?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I ask the member, in the interests of integrity of this House, to put the evidence on the table.

* (1355)

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Temro Automotive Agreement

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if our Autopac system is to have integrity, and I think it is important that it does, then we must make it as depoliticized a Crown corporation as possible, and I congratulate the government for having moved the rate setting to the PUB. That is where they belong. That is where they should have been under the previous administration. But there was a serious incident that was raised last night on television. The public needs answers, and I hope that we can get those answers today.

The report indicated that the public corporation, MPIC, and a manufacturer of a product with a history of trouble entered into a secret agreement with one another.

Can the minister responsible please tell the House today when that agreement was entered into and why it was entered into? Was the Department

of Consumer Affairs informed of this difficulty so that it could keep the consumers of this province adequately informed about the dangers?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): The Leader of the Second Opposition has correctly identified a concern that I share on this side of the House, regarding certainly the appearance and the implication of MPIC having entered into this understanding with Temro. The one thing that was not included, however, in the report last night was that MPIC did contact the CSA indicating to them that they had a number of concerns. At that point, they felt they were unable to produce enough evidence to take the matter to court.

My position is that they should have taken these matters to court one at a time until they were able to prove beyond any doubt—and through that process they would have been able to produce the public information, and then make statements publicly that they could have supported. It was an error in judgment, Mr. Speaker, and one which I expect the corporation will not repeat.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, to some degree, that begs the question as to when the minister himself found out about this agreement. After all, if one looks back, it would appear that the current Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) was on this board from 1988 to 1990, and the now Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) was on this board from 1990, '91.

When was the minister informed of this particular secret agreement?

* (1400)

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, the same question arose in my mind as to whether or not there had been any communication or any implication in my presence that this type of agreement had been struck. It is only within the last 10 days or so that I became aware of the issue as it was described by the I-Team last night. I would doubt if this is the type of question that would have been brought to the board table as a matter of fact. I certainly can research the agendas to make sure that was the case, but frankly, this was an executive decision,

one which they tell me they felt was supportable at the time. Obviously, I disagree.

Mrs. Carstairs: If the minister has known about this for 10 days, has he in the last 10 days informed the Minister of Consumer Affairs so that she can issue an order protecting the consumers of this province?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, all of the departments of government need to be concerned about the perception as well as the reality of what occurred in this matter, but the simple fact is that the CSA certification and the CSA organization, they continue to stand behind their position. I have been in consultation with the minister, but there has to be a process that she could enter into. Entering into a decision without reason would have caused that department every bit as much grief as it would have caused my office if I had made an abrupt decision without correct legal advice behind it.

Ozone Depleting Substances Act Exemptions

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for MPIC and for the Environment.

Mr. Speaker, as the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) has been pointing out, there are some concerns about MPIC's ability to show leadership on issues of consumer protection. My further question, however, is it has now become clear that MPIC has been attempting to shirk its responsibility to protect the environment as well.

Can the minister explain why MPIC has recently advised the working group on the implementation of The Ozone Depleting Substances Act that it requires a special exemption from this act so that it will not have to safely dispose of the CFCs in air conditioning units of vehicles that it is attempting to resell to the public?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): Mr. Speaker, I presume that either someone from the working group or the member himself has summarized or in some way drawn a conclusion from correspondence or comments made by the corporation, because what he has just stated is different from my

understanding, which is that the corporation is moving towards a project that will allow them to withdraw the CFCs from the vehicles within their responsibility.

The issue, of course, that no one wants to address is that the corporation has to attribute this cost to someone, and it will either be to the person who recently had his car written off, and is he now additionally going to be deducted to have the CFC removed, or is it going to be the person who purchases that car at auction who will pay additionally to make sure that it has a green sticker or that it has had the CFCs removed from it?

The corporation is moving towards a project so that they can define what would be proper cost. This will more than likely be a project that will be undertaken by contract or by tender, and the corporation will be moving towards that, bearing in mind that one of the problems they have at a number of their compounds is that in order to remove the CFCs during the winter, they have to have a heated building and the equipment has to be at 70 degrees before they can properly remove that. That requires some investment or contractual work, and the CFC removal is moving in that direction.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, for the minister's information, I want to table correspondence dated November 17 from Ms. Anne Lindsay of the Manitoba Eco-Network, a member of the working group. The letter is addressed to him and specifically points out to him that she is distressed about Autopac's application to be exempted from the act.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Canadian Council of Ministers of Environment which is supposed to be co-ordinating efforts to recover and recycle CFCs, how can this minister sit at one table and discuss phasing out CFCs but when he is wearing another hat presiding over a Crown corporation seek to get a special exemption for this Crown corporation which every other owner of vehicles attempting to resell them will have to comply with? Why is MPIC special?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is actually leading in Canada today in terms of legislation to deal with CFCs and the implementation of that legislation. So let the member not leave the impression that somehow we are exempting either individuals or corporations with these regulations.

The corporation is not breaking any laws or legislation in this province. They are selling a vehicle. Those vehicles, some of them may go towards reclamation, some of them may go to destruction, and it is a juncture when we have some 2,000 vehicles within the possession of the corporation at which point they could remove the CFCs. In setting up that system, they better make sure that in fact they are going one step further than is required by law. For him to imply that they are somehow being exempt is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, MPIC is seeking exemption from a law which will apply to everyone else in this province.

What kind of leadership and what kind of example does the government expect to offer when it imposes cost and responsibilities on the public for phasing out CFCs but seeks to exempt Crown corporations from the very same law?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, something that the member, I am sure, is very conversant with, given his training, is some of the principles of responsibility. Environmental responsibility very often says that he who has the benefit of the environment and the use in the environment should pay for that cost.

Mr. Speaker, that speaks to my answer previously, which was that the corporation has to balance the question and has to make a decision that will be compatible with its organization as to whether, if the person who has just had his car wrecked, who is going to be billed additionally for the removal of the CFCs because he in fact had the benefit of that air conditioning, or is it the wrecker who is going to take that car and perhaps move on with it to claim parts off of it? Will he in fact be paying for the removal of the CFCs in advance of taking it off of MPIC's lot?

MPIC in fact is not much different in this situation than an automobile dealer would be under similar circumstances. They do not have these vehicles for their own use. They are in their possession as a result of a full claim write-off.

Mr. Speaker, he knows full well that perception is everything in the business of politics, and he is trying to create the perception that somehow MPIC is exempt. He is wrong.

* * *

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation as well. The minister has just noted that he was aware—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a matter of privilege that took me a little while to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A matter of privilege is a very serious matter.

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, first of all, it will take me a few minutes, and I will have a motion that I will give forward.

It is very upsetting when you are accused in this House, especially in the example that I have led—when I was in opposition I did not participate in any of the functions or any of the committees dealing with MPIC and also, as a minister of the Crown, did not participate, at any time did I participate when I was at cabinet or participate any time at committee hearings. I have made it a purpose to stay away when your family is involved in a particular business. I have also put all of my business interests in trust. I do not participate in the practice of Autopac, and my family participates while I have it in trust.

Mr. Speaker, I deny all allegations that the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) has produced, and I move that the member for Thompson produce any of the evidence supporting his allegations that I, as Minister of Government Services, acted in a fashion that could be construed as a conflict of interest in any possible way, and failing his ability to do so, that he immediately apologize to me and my family and the government, immediately apologize to the Premier (Mr. Filmon), to my colleagues in the Legislature, to everyone in this House, apologize immediately for his false allegations.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I indicated very clearly in the question my concern, the concern of our caucus about the minister's involvement in this, and I based very much of that not only on what brokers have been told but what members of our caucus have been told, including by the minister himself.

We are very concerned when we see evidence as clear as we do of political interference of a savings of \$1 million that could have been had for the motorists of Manitoba that was stopped by this government, by this cabinet, by political interference, something they promised in 1988 they would not do. That is why I asked the question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon), how he could justify that kind of political interference. I have no intention of withdrawing the very clear fact there has been political interference and my urging that the First Minister perhaps begin by speaking to his own minister and ask his own minister why he has been taking credit for that, including with members of our own caucus, when now he stands and makes this comment a matter of privilege. I will not withdraw that, and I would suggest the Premier and the Minister of Government Services have the explaining to do to members of this House and members of the public of Manitoba.

* (1410)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a very serious matter. It is the onus of responsibility for each and every one of us inside this Chamber to bring forward what we feel are legitimate concerns on behalf of Manitobans and to represent what is in their best interests. At times, and I believe that this is one of those times when the allegations have been so strong, there is some sort of a need to have some sort of verification of the allegations. The Premier in his answer did request for some solid—something tangible, that would demonstrate in fact that the Minister of Government Services was in fact in a conflict of interest.

I have not heard anything to substantiate that, and given the serious nature of the allegations that have been brought forward, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in fact the Minister of Government Services is in fact owed an apology or, at the very least, given the information to substantiate the allegations that have been levelled against him.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I do not certainly have to tell you this, but certainly I think I have to tell again other members who maybe have not read rule books recently that when one reads the rule book, there is one section that strikes out. That is the area dealing

with personal privilege. All of us, when we come here into this type of a setting, when we are so much on public view and we are so much vulnerable to attacks which have no evidence or have no substance, that is why we can stop in the middle of the Question Period to rise at this point in time. That is how serious any allegation is under a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, we in public life bring a lot of difficulties on ourselves, and I think all of us want to begin to clear that up to the extent that we can, but when unsubstantiated allegations are made, we do not only a disservice to the person who is being attacked, but indeed to each and every member of this House. So we all have a vital role, not only in this issue, but in any area where there is a claim being made against another member.

Today we had a situation where the member for Thompson, without evidence, without anything, I am led to believe, other than a comment that he may have heard or may not have heard, got up on the guise and raised the question and made a very strong allegation. The allegation was that a member of the Treasury Bench, through his capacity as a member of Executive Council, influenced a government decision. What he did not say was: to his ultimate benefit. That is what he did not say in his question, but each and every one of us in this House knows exactly what he meant. So, Mr. Speaker, that is why the member has to defend his character and indeed all the characters of the House that are from time to time charged with an unfounded allegation, and therefore he has to rise.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot share the minutes of the cabinet meeting of that day when this issue was discussed. I cannot do that, but I can tell the members of this House that the member of the Executive Council was not there. He was not in attendance, so he influenced not any decision that was made within cabinet on this particular issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rest my case. This is a very, very important issue, but more important than that is the allegation spuriously, falsely made against a member of this House. I would say that if the member wants to do anything honourable at all in his long-standing tenure in this House, he will withdraw that allegation. He will apologize to the member. He will apologize to the Premier, to the government and, more importantly, to all members of this House.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to take this matter under advisement, and I am going to consult the authorities. I will return to the House with the ruling on this matter.

* * *

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Temro Automotive Agreement

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister in charge of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

A few minutes ago, he made the statement that he had learned of the Temro situation regarding the defective car heaters only 10 days ago. What we are interested in finding out on this side of the House is: What action did he take upon learning 10 days ago that this situation had occurred in Manitoba?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I could repeat in this Chamber what my immediate reaction was, but let us leave it at that in terms of what I actually said. I should remind the member opposite that I have been known to spend some time working in the farmyard, so he can draw his own conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I immediately expressed my concern about the position that the corporation found themselves in. I asked if there were other situations similar to this. I was assured that there were not. I inquired if there were in fact situations that may have arisen as a result of this, where someone was injured or imperilled. I was told there was not. Nevertheless, as I said before, when the corporation took this decision, they did it based on the facts as they saw them. It was an executive decision, and certainly they have said to me, in looking at hindsight, that they would have chosen a different direction.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the same minister is: Given that the corporation is responsible for safety in this province, could he endeavour to discover why the corporation did not issue a warning in all this time, neither in their annual reports or referral to the Consumer minister or any other way?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, the corporation, as they indicated to me, sent a number of these heaters

to an independent lab for examination. They notified the Canadian Standards. At the same time, the results that came back from the labs were inconclusive. They had to make a decision whether they were going to go to court at that point, and they were moving towards court but did not feel in their own minds that they could make a case that they could substantiate. In the course of pursuing Temro on these matters, an offer was made, and they considered it to be the course that they would take.

Nevertheless, as I said before, I am sure that they would have done differently looking back over a period of time.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary.

Will he now request the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh) to issue a warning to the public and try to determine how many of these defective heaters are still out there in the public, because I think there are a lot of people who are not aware of this problem at this point?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, because I am cognizant of the amount of time I have in answering a question, I did not refer to the fact that we have also been in contact with Temro obviously to see what their position has continued to be.

They have been actively removing all of these heaters from the market for the last two and a half years or so, I believe. In fact, they will be issuing a press release later today, which will provide some further clarity to what their position is. I want to assure the member and the public that we were actively pursuing the corporation to make sure that there was no stone left unturned and making sure the public was properly cared for.

* (1420)

Antisniff Legislation Proclamation

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, today we are saddened to hear another tragic story of a young person who has died as the result of chronic solvent abuse. In spite of the near epidemic proportions of this problem in some areas of the city and in the province, the government has refused to take strong action on the problems of sniff.

The Minister of Health said that legislation would be proclaimed in January of 1991. Instead, all we have heard are the excuses of why this government will not proclaim the antisniff legislation introduced by our caucus.

I have a very simple question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). When will his government fulfill the commitment to proclaim the antisniff legislation to prevent another tragic death?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I, too, read the newspapers this morning and have empathy for the death of the individual and understand that one of his difficulties was sniffing substance abuse.

We have not proclaimed the legislation that was passed in this House, Sir, because we have not the assurance that the legislation, as written, would be enforceable. That has been the reason for the delay since 1990.

Legal Opinion Request

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Health table the legal opinions he has received which indicate why the legislation, which received support from the police and community activists, cannot be proclaimed?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, it has been an ongoing discussion with the ministry of Justice in terms of the parameters of that legislation, whether in fact it has the kind of authority and the kind of outcome that my honourable friend alleged would be part of that legislation.

Sir, we do not have that kind of opinion that, as written, the legislation would do what my honourable friend wanted it to do, and indeed I think it is fair to say what this House expected the legislation might be able to do when it passed it.

Mr. Speaker, that is the subject of ongoing discussion within my ministry and the ministry of Justice with hopefully a resolution that will attempt to uphold what I think all of us wished to accomplish in this House when that legislation was passed.

Liquor Control Act Lysol Inclusion

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, will the minister and his cabinet colleagues

take immediate action to include Lysol as an intoxicating substance under The Liquor Control Act so that it can be designated and treated as a controlled substance?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, that is certainly an issue of one of the substances, and in fact, as I understand it, was one of the difficulties with the legislation because of inhalable versus consumable, in terms of Lysol, the spray versus the nonaerosol aspect, and that is where the legislation had difficulties in terms of its enforcement, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, that issue has not been resolvable on the legislation, with the legislation that this House passed, and that of course, Sir, is why we have been back and forth over a two-year period of time with the Justice department, attempting to bring further clarity to enforcement of the intent of that legislation.

Medicare Eye Examinations

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Speaker, when Delilah betrayed Samson and she cut Samson's hair, Samson succumbed and he went blind. If the Health minister proceeds in cutting medicare in accessing eye care, poor Manitobans in a financial bind may ultimately go blind.

Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister of Health, will the honourable Minister of Health reconsider, postpone or countermand the impending change in the regulation to extend the waiting time period for basic eye examination from one year to a two-year time period come January 1, 1993?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, we have been reviewing issues within the responsibility and purview of the ministry of Health and the service provision that our plan provides in an attempt to assure that we are meeting medical needs. One of the recommendations that we accepted and are in the process of expediting, and it was in the news some six, eight, 10, 12 weeks ago, was the extension of a two-year insured optometric examination for Manitobans, because that is the provision of service that is in eight other provinces, the exception being Manitoba and British Columbia.

It was our intent to bring in a two-year examination paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable minister chooses to proceed with this change in regulation, what conditions constituting exceptions will he allow so as to prevent diagnosable eye problems from becoming serious and translated into more risky and more expensive eye surgery?

Mr. Orchard: Well, Mr. Speaker, that, of course, is the subject of discussion right now with professionals in eye examination so that we can, for instance, assure that our regulation will not compromise medical condition, because that is the responsibility of this ministry in calling upon taxpayer dollars to provide services which have medical necessity.

Mr. Speaker, I would suspect we will probably have at least as effective an assurance that we meet medical needs as, for instance, Saskatchewan has, who recently made the same change.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable minister publicly disclose his basic reason, his basic rationale, for allowing this change, in allowing people to go blind just to have a few savings in dollars?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, from time to time, I have listened with a great deal of interest to speeches made by my honourable friend, such as the creation of woman from Adam's rib, but my honourable friend has exceeded the bounds of integrity and the kind of ability to deliver a clear and concise message on morals and principles in this House when he accuses this government of wanting people to go blind with a regulation change that is consistent with seven other provinces in Canada. My honourable friend does himself a disservice as a professional and an educator.

Public Schools Act Review Tabling Request

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education and Training. The Minister of Education and Training had a year-long study to examine the proposed new public schools act, and we have been looking for

legislation and/or for that report in this House for some time.

Can the minister outline when the report of her advisory committee will be tabled and when we can expect a new public schools act in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, the hearings for the revision of The Public Schools Act did not end until February of '92 because there was great public interest in responding to the issues relating to The Public Schools Act. The panel then reviewing the submissions that were received—and I am happy to tell the member there were over 1,000 petitions representing over 6,000 Manitobans—had a great deal of work to do, and I have only very recently received a draft copy and then a final copy approximately a week ago.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, will the minister therefore table that report in the House, since she has the final copy and she has made all kinds of recommendations in the throne speech concerning education?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, first of all, in relation to the throne speech, I am very pleased with what this government has put forward in relation to education in the throne speech, and educational reform relates both to our K-12 system and also our post-secondary system. Perhaps, the member has forgotten that.

However, the report which I have very recently received, I am in the process of reviewing. Mr. Speaker, I have also made it clear to Manitobans that they will have an opportunity to respond to the recommendations made by that panel before legislation is brought forward to this House.

* (1430)

Mr. Chomlak: My final supplementary to the minister who has failed to answer both of my first questions: When will the report be made public? When will we see legislation? Why is the government hiding the report?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the member, I have only just received the report, because it is a report which contains the opinions representing over 6,000 Manitobans. I think that is

a very significant amount of work that has been done in that report.

Government is now looking at the best mechanism to release the recommendations to Manitobans, the report to Manitobans, and make sure that Manitobans can then be sure that they are accurately represented in that report before government goes ahead and drafts legislation to amend The Public Schools Act.

Pharmacare Smoking-Cessation Products

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, we are increasingly concerned about this Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and his government's attention to prevention and cost savings as a result of preventative measures in our health care system. Today, we have heard about this government's inaction with respect to preventing serious eye problems. Yesterday, the Minister of Health indicated—[interjection] Yes, I think the Liberal Health critic might want to consult with the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, I will try to get to the question if the other Tory Health minister in this House would just be quiet.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister indicated that labelling on liquor bottles pertaining to fetal alcohol syndrome was unnecessary and only appeasing our own conscience.

I want to ask the Minister of Health, on a very serious issue pertaining to smoking in our society, why this government has deinsured pharmaceutical products that help people stop smoking, that being Nicorette gum, and why this government refuses to provide any kind of Pharmacare coverage for the nicotine patch.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, all of us know that smoking compromises one's health condition. One also knows that cigarettes cost \$5 a pack or better. [interjection] Pardon me, \$7. Obviously, I am a nonsmoker. Often people smoke one pack per day, which means in a month you would spend \$200. The patches to

stop cost about \$100 a month, and my honourable friend wants taxpayers to pay for it?

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for St. Johns has time for one very short question.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health how he can justify a decision that will cost this government and taxpayers thousands upon thousands of dollars, by not taking preventative measures now and avoiding costly medical interventions and surgery pertaining to cancer caused by smoking down the road.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, with all the respect I can muster for my honourable friend and her would-be indignation over measures taken by this government to preserve and protect medicare which are not dissimilar to provinces right across the length and breadth of Canada, including provinces governed by Liberals, governed by Conservatives, governed, Sir, by New Democrats, now my honourable friend, in the comfort of opposition, cries that we should do many things that, of reality in the honesty of government, her confreres in governing provinces do not do.

Mr. Speaker, all we need to preserve medicare in this province and in this country is a little bit of informed debate and discussion around the issues, not the shrill of rhetoric that we hear from her all the time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: Prior to moving on to Orders of the Day, during Question Period, the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) tabled a document which was unsigned.

On November 14, 1988, I did take a matter under advisement. I reported back to the House. At that time, I noted that Speaker Hanuschak in 1970 ruled, and he stated that all letters when read must be signed and then they become part of the documents of the House.

In 1981, Speaker Graham ruled that an unsigned and unidentified document is an incomplete document and cannot be considered the property of the House.

As I did in 1988 on November 14, if the honourable member was prepared to make a declaration on the document similar in [interjection] Order, please—the document would then be in the form acceptable to the House. If this was done, I would be prepared to accept the document of the honourable member for St. James.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Fourth Day of Debate)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) for an Address to the honourable the Administrator in answer to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed motion of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in further amendment thereto, standing in the name of the honourable member for Gimli, who has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when I concluded at six o'clock, I was talking about the benefits of rural gasification.

Providing a favourable economic climate in order to improve our Manitoba farm economy is certainly a priority for this government—as an example, the multimillion dollar expansion by the Brandon-based Ayerst Organics Ltd., which processes a widely used estrogen replacement product for women. This project will not only result in the expansion of the Ayerst plant and provide jobs in Brandon, but also will increase the payments to farmers and to the PMU producers in Manitoba.

This is a real welcomed announcement and will have a very positive impact on every local rural economy in the province, but because of the larger payments these producers will be able to inject more money back into their respective communities also, which means a stronger Manitoba. So the farmers in my constituency who supply these PMU producers and also the PMU producers with feed and other supplies will also benefit.

As well, the government has revised the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation financial assistance, so this will also encourage more farmers to enter this PMU business. This is a very positive announcement for all rural areas of Manitoba.

I also support this government's pledge to intensify efforts to strengthen Manitoba's presence in new and emerging markets for primary and processed agricultural products. Manitoba farmers are important to this province in every region. They produce some of the best products in the world, and I fully support any move that will expand Manitoba's agricultural industry to other parts of Canada, North America and, of course, the world.

* (1440)

An Honourable Member: You forgot to mention Mexico.

Mr. Helwer: That is right.

I welcome, as well, this government's intention to press our counterparts in Ottawa to act on its responsibilities to strengthen and promote the sugar beet industry not only in Manitoba but across western Canada. Manitoba needs our farmers and they produce some of the best products in the world.

I am really pleased that the Speech from the Throne stated that this government will be bringing together the major players in the agricultural industry in order to identify future directions in diversification, value-added processing and exports. We should work with farmers to produce special crops for export areas.

Just in Sunday's paper, one of the headlines "Bumper harvest 'amazing'" also outlines the fact that Manitoba's wheat yield this year was a phenomenal 41.4 bushels an acre, the highest on record. Canola production in Manitoba also broke records this year, according to one of our surveys, and the provincial average for Canola was 28.5 bushels, which was an all-time high.

This will also make value-added industries such as Canola crushing and add to the jobs that are created in these industries. So I think it is just great that in agriculture in Manitoba, farmers were able to harvest a good crop. Unfortunately, in some areas the quality was not as good as we would have liked to see, but on the whole I think the crop generally was pretty fair.

Guaranteeing safe and reliable roads and highways is another very important priority for this government. In the Gimli [interjection] Yes, it is very important. [interjection] It is very important there. In the Gimli constituency as an example, for '92-93 the Highways department is going to spend about \$3.5 million in upgrading work. For example, work

continues on Highway No. 8 between Gimli and Winnipeg Beach, and this will eventually result in a better road and make travel safer.

This is a very important project. [interjection] No, just two lanes, but this is an important project so that members from St. Boniface and other areas can go golfing and also make use of our tourist areas such as our campgrounds and things like that in the popular tourist areas in my constituency. So I am pleased that this government is making it safer for Manitobans and visitors to our province.

I am pleased that protecting Manitoba's environment and conserving our natural resources remain a high priority for our government. The Gimli constituency is blessed with many natural areas or, perhaps, nature museums. Just a new one is the Oak Hammock Marsh, of course. The number of visitors who have been to Oak Hammock this past year is just phenomenal. Even the most optimistic estimates have been surpassed. It is certainly an indication that Oak Hammock is a very popular place for visitors to view the geese and the ducks. That is just one of the natural areas that we have in the province. We also have Lake Winnipeg, of course, which I would say is perhaps one of the most popular recreation areas in all of Canada.

Along with our commercial fishermen in my constituency, I am anxious to see the introduction of an amendment to the provincial Fisheries Act which will expand the market for commercial fish in Manitoba and provide greater opportunities for small businesses in the province. As the throne speech outlined, this amendment will allow Manitoba commercial fishermen to sell their catch directly to Manitoba restaurants, retailers and processors. This will mean that our restaurants will be able to feature fresh Lake Winnipeg pickerel, Lake Winnipeg goldeye and species that are caught in Lake Winnipeg. It means that our stores will also be able to sell fresh fish to the tourists.

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

I am really pleased that this government will establish a fund to support projects that will enhance the quality also of our sports fishery, a recreational activity that is becoming more important in many areas of the province.

Just on fishing, in Tuesday's Winnipeg Free Press an article on the [interjection] Well, I will read part of

it—again how well fishermen in Manitoba are accepting the amendment to The Fisheries Act.

It says: fishermen applaud direct-sale promise. One of my constituents, Kris Olson, a Gimli fisherman, is very pleased. He said it is very good news. Also, the Grand Rapids First Nation Chief Harold Turner said that this is a very positive thing for Manitoba and for Manitoba fisheries.

In spite of what the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) said yesterday in her speech about fishing, this amendment is a very positive thing for us in our constituency and for Manitoba fishermen, so I am really pleased that our Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) has taken it upon himself to bring in this amendment to The Fisheries Act. It is a very popular thing in my constituency because fishing is a big industry. Our fishermen this past year have done very well with the increased final payments, and it is an excellent industry and we certainly want to protect and enhance and see this industry grow and continue.

I also welcome the introduction of a new Park Lands Act, which is designed to better meet the needs of today's park users. So I support this government's continuing efforts to implement the necessary measures to control and properly dispose of hazardous waste. I also welcome new regulations that will be introduced which will impose tougher standards for the installation of the new underground storage tanks which will require testing and testing of existing facilities and cleanup of problem areas.

Just last week I attended a meeting of the Western Fertilizer and Chemical Dealers' Association in Brandon. One of the topics there was, of course, the environment. It is always a very big topic when fertilizer dealers get together, and I think dealers today are taking the environment much more seriously than they ever have, and spillage and misapplication and things of that nature are very important to the dealers and they want to be sure that they are handling this industry and any environmental concerns very, very seriously. We hope that with the new CPIC rules on chemical storage and the Department of Agriculture rules on handling of different pesticides and herbicides, the environment will be protected for many years to come.

I am pleased that energy efficiency also will continue to play an integral role in all government owned and funded operations. The introduction of

new policies to encourage the use of renewable and alternate energy sources is also very welcome. I am also encouraged with plans by our government to introduce a comprehensive new oil and gas act to encourage and promote and facilitate the exploration [interjection] and development of Manitoba's petroleum resources. This is so the people in the urban areas, such as the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), can be assured of a supply of petroleum supplies, for your cottage also, for many, many years to come, so I think it is great.

Another key service that is a priority with this government is with the telecommunication services. Earlier this month, 600 rural residents living near Teulon were switched from party-line telephone service to private lines. These Manitoba Telephone service customers are now enjoying the many pleasures of having a private line, like increased privacy, improved access, call waiting, computer and fax machine capabilities. For many of us private lines have been taken for granted, but for those who are just getting the phone service this is certainly a major development and a great thing. So I am pleased that the Manitoba Telephone System has been able to switch the 600 Teulon-area residents to individual telephone lines and I know that other rural residents can expect to have this same service in the near future.

Last year towns such as Stonewall, Balmoral, Gimli customers received the service.

Also, I am glad to see that the Community Calling areas have been expanded in my constituency and many areas of Manitoba. This is also a great benefit to the businesses located in the small communities.

* (1450)

Modern communication links have also been introduced in the Evergreen School Division, No. 22, in my constituency. Through an agreement between the Manitoba Telephone System and the school division, a setup called interactive television, or ITV, will soon be used in the classrooms and in the Evergreen schools in Gimli, Arborg and Riverton. Through interactive television, which uses two-way audio and video communications equipment, an instructor in Gimli will also be able to teach students in Arborg and Riverton. With ITV, Evergreen School officials will now be able to offer their students more educational options, which is a key in these competitive times.

In fact, education and training are two very important areas that are being addressed by this government. Improving standards and increasing province-wide testing and evaluation will also better prepare young Manitobans for the real world. I welcome the refocusing of the education system towards producing some sound reading, mathematics and learning skills.

This government has also taken steps to help our young people find employment. Through initiatives like the Green Team, Partners with Youth, a number of young people in my constituency have been able to find work. So I hope that these—and I am sure they will—programs will continue. Also the CareerStart Program is another excellent program that our communities have been able to take advantage of.

Several young people from my constituency are also getting a first-hand taste of what it is like to be an RCMP officer. Through a provincially funded RCMP pilot program, 11 Interlake residents are currently in RCMP uniform as volunteer officers. These auxiliary constables are getting the unique opportunity of experiencing police work close up.

I support the continuing efforts of this government to improve the quality of health care in this province. We are attempting to achieve something that is practically impossible under other administrations. We are trying to keep costs down, while maintaining a high level of care. I feel this government's plan to preserve our medicare system by shifting services away from some of our higher-cost institutions to the more personal methods—[interjection] Oh, it is an excellent move. [interjection] That is right. All Manitobans will benefit.

This government has also played an important, key role in improving the quality of life for Manitobans. In July, we announced the \$1.2 million well and water pipeline project for the Stony Mountain area, which will result in cleaner water for residents there.

This project involves the cleanup of previous ground water contamination and the development of a deep well and piped water supply to residents who were affected by the contamination. So the cost of this project is being shared by the provincial government, the federal government and the local rural municipality. There is no doubt, this is a very important project, and I am pleased to have taken an active role in resolving this serious problem.

In closing, Mr. Acting Speaker, I know this government will provide the leadership that Manitobans can rely on to make this province stronger. Through my government's plan for economic renewal, all Manitobans will be able to work together for a brighter future. Thank you.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Thank you to my honourable colleagues.

I would also like to start off with some thanks to other people. I just finished writing my Christmas message to my constituency, which is going to go in my newsletter at Christmastime. I was reminded of the number of people in my constituency whom I should thank, including my constituency executive, for their ongoing support and the number of other volunteers and community agencies that I have the good fortune to work with on a variety of issues to ensure that the East Kildonan-Transcona community is a better place to live.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the number of people in my critic areas for their ongoing support and co-operation. I truly believe that being an MLA is a tremendous opportunity, and I would like to express some gratitude for the opportunity to learn from working with so many people who are so committed to social justice and equality in our community. I truly believe that I have learned more in my last two years as an MLA than I learned in all my years at university, five years at university. I truly believe that I am the kind of person who learns best from doing, and I appreciate the opportunity as an MLA to have the freedom to—[interjection] The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) said that I will get a tuition fee at the end of the year. That is cute.

I want to spend the majority of my time dealing with the throne speech and the economy, and I appreciate the chance to do that. I also wanted to take a moment to thank and put on record my appreciation for having a new woman in the Legislature in Avis Gray, the member for Crescentwood, as well as the new member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister). What I notice about both of these people is, they are closer to my generation and the generation shared by the two honourable members here listening to me now and perhaps even the Deputy Speaker.

I hate to say it, but when I look across at the benches opposite, I see a bunch of old white guys. That is the majority of the impression that I am faced

with on a daily basis. I know that there are members on the opposite side who are a representative of the female gender, but the percentage of women on that side of the House continues—[interjection] I am trying to explain to the members opposite that I mean no personal offence to this. I think I have struck a chord with one of the members opposite.

An Honourable Member: Is she scolding you?

Ms. CerlIII: I think she is scolding me, but I will continue to explain that I do not believe that their caucus truly represents the diversity in our society. I do believe that I do not have any problem standing here and saying that this side of the House does more accurately represent the diversity, and I include my Liberal colleagues on this side of the House, because we do, I think, more accurately represent the diversity in our society.

An Honourable Member: You are so arrogant.

Ms. CerlIII: I am not being arrogant. I think it is a fact.

Well, now that I have the attention of members opposite—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

* (1500)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Order, please. The honourable member for Radisson has the floor.

Ms. CerlIII: Mr. Acting Speaker, I was going to say that on Thursday, November 26, when we began this session, we heard a Speech from the Throne, and it did not give me much hope that the Conservative government has learned from the mistakes of the past. I do not think that they have learned from the mistakes of previous governments—perhaps even previous NDP governments, because I am certainly not going to stand here and say there were no mistakes made—but it does not seem that they have learned from the mistakes made of previous Conservative governments either nationally in other provinces in the country or internationally.

I also want to say that it does not seem like Mr. Filmon learned from his trip to Brazil—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Order, please. I would like to remind the member that it is the honourable members in the House.

Ms. CerlIII: Thank you. I am working from notes here to some extent, so I will refer to him as Premier.

I do not think that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has learned the lessons that he could have from his trip to Brazil. I had the opportunity, recently, to attend a meeting of the YMCA international development luncheon, and I was able to hear a description of the trip that Premier Filmon attended when we went down to Brazil. I was struck by the ingenuity and the real community development that was going on as sponsored by those YMCA projects. I would love it and I would hope that those principles of sustainable development that are being applied on those community projects could be brought home and be applied to the community and economic development so necessary in Manitoba.

I really thought when Premier Filmon returned from Brazil that he had been affected by his experience in a developing country. I have not had the good fortune to visit a developing country. I have learned what I know about international affairs from talking to people from other countries, from watching movies, reading books and those kinds of second-hand learning methods. I would love one day to travel. [interjection]

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh) insists that I honour my elders. Well, I honour people who deserve to be honoured. I do not respect authority that is not deserving of respect.

As I was trying to say, I was going to talk a little bit about the projects in Brazil and that I hoped that the principles that those projects are based on would be applied here. I will just mention what the basis is for those projects that are done using government of Manitoba money. This is money that is donated to the Y and in turn goes down to do development in other countries.

The criteria for deciding if a project is going to go ahead to be legitimate as a community development and economic development project—it has to meet the following criteria. They question these things: Who initiates the project? Who benefits from the project? Who controls the project? What is the long-term impact on the needs of women, the needs of the disabled and the needs of the environment? I sit back and I think, wow. If we could only apply

those same principles in our province, in our industrialized society in Manitoba, boy, could we really do something. I really would hope that Premier Filmon would have learned from the ingenuity shown in those communities.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Order, please. I would like the honourable member to pay special note to her notes, that members are to be referred to as the honourable member or the minister of a department.

Ms. Cerilli: Sorry, I apologize. I would hope that the Premier would have learned from the idea that they are doing community and economic development by not only investing into the corporate and private sector, that they are investing into community health care, social services and education.

One of the projects that they did in Brazil was they turned a bar into a community school and a community centre. This school now is a local community school and centre for young people so they do not have to walk so far to go to school. In the evening—they have sewing machines in that school so that people can do other work that is going to benefit the economy in that community after, when the kids are not in school. Think of it, it is a bar, or it was a bar, and that to me makes it even more exciting.

The other project that they did in Brazil, and I do not know the names of the communities, unfortunately, but they turned one room of a building into a dental clinic. They invested money in a dentist's chair, and what that allowed them to do is not only provide dental care to children and others in that community, but it allowed them to teach nutrition. It allowed them to have access to the people coming in to have their teeth taken care of to learn about the lifestyle changes and the diet that is not only going to give them healthy teeth, but is going to give them a healthy body and enable them to live a healthy life. To me, that is community and economic development at its finest.

I think we could apply those same kinds of ideas and principles in Manitoba in a bigger way, and that is what a government is there to do. In the throne speech, we saw more of the same Conservative, elite, corporate welfare masqueraded as progress and diversification, more handout of taxpayer money to industry and business, and I want to

emphasize that it was money to non-Manitoban, non-Canadian industry and business. So the capital is leaving our province and actually drains our economy.

Now I want to talk a little bit about an example of this in my own constituency. Right now, in the constituency of Radisson, we are struggling to keep open a local Safeway store. This Safeway store has been there for about 32 years. It is in the part of Transcona that has probably some of the most long-lived Transcona residents. It is the west end of Transcona in an area that has a very high number of senior citizens.

The member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) says that his grandmother lives there. Well, he would take a special interest in what is happening in that community, because we have seen the mobilization of people concerned that they have some control over what happens in their community, and why should they not, after 32 years of spending their hard-earned money at a grocery store in their community, stand by when the corporation, based on their bottom line, is going to be allowed to pack up and move out farther to the 'burbs and provide them no option for grocery shopping in their own community.

They are going to try and maintain the lease in that store so that no other competition can move in. Now I do not call that free enterprise. I do not call that fair. Corporate feudalism is what you could call that. Not only that, in the research I have found out from investigating the background on this case, Canada Safeway is no longer even Canadian. Canada Safeway, through the mergers that are going on on our planet due to globalization, the buzzword of the century, and due to Conservative policies that allow these huge corporate mergers, we now have Canada Safeway entirely owned by an American multinational.

Canada Safeway has a debt probably bigger than this government's debt, but because it is a private debt and all the shares are not even in the stock market, we cannot even find out what the debt is of Canada Safeway. So now the people in my community of Radisson—[interjection] We do have to pay it, because as you remind us every once in awhile, there is only one taxpayer. So we are losing millions and billions of dollars in our grocery money out of the economy, and it is going, I do not even know where, to the U.S?

* (1510)

There is one shareholder for Canada Safeway now—this is what I have found out or what I have been told—that resides in New York. Now to me, we have a real problem in this country, and this is a symptom of it when we cannot even have our grocery dollars spinning around and coming directly back into our economy. I ask myself when I go and buy a loaf of bread at Safeway and I pay \$1.09 for that loaf of bread, where is that money going? How much of it is going to the farmer? We know not very much. How much of it is going to the manufacturer that mills the wheat and produces the flour? How much of it is going to the corporation to do the marketing and the packaging, and how much is going to the workers? Well, we know that at Safeway they get paid pretty good, thanks that they have a decent union.

An Honourable Member: And that is not affecting our grocery bill?

Ms. Cerilli: I would say to the member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) that the salaries of those union workers at Safeway are the least of our worries when it—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable member one more time that it is the honourable member for Rossmere. All members are honourable in the House.

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

This is what I am talking about. I have had quite an education from being an MLA. I thought that I had some political analysis when I came into this position, but I like to think that it has been strengthened by my experience of working on behalf of the people in my constituency and trying to raise issues and do something about the devastation of our environment as well as my other critic areas.

I want to talk a little bit about that. I want to talk about what was missing from the throne speech. What was missing from the throne speech were some pretty key things in my mind.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Order, please. Could I have the honourable members trying to carry on a conversation on my left go into the loge and carry it on, so that I can hear the honourable member for Radisson put forward her speech.

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker, I appreciate your rapt attention. I appreciate it.

Not once in the government's throne speech, its plan of action for the upcoming session, did we hear the words equality, justice, culture, job creation, recession, multiculturalism, immigration, environmental restoration or poverty. Not once did we hear any of those words. Talk about denial. It seems like this government wants us to forget about all of these things, and they expect us to do the same on many other areas.

I guess we cannot expect, after all, for a Conservative government to have any notion of social, economic or environmental justice. Conservative economic policies that support multinational corporate mergers, that centralize capital and wealth, that tax the poor and eliminate or strangle government public services have caused this recession. No one talks very much about the causes of the recession, and I would disagree with members opposite when they try and put the blame on debt. I would disagree with that.

When you look at what is going on outside the public sector, the shrinking economy brings with it other social problems. We have seen the rise in racism; we have seen the rise in violent crime and theft. We have seen more family stress which in turn causes more health problems and more ignoring. They use the debt as an excuse to ignore the very deep changes that are necessary to deal with those social problems that I just mentioned.

I would like to impress upon the members that are opposite and listening that we are really in a crunch here. I am not suggesting that the solutions are easy. People, though, are feeling very desperate. People are feeling horribly betrayed. People did put their trust in this government. A number of people voted for this government [interjection] A largest number, you are right.

I would stress to this government that democracy does not mean that you get elected every four years and between then you can ignore the people who elected you, and you can ignore the majority of people who are impoverished in this province. We should start talking about making our democracy work, about having some accountability.

Let us talk once more about participatory democracy. We have seen what this government thinks of that when they have dismantled Child and Family Services which was community based, when

they have dismantled housing services which were community based. That is what they think about democracy: Let us control everything; let us obsess with control and let us use the idea that father knows best. I am saying that people in our country no longer will stand for that, and I am very proud of that.

An Honourable Member: That is very sexist. I resent that. I am surprised at you.

Ms. Cerilli: I will talk a little bit, as the members opposite get more upset about my terms. I wonder if they have ever heard of the term "patriarchy" and if they will accept that our society—[interjection] Unfortunately, we do not have a matriarchy. Unfortunately, we have a patriarchy.

I am not saying that women are superior and I am not saying that men are superior. I do believe that we both have knowledge and things to contribute and skills and understandings. I would implore the members opposite to listen to the women in their party. I would implore them to go then beyond their party, if the women in that party are not expressing the deep concerns of women throughout our country, because women are not equal, and we cannot treat this society as if it were so.

An Honourable Member: Give us some examples.

Ms. Cerilli: Oh, give us some examples, says the honourable member for Rossmere.

An Honourable Member: I think he is trying to trap you.

Ms. Cerilli: I do not think I could get trapped on this one.

I will get to some examples later on, because I do want to get to talking about NAFTA. Oh dear, I could talk about the effects of NAFTA on women, but that is another speech.

I think the main point that we have to make here when we are talking about the betrayal of Conservative governments to the people in this country is the honourable Premier's (Mr. Filmon) hypocrisy, on the one hand of complaining about federal offloading, and then on the other hand of doing exactly the same thing to municipalities in Manitoba. We have to remember that the Premier of Manitoba is from the same party, has the same policies and the same politics as the Prime Minister of this country, who has gone down in history as being one of the most unpopular politicians of all

time, and now is taking it apart, says my honourable friend from Swan River.

I want to talk a little bit about both the Tory and the Liberal approach to dealing with our crisis. We are in a global crisis here. No one is disputing that, because on the one hand we want to restore and protect the environment and on the other hand we want social justice. Environmentalism without social justice is nothing, as far as I am concerned. Social justice means jobs. It means jobs for everyone. It means jobs for all of those people who want to work and are not able to because of Conservative economic policy.

Now the Tory and Liberal approach is just to sort of hunker down and try to do more with less. We hear a lot of doing more with less. They try to hide it out, wait it out like it is a storm that is going to blow over.

Yet we heard the Premier himself say that this is an economic restructuring, not a recession. Conservatives across the country seem content to let the corporations and the monetary institutions restructure our society, and we are supposed to sit back and watch. The governments of the people that they are supposed to represent are going to sit back and watch. Well, we have fewer and fewer people on the planet control more and more resources and control more and more of the wealth, and we have a greater number of people who are living in poverty or on the borderline of living in poverty.

It is obvious now to me and to many of us just how firm a hold corporate interests have on our country. It is our beautiful yet gasping country. Globalization is the Conservative word for corporate, multinational control of our global, monetary, and industrial trade and capital.

* (1520)

I have a newsletter that was put out by our M.P., the member for Winnipeg-Transcona, and it talks about globalization. A Manitoba result, an example of globalization, has to do with Pine Falls and Abitibi-Price. After years of unsustainable forestry and pulp and paper industry and logging and growth—we will call this growth—Abitibi-Price can pack up and leave, open a new mill down in the United States, and they can leave the community of Pine Falls holding the bag, holding the responsibility for a polluting mill. That is what it is now. It is out of date. It is inefficient.

An Honourable Member: Pine Falls is doing everything to keep them there.

Ms. Cerilli: I know that, and I would wish all the people of Pine Falls well in doing everything that they are able. I would support them 100 percent in taking over that mill so that it continues to support the economy of their community.

What I do not want to see continue is unsustainable forestry. While we have this corporation going and opening up a new mill in the United States, we have the Free Trade Agreement, which is going to assure that the United States not only has our mill, a new, up-to-date, high-tech, nonpolluting mill, but it also has assurance that it is going to have Canadian trees. Because of the Free Trade Agreement, they are going to be assured that their new mill will have our trees—our new mill, our new trees, our jobs, down in the United States. That makes me pretty angry.

An Honourable Member: Explain how they are going to get the trees down there?

Ms. Cerilli: Read NAFTA and the Free Trade Agreement and you will understand how they are going to get the trees down there. I would suggest to you, the train tracks are already set up to go down to the United States to take those logs and, if we have NAFTA, we are not going to have any control over the manufacturing or the processing of those logs. We can have full logs going down to the United States.

I want to move now to a little bit more of a positive note. The NDP approach would be a lot different, the social democratic approach, because we believe that government must stand up to corporate interests for the jobs and for the people that they represent.

Our approach to development is more holistic. We do not see the economy as a funnel. We do not see it as a funnel to trickle down wealth to those people who have the misfortune of being at the bottom of the ladder in our society. We see the economy as a circle or a wheel, and that wheel must revolve. We believe that governments, industry, workers, community services and consumers are all equal and important partners in the economy, and when the partners work together the cycle turns. When the wheel turns it grows, involving more and

more people in the economic activity that sustains our culture and our society.

What I am saying here is that with the rampant competition we have become brainwashed into trying to accept does not work. The kind of competition that was used as the principle at the end of the throne speech isolates the partners in the economy. It creates turf wars and it makes our economy unsustainable. Co-operation works.

Health care, education, social services, recreation—these are all sectors of the economy. They are not a drain on tax dollars, nor a drain on resources. They are an investment into the community and into the people and future of our culture and society. Money invested into these areas creates jobs, develops communities and makes them strong, makes them more co-operative, makes them more self-sufficient and creative, and it makes them healthy.

You cannot invest only money into private industry and ignore social services, health care and education and think you are going to get anywhere near close to having a healthy community or a healthy economy, says the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), and I agree. A greater percentage of money under the NDP would be invested into people and into families and not into private corporations that are allowed to take the money and run.

Real education and health reform cannot be put on the back burner until the economy is fixed or better. Real education and social service reform is part of the solution. If the \$90 million or so that was paid extra to welfare over the last two years was put into work and training programs for things like care and cleanup of the environment, support for the elderly and the sick, education and retraining of laid-off workers, we would be better off both in the short term and in the long term. This is the NDP approach provincially and federally.

As I have said before, we must make our democracy work. This means the democratization of our institutions so people have a say in their education, so people have a say in their health care and in their government services and in their community development so that the public are not treated like sheep and are expected to vote every four years and ignore it in between. Those things are the old way. Those things are passe, and I really believe that we are developing a generation of people who are not going to stand for it.

Before I wish you a Merry Christmas, I am going to talk about NAFTA a little bit. How much time do I have left, Mr. Acting Speaker? Eight minutes. I only have eight minutes to talk about NAFTA.

I guess one of the main things about these trade agreements is, we can no longer continue to struggle for jobs, to be held hostage by the private sector and use our standard of living and quality of life as the currency to try and keep people and jobs in the province. We cannot do it anymore. We simply cannot afford NAFTA. We cannot afford to lose sovereignty over our natural resources and our country.

Some of the issues I would talk about if I had more time would deal with the pharmaceutical industry in respect to NAFTA, natural resources, aboriginal rights. I really believe that if the federal election comes and we get another Conservative government elected in this country and we have NAFTA, we are not going to have a country left. I often joke with my colleagues on this side of the House that some days I think I would be better off and maybe the members opposite would be better off too if I just went and lived in the bush, because some days I really think that this is the biggest fight that this country has ever seen.

We can no longer talk about economic development and ignore aboriginal rights. To me, NAFTA is about aboriginal rights—aboriginal rights to have their land claims settled, aboriginal rights to have the Northern Flood Agreement settled, because we cannot be negotiating away land and resources and parts of the economy which are not the dominant white society's business to be negotiating away.

I think that we cannot talk about natural resources, particularly in Manitoba, without talking about aboriginal rights either—very big concerns related to water, hydro, forestry. Something this government does not seem to have clued into yet is the potential for growth in the ecotourism area—real ecotourism.

* (1530)

Maybe if I left this job and I went to live in the bush, this is the industry that I would get involved in, because I truly think that what most people in our industrialized culture and society need is to spend some time out of the city in a canoe or in a park before they are logged. [interjection] In a wilderness

area, I would say to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns).

I know the Minister of Natural Resources did a canoe trip up north. I think it was on the Seal River, and I would hope that once again the Minister of Natural Resources was reminded how insignificant we really all are, how insignificant in the big scheme of things the human race is. We are just part of nature. We are just part of the ecosystem. We are just part of ecology, and we do not have the right to destroy it.

Something that Senator Al Gore, just elected to the vice-presidency in the U.S., talks about in the book that he wrote is intergenerational rights and responsibilities, and that is what the environment is all about to me.

We talk about sustainable development, how we do not have the right to use more than is our fair share so that there is going to be nothing left for the next generation, and I would challenge the members opposite to start applying that to the economy.

The other thing I want to mention in closing is that another thing that was not mentioned in this throne speech was the buzzword "we are keeping taxes down." That is what this government has held their hat on for the last five years. So I was just going to give out a warning to people that I think the budget that is going to go along with this throne speech is going to make Sterling Lyon look like Santa Claus. I think that some of the articles coming out with headlines like "Civil Service braces for big cuts" are a telltale sign.

I could talk more about the problems with the media in our culture and society, but I will leave that for another day.

So with all due respect, I thank you for the time. I feel like I have had an awful lot more attention than often other times; people have been rapt in attention.

I will say Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to all the members in the House. Thank you very much.

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Mr. Acting Speaker, it is certainly gives me great pleasure to be able to rise today to voice a few comments and maybe at times even concerns about what was contained in the throne speech. However, the concerns I have probably largely will be directed towards some of the

rhetoric and the criticism that has been extended by the opposition towards the throne speech. I simply have no amazement at wondering where they are coming from at times.

However, before I get into that I want to, of course, welcome my new colleague on this side the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister), who I have known for quite a number of years and who I have, throughout the years, grown to admire and respect for his, at times, audacity and his intelligent way of dealing with issues. I believe that will come forward as he contributes during this session to the issues as we deal with them and the matters of piece of legislation that are brought forward and debated on a regular basis.

I also want to extend my sincere welcome to the return of the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) to this Legislature. I had always thought that she added to the debates and the discussions, and we certainly welcome her back to the Legislature here at this time.

It was sad to see that when the Speech from the Throne was made our Lieutenant-Governor could not be with us. We all want to, at this time, share our sympathies and wish Mr. Johnson well in his recovery from his illness and hope that he will be able to be with us fairly soon.

I also want to indicate that it is always a pleasure to see our Speaker of this House back in the Chair. It is his strong leadership that this House needs and that he has demonstrated over the years that we admire and appreciate. I want to sincerely say that it is his jocular attitude at times and his approach to authority that we respect most of all in this House. We welcome his sincere presence sitting there looking at us and condoning our antics at times. Certainly he is an asset as he will guide us again through this session.

One of the key elements I suppose that our Speech from the Throne indicated in setting out the agenda for economic renewal in this province was that we are indeed at a crossroad, a crossroad in economic development, and I think that was clearly demonstrated. It was clearly demonstrated during the American election that that crossroad does not only, ladies and gentlemen, pertain to Manitoba. Yes, indeed it pertains to all of the world. We are entering into a different era. We are all going to be subjected, whether we like it or not, to the effects of competition from outside our borders, whether it be

from our friends to the south of us, whether it be from the Asian countries, whether it be from the Pacific Rim, or yes, indeed, within the next decade, we could very easily be faced with a competitive ability of the U.S.S.R. to impact what we do in this country.

There are significant developments occurring as we stand here and speak, whether it is through the negotiations of the GATT, whether it is through negotiations that are currently occurring in Croatia to stop the confrontation over there, whether it is in Tokyo in the financial community, or whether it is in this province, that we deal with on a daily basis about our concerns, about our ability to provide employment and indeed food for our children on our table on a daily basis.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

We all share the concern, opposition members as well as government-side members, for those who are less fortunate than we are. It is for that reason that our government has taken the strong stand on ensuring that we will control the unethical spending that went on during the past decade prior to ourselves taking office, because would we today have the additional \$500 million a year to spend that we are now spending on interest rates.

* (1540)

I would say to the opposition that they were at that time government and had they chosen a tougher road at that time, had they made some tougher decisions, we would today not be giving the banks and the financial institutions \$500 million a year. We would today have that \$500 million a year to provide better jobs and better facilities to those who are less fortunate, whether it be in health, whether it be in education or whether it be, in fact, providing social services to those who cannot fend for themselves.

We have tried and we will keep on trying to keep our taxes down. Our record today in this province stands taller than any record anywhere else in any other nation or province that I know of. Now we are the only province in this country that has for five years straight not increased income taxes, not increased service taxes. As a matter of fact, we have decreased them.

Our strengths are maintaining our health care system. Our strengths are ensuring that our children will be educated, and our strengths are providing real jobs in this province. How do we ensure that real jobs are provided by sitting on our

hands and grasping our knees and shaking every time somebody suggests something new and different, or are we going to be aggressive in encouraging others from outside of this province, outside of this country, yes, outside of even this continent, to consider Manitoba as the place to make their home and to invest? How do you do it? By increasing taxes? By decreasing welfare payments as Mr. Doer said that he would in his address to their annual meeting just a few short months ago? He said, we will spend \$250 million to create jobs, and we will do it by reducing the payments to welfare recipients, to those that are dependent on government support. We will decrease their assistance, and we will spend \$250 million to generate infrastructure.

Well, I want to remind members opposite that this government is not spending \$250 million on infrastructure. We are spending \$300 million and better on infrastructure and infrastructure renewal, so what Mr. Doer has in fact said to his delegates at his annual meeting is that he will decrease the spending by \$50 million, and he will decrease spending on welfare and do what?

Well, there were also some criticisms of our Premier (Mr. Filmon) for making trips outside of this country to attract industries and businesses. Let me remind you, let me read from a Winnipeg Free Press article, I believe in 1987, November 16, when the question was asked where the then premier of the province had been, and the answer can be found by looking at whom the premier took with him to promote business in Manitoba. I believe this was in reference to a trip that the then Premier Pawley made to somewhere outside of this country. He took with him the Finance minister, Eugene Kostyra. He took with him the Industry, Trade and Technology minister, Mr. Vic Schroeder. He took with him the Energy and Mines minister, Mr. Jerry Storie. He took with him Mr. Marc Eliesen. Who was Mr. Marc Eliesen? Was he the chairman of the then so famous Manitoba Hydro Board? I believe he was. Our premier, it says, when looking for business takes politicians. Other western provincial premiers arranging provincial ties to the Pacific Rim take businessmen.

Well, I want to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that when you are going out into the world to attract business to establish in this province or any other province, you better take your business community with you because business attracts business.

Our strengths, I say to you again, are health care. Our strengths are education for our future generations, and our strengths are the development of those industries that will use our most basic elements for production and cause job creation and employment to happen.

Agriculture in this province has traditionally been viewed by opposition members as just another business. Agriculture is not just another business. The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) just stood before us a few minutes ago and indicated that \$1.09 that she spent on bread was not something that she objected to, but she wondered where the money went. Well, let me tell you that we also wonder where the money went when the previous NDP government spent the \$500 million a year ruthlessly, without consideration for rural development. They did not even know the word—know the meaning of the word “rural development.” They did not know what agriculture meant.

They built, Mr. Speaker, bridges to nowhere, and I say to you that if I look at the comments that were made in the press at the annual meeting of the NDP convention by their Leader, they are again on a path of building bridges to nowhere, because their Leader referred to spending money on retooling provincial infrastructure to create jobs. Specifically what are they talking about? We raised our budget from roughly about a \$70-million capital budget in highways that the NDP left to last year's \$100 million or better than \$100 million, a \$30 million increase in highway spending. The people in southern Manitoba are certainly noticing the aggressive way we are proceeding with the four-laning of Highway 75.

An Honourable Member: Oh, that is very aggressive.

Mr. Penner: Well, the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) sits there and says, yes, very aggressive. It is noticeable. Well, certainly it is noticeable. Everybody in this province driving to Altona or Letellier or St. Joseph or St. Jean or Emerson or Sprague or Vita will note the improvement of the road system in this province. Yet what did they do?

We are embarked upon a path of economic development to ensure that not only rural Manitobans—oh, and I should indicate to you that the

NDP indicated that they were going to look after the health care needs of this province, and in doing so they would consult with Manitobans. You know where? You know where they are going to consult with Manitobans? They are going to consult with Manitobans in Winnipeg and in Brandon.

I will read to you, Manitobans do not trust the Conservative health reform. This is, of course, from a news release that the NDP released. It says, NDP priorities for the next session. They do not trust Conservative health reform. Many people believe it is just an excuse for cutbacks and services, and Doer says, for these reasons New Democrats are holding public forums throughout Winnipeg and throughout Brandon to talk about health care reform with Manitobans.

* (1550)

Of course, that has always been the opposition's forte, to discuss with Manitobans in Winnipeg and in Brandon whatever issues that come before them. They have yet to realize—oh, well maybe with the exception of Flin Flon and Swan River—that there are other parts of Manitoba besides Brandon and Winnipeg. Therefore, our consultations, through regular cabinet meetings outside of this city, through discussions with Manitobans, are on an ongoing basis consulting about the needs of Manitobans.

We know that Manitobans all over this province, whether it is Manitoba, whether it is Winnipeg, whether it is Brandon or anywhere else in this province, need infrastructure. We need good roads; we need good sewer services; we need good water supplies. For that reason, ladies and gentlemen, our province entered into what is called the infrastructure agreement, the SDI program which is spending \$90 million to ensure that communities such as Steinbach, Altona—yes, we even indicated that we would include Dauphin, but they, of course, said no—but many other communities will be served with water and sewage facilities that the NDP had simply neglected over their term of office for almost the last two decades.

Twinning of Highway 75, schools, airports—and I talked about the commitment that we made to a new airport in Snow Lake. I just very briefly talked to the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) and asked him how we were progressing with that commitment that we had made to that town. We believe that every community should have access to the rest of the province, whether it is by providing airports, whether

it is by providing roads, highways or whatever. We believe that every person in this province should have access to good, clean water. We believe that every person in this province should have access to good clean sewage disposal systems.

The amount of money that we have designated is better than \$300 million a year, and yet the NDP were going to, in their new budget, designate \$250 million, a decrease of \$50 million, and that was going to be their job creation initiative. So much for innovative thinking.

It certainly is, in my view, Mr. Speaker, shades of the old Pawley administration. They call that, new-think? Well, let me say to you that we believe that in order to strengthen the rural economy in this province you needed new programs, programs that the NDP had not even thought about before. We initiated the rural bond program, the Grow Bond program, which will allow rural Manitobans to invest in themselves. It will give rural Manitobans an opportunity to invest in their own businesses. We as a government will guarantee that those investments will in fact be secured.

How many times have I heard questions from across the House saying, what have you done? Well, let us look at what we have done. Let us look at the expansion of Arris in Winnipeg, let us look at the expansion in Brandon, let us look at the health care industry expansion in this province over the last couple of years. Let us look at the creation of thousands of new jobs in those industries over the last couple of years. Ask what the previous government did during a similar period of time.

An Honourable Member: Nothing.

Mr. Penner: That is right, they did nothing. They did absolutely nothing. [interjection] We are going to very quickly use the infrastructure agreement that we have with the federal government to create an economic climate, an environmental climate so that when industry is looking at the establishment of, whether it be in Gimli or maybe even Grunthal or many other communities such as Waskada, when industries come in and look for homes, they can be assured that there will be water, that there will be sewer, that there will be good roads for transportation of the goods that they are going to produce in those communities.

Manitoba merchandise exports last year were nearly \$3.1 billion. That was an increase of 4.5

percent over 1990. This year we are expecting that the 1991-92 export increases will be 13 percent increase over the year before. Agricultural products exports have increased by 33 percent over last year. Yet the NDP says, what have you done? Well, we have created an economic trade climate between two great nations that will allow the flow of products on a much more organized and without-restriction basis. That is what we have done.

(Mr. Harold Neufeld, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Now in the Emerson constituency alone— [interjection] The honourable member for Flin Flon sits there and jabbars about things of the past. It is simply an indication of what their aggressive thinking is doing, reverting continually to the Pawley era, and every policy decision that they make and every consideration that you read and every indication leads me to believe that they are totally bereft of new ideas.

D. W. Friesen in Altona, one of the largest printing companies in this country today, has increased its market share in the United States by \$2.6 million last year. In an economic climate when the opposition members yell doom and gloom, this company has aggressively moved forward and is creating new jobs and new opportunities for Manitobans, \$2.6 million of additional exports over last year. What do they specialize in? Hard and soft book covers, books of all kinds, printing of all kinds, binding of all kinds.

Ladies and gentlemen, they just opened a brand new office in New York. They are moving very aggressively into the North American market. Why is that? Because these people do not believe in sitting back and letting the gloom and doomsayers take control of them. They know where opportunities exist, and they know how to take advantage of those opportunities. That, Sir, Mr. Acting Speaker, is the difference between free enterprisers and the socialists. The socialists will sit there and continually condemn those who are aggressively seeking new niches in the marketplace. That is why our Premier has said very openly in this House that he will go anywhere in the world to seek out new markets, to seek out new initiatives to provide jobs for Manitobans. That, Sir, is the difference between us and them.

* (1600)

Let us look at the trade agreements that have been continually condemned by the opposition

members. I say to you that our grain farmers in this country have been the object of a trade dispute between two great nations, the Europeans and the Americans. They have used tax dollars to support exports out of each of their various areas in the world to compete against you and I. What has it done? It has driven grain prices through the floor in this country. It has made it virtually impossible for those grain producers to survive in this country.

Yet, what do the socialists say? Do not strike trade agreements with anybody because we should keep on building more walls around ourselves to protect ourselves, to keep our people within and not let our products flow freely to other nations. I say to those who promote that kind of thinking, that ain't gonna get us nowhere.

I am looking forward, Mr. Acting Speaker, to a settlement of the GATT agreement. I am looking forward to the end of the grain trade subsidy war. I am looking forward to the United States and the European community agreeing to some way of settling their differences over a long period of time. I am looking forward to the enhancement of our agricultural community to compete against their foreign counterparts on a one-to-one basis again, because I am a true believer that when that happens our farm community will again take off and provide the economic stimulus that we require and look forward to in this province.

When that agricultural community takes off, so will our economy as a whole in this country follow that agricultural community, for it is the agricultural community that, in my view, has been the driving force in western Canada to create economic activity. If we are going to use that primary resource to build on, to build secondary industries on, to provide jobs for us and our children, then we will be able to generate revenues that will allow us to retain our health care system and provide better educational facilities in the future.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there are a number of other issues that I think have an extremely important aspect and an impact to our economic viability over the future. One of them is tourism. I am convinced that we can do much more in tourism than we have. It will need such projects as we did in Emerson last fall. We opened a new tourism centre, because in order to provide good tourism you need visibility. The only way you are going to get visibility is by directing traffic and encouraging traffic into this province.

We are going to have to provide people from outside of this country and even people inside of this country with the kind of information they need to know where things are at in this province, and I do not think we have done a very good job of that. That is something, whether it is the Mennonite Heritage Village in Steinbach, whether it is the lakes, and the Turtle and Duck Mountains and the Riding Mountains in western Manitoba, whether it is our great fresh-water sports fishing industry in northern Manitoba or whether it is just simply viewing and taking pictures of nature in the eastern part of our province, we are going to have to tell our story. We are going to have to tell it better than we have done up till now.

The only way we are going to be able to tell it better is by taking the initiative ourselves and using our media properly in other countries to ensure that other people know what we have in this province that is worthwhile seeing, whether it is the Museum of Man and Nature which is situated not too far from this building, whether it is the many ethnic cultural activities, whether it is The Forks which is fast becoming one of the tourist attractions in this province, or whether it is the Boundary Commission Trail that has just been marked by Highways in southern Manitoba. But those are some of the areas that we need to build on, and we need to build on those communities and use those communities, and encourage communities to take action themselves and to believe in themselves, and to cause things to happen.

The previous administration's ability to condemn initiatives of the private individual simply must be turned around, and I think we have come a long way in doing that during the last four years of our tenure in government. I am a strong believer that in order to approach the 21st Century that our young people are going to have to provide themselves with an education that is second to none in this world, and therefore we have identified clearly in our Speech from the Throne that we have within our own borders probably the greatest resource anywhere else in the world, and that is in the youth of our province. I believe that Manitoba's greatest resource is its youth. It is essential that we foster a positive learning environment for our youth as they form the group of people who will take our province and our country into the 21st Century.

In the throne speech the Government of Manitoba outlined its plans very clearly to take a

back-to-basics approach to education. They will achieve this by a greater emphasis on policies and programs directed towards producing sound reading, mathematics and learning skills, and I believe truly that we have lost in a large part over the last decade or two that approach to education. It is with sadness that I see many of our young people when they do résumés or when they do job interviews that they have a difficult time reading and a very difficult time writing and a very difficult time using their mathematic skills. We are at fault. Our generation is at fault for having negated our responsibility in that area. Therefore, I give our Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) a great deal of credit, our government, our cabinet a great deal of credit for re-emphasizing our will to go back to basics in education.

I believe that the Roblin commission currently travelling throughout the province will have a great impact, and the people of Manitoba will tell Mr. Roblin and his commission what needs to be done in our secondary educational institutions. For there similarly exists a need to redirect those emphases to reflect correctly the needs of the 21st Century. If we do this right, if we do this correctly, we will at least have provided our young generations with the ability to provide for themselves, and that, of course, is what governments are all about and should be all about. We should look after the needs of our constituents and our populations, providing them with the tools to fend for themselves and to provide incomes for themselves is our responsibility.

* (1610)

We also must not forget our responsibility to the environment. In the past we have neglected that. Whether it is the former NDP administration, whether it is federal government or whether it is our government, we have neglected to correct, to emphasize well enough, though whether it be through legislation or whether it be through programming or simply through education, the importance to ensure clean water supplies for future generations, to ensure our ability of our land to keep on producing the way it has produced or to ensure that our air will in fact be breathable and our climate maintained. For that reason, we must ensure that this legislative body drives our ability to ensure that our environment will be contained in such a way that our future generations can survive.

So what have we said in this Speech from the Throne? We have said that we must build, and we

must build foundations well enough that our institutions will survive, that the programs that we create must be of such a nature that they will strengthen the ability of our future generations' survival.

We are all children of this earth and we all depend on this earth for future survival. Let us all jointly, in this House, work together. I call on all of them, both opposition and members of government, to work together, to ensure that our future generations will see this government as having been the kind of government that is required to provide the economic climate that will allow them to survive.

Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): I thank the members of the Chamber for their enthusiastic greeting of my remarks. I think before I get into the throne speech, though, I would like to just say a few little things by way of welcome as is the tradition of this House.

I would like to start by noting that Miss Judy White is now sitting at the table. I think she is a very good addition to the table. I know Miss White, and I think that she will enhance and add to the already very capable work that is done by the table on behalf of all members.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I also want to welcome the new Pages that are here. Thank you very much, new Page, and the new interns. I have met almost all of them, but there are a couple yet that I have yet to be introduced to but, certainly, the quality of work that is coming out of our caucus I am sure is being matched in the other two caucuses. I want to welcome the two new members, the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) and the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray).

It is also a time for saying goodbye to the former member for Portage, who was a strong representative of his area, and it will be interesting to see whether the new member for Portage (Mr. Pallister) is willing to be as strong in representing the interests of his riding as the former member was.

I also want to say goodbye to the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper). I think he has played an important role in this House over the last few years, and he will be missed in this Chamber.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I want to say goodbye to my Leader. I was elected in the '88 election, when Sharon made her rise to official opposition. I owe

that election to her, and I have found her to be an honest, capable and eminently fair leader and a very fine leader of our caucus, and I regret her leaving.

Mr. Speaker, I should also make mention of one thing that has changed in my life. I have a little daughter, who is now two and one-half months old. Yes, I feel like applauding that. I actually feel pretty good about that, I must tell you.

I am reminded of something that happened when I got married, in this Chamber. What I am reminded of is something that happened to me repeatedly in this Chamber, as members from both sides took me aside to wish me well, and repeatedly they said to me, this is the most important decision you will make in your life, and this is one of the best. You will always remember this with great, good feeling, great positiveness, and it is true, I do.

Sarah has added to my life in immeasurable ways, and she has caused me to change my lifestyle. I make a point of being home every day. I do not stay overnight in the office. I actually want to get home and spend some time and see how she has changed each day.

Unfortunately, but in my only 40 minutes, I do not have the time to allow myself to go off and answer some of the questions from members, but I would be quite willing to answer those questions after I have finished. I do have quite a bit that I want to say about what is happening in this province right now, and I think it is an important opportunity.

I look forward to the throne speech to talk a little bit about the planning and the way the government has laid out its vision of this province and what is happening here.

I think if Sarah does anything for me, she forces me to think a little more completely about the responsibilities that we assume as we look at making plans for the future of this province.

I also wonder, I know members here who have older children must put up with the impact on their children of the way that politicians are held in such low esteem in the community. I also wonder how I am going to feel should she come home from school some day the way other members' children have come home from school complaining about being called names because their parent is a politician. I worry about that. I worry about that a lot.

* (1620)

When we talk about the debate that goes on in this House, and in my last speech I talked somewhat about the way in which politicians tend to bring down the whole profession by the way in which they play games with the language and the way in which they run pretty fast and loose with facts and information. I want to reflect on that a little bit as I get into what I want to talk about with the planning for this economy.

The Prime Minister in the last debate spent a lot of time doing the very thing that he did in the Meech Lake debate, telling us that if we did not do things his way that the world would fall apart. We did not do things his way and the world did not fall apart. I think what he has done each time he has uttered those threats and each time he has attempted to force us to his will with false information, all he has done is hurt all of us. He has hurt every member in this House and every politician in this country because people no longer believe us. They do not take what we say as being factual. They do not take what we say as providing leadership. They simply see it as more noise in the system and they screen us out. I think we all lose from that.

I was reminded of that a bit on Monday as I listened to the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) give his response to the Speech from the Throne, and he said something that troubled me because it is similar to that kind of rhetoric. He said in his speech when he was trying to talk about the NDP years versus the Conservative years, he said the deficit has gone from a \$58-million surplus to the deficit that we have today, and we will argue in a few minutes about that deficit. [interjection] Well, I have it at 658.

I have the NDP budget for that same year, and it predicts a deficit in the order of \$364 million, not a \$58-million surplus. I think it is important that we not play fast and loose with those kinds of facts. The fact is, we have been in economic trouble in this province for a long time. We have been behind in our ability to meet our obligations for a long time, and I think that—[interjection] Well, I am going to talk in some detail about the windfall in just a minute.

The other thing I want to do to try and lay the groundwork for the discussion that I want to have on the throne speech is just to reflect a little bit on some feelings that I had when I heard a couple of announcements last week. The announcements that I heard were the firing of a gentleman named

Ed Buller in the Finance department and the firing of a woman named Marlene Neustaedter.

I do not know either of these two individuals very well. I can put a face to a name. I know Ms. Neustaedter from the Arts Council days when I was at the Prairie Theatre Exchange, and I have met Mr. Buller in the halls here, so I do not want to talk specifically about them, other than the fact that they are to me a symbol. They are a symbol of a government that chooses to solve its problems by making victims of people, rather than trying to produce positive change. It is a symbol of a government that sees the solution to its problems by simply beheading somebody or removing somebody, instead of looking at the organizational or systemic reform that will produce long-term positive change.

I was quite set back when I just thought of, in today's economy, what it is like to be let go after you have worked 20-some-odd years at a job and given your life to it the way Miss Neustaedter has at the council.

I just thought what a cruel and inhuman and violent thing for a government to do, and I am saddened by it. I am saddened to see my government take those kinds of actions. I am saddened to see my government act in a way that treats labour as some sort of cheap commodity that you throw away, rather than something that you work to preserve and strengthen and enhance.

In a sense, that may be what we want to talk about as I look at this throne speech, and I have tried to begin each throne speech and each budget by looking at the things within that I like. There are a couple of things in here that I agree with, and there are a couple of things in here that I think are worth supporting.

The government makes the statement here about the changes internationally, and I think that is something that we must keep in mind as we look at the kind of structural changes that have to take place in this province. It proposes to do two things that I think are achievable and I think are important for the long-term health of this province.

It proposes to undertake some serious regulatory reform, and I think that this is a worthwhile goal for the government, and I think, although I am not certain, but on page 4, it talks about regional capital market development. Now, if that is a hint at a movement toward the development of a prairie

regional stock exchange, such as has been proposed by Lloyd Axworthy and others as they have worked with the Alberta Stock Exchange and with the Minister of Industry and Trade here and in Saskatchewan, then I think we are on a track to doing something that will provide some needed investment in this province. If that is simply more of the rhetoric that we have seen out of this government, it will be an opportunity lost and one that will be missed for many years.

That brings me to the substance, or perhaps the lack of substance, in this particular speech. I went back over all the other throne speeches and budgets.

Since this government has come to office, it has announced a Manitoba stock option program in 1988 and 1989. It announced the International Centre for Sustainable Development, which was supposed to be a world-class, very large, very powerful organization headquartered in this province. It announced the Vision Capital Fund in '89, '90 and '92. It announced the Manitoba Centres of Excellence Fund in 1989; Business Start loan guarantee fund in 1989; HydroBonds 1990; The Environmental Innovations Fund 1990; Grow Bond 1991; Manitoba Mineral Exploration initiative 1991; Crocus Fund 1991. It announced an industrial opportunities program, research and develop initiative and created the Economic Development Board of Cabinet.

So last year I said, well that is fine. Some of these things have been around for awhile. If they have been around for awhile, let us find out what they are doing. I asked some questions and I could not elicit any answers from the departments, so I put an Order for Return in. I said, tell me what has gone on, just tell me.

Take the Vision Capital Fund. Tell me what it has done over the last few years that is has been operating. Just put your good story on the table, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) stood up and he accepted the Order for Return. We certainly will; we will show you; we have a good story to tell you.

To this day, I have not seen a single piece of information. The government has never responded to that Order for Return despite the order of the House, and they have not produced a single piece of evidence that this fund has produced a single job in this province, and that is consistent with the actions that this government has taken over

time—lots of talk, lots of rhetoric, lots of words; no action, no production, no results.

Now, every time that we have gotten into a discussion in this House about what is happening in this province over the last five years, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) or the Premier (Mr. Filmon) or occasionally the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), although he tends to be a little more consistent in his approach to information, but the Minister of Finance and the Premier will stand up and say, well, yes, we will just ignore that fact that you are putting on the record here, because I have a projection here that says, we are just going to get, we will be okay, just around the corner, which is going to get a little better. Occasionally, late at night, and perhaps in a moment of absolute clarity, the minister might say, well, yes, that was not so good, this was not so good or dare we say it, we have been in a recession.

It took us a long time before they would even admit to there being a problem. Today, after almost five years—in three months, it will be five years—that this government has been in charge of the financial affairs of this province, five years since this government has come to office. Yes, there has been a recession. Yes, the global economy is undergoing a massive restructuring, that is a fact but this province has fared very poorly, this province has done extremely poorly relative to the rest of the country.

It is very simple. I mean, I have asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness)—[interjection] He says from his seat, you know that is not so. The fact is we lay fact after fact on the table, and he has yet to respond to them in any kind of analytical way. He has yet to give a single response that disproves a single one of the allegations that have been made.

What he does is he goes back into his shirt pocket and he says, I have a projection; I have a fact that tells me that next year it is going to be better. It has yet to come true. He has yet to be accurate.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at what has happened. In 1988, we had a particular share of wealth in this country. The wealth in the whole country has shrunk somewhat during the recession, but in Manitoba we have fallen faster than any other province. Despite five years of Conservative government, despite five budgets, despite five years of the implementation of this Finance minister's dream, we have fallen, not grown. We have gotten weaker, not stronger.

The Finance minister has talked about Manitoba business investment. In '87, '88, it was 5.1 percent of GDP in this province, Manitoba business investment and fixed capital. In 1989, it dropped to 1.3 percent; 1990, it dropped a further 1.53 percent or only rose by 1.53 percent; 1991, it dropped 9.53 percent.

Another example or another statement this government has made is that full-time jobs will be the kind of jobs that they create, that they will not create the short-term, make-work, Mcjobs of the former Jobs Fund, and they make great fun of the former government for creating those kind of jobs. So you say, okay, let us test that, let us have a look at that.

When you look at the labour force statistics that come out and you look at the percentage of full-time jobs within our labour force, the labour force has gotten smaller overall. Look at the number of full-time jobs within the labour force with a percentage, and you find that we have lost—[interjection] the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) says 20,000 full-time jobs. My figures as of October say, 13,600. The difference is significant but the trend is exactly the same.

Take the smaller number. Let us say it is only 13,000 fewer full-time jobs in this province. Over five years, instead of producing the growth in full-time, high-quality jobs, they have produced a net shrinkage of over 13,000. It is another one of their policies that is not working. They said, if we just change the tax structure, if we just reduce the relationship between government and business, if we free the private sector, that they would begin to invest in this province, that we would see all sorts of vigor and energy on their part.

* (1630)

Now, it is true that there has been a recession, so that overall private sector capital investment is down. That is a fact, but Manitoba's share of that has shrunk further than it has in almost every other province. Instead of a private sector that is revitalized and growing in this province and investing in this province, what we have had and what we have seen every year since this government came to power is that its share of private sector capital investment in this country has decreased, decreased in real terms, decreased in relative terms. So what is wrong with the policies? No growth, shrinkage, no improvement in full-time

jobs, fewer full-time jobs, no revitalized private sector investment. I mean, I realize that it may be heresy, given the remarks of members opposite, to suggest this, but could it be that their policies are wrong?

Could it be that they have just failed to understand what people are talking about when they are talking about the restructuring? They use the language. You know, the Premier invited us—I presume every member was invited—to go to this forum on innovation, and I went. I have to tell you that I was disappointed. I was very disappointed by the tenor of the meeting because it seemed to me—I listened to somebody from New Zealand tell me that if you changed the tax structure, things would get wonderful.

I listened to somebody else tell me that Manitoba was a fun place to live because we had four seasons in the year. I listened to people tell me the same kind of boosterism we have seen coming out of Winnipeg 2000 and other groups for the last four or five years, but I did not hear significant policy initiatives.

You know, we talk, we use the language of knowledge-based industries, we use the language of technology change. But the real question is, what does all that mean when it comes to paying a dollar. What does all that mean when it comes to putting a program into operation? What does that mean when it comes to making a policy decision in a cabinet to strengthen the Manitoba economy? What does that economic restructuring look like when it comes to decisions which affect this province's place, because the decisions that this government has made are obviously wrong. They are failing.

You know, I was interested. I left the Chamber briefly today to go and listen to the Finance minister, Mazankowski, who has the same problem, only he has been around a lot longer. He has been around since '84, and after eight, coming on nine years in charge of the financial affairs of this country, he starts talking about an increase of the deficit from \$28 billion to \$34 billion as being a decrease. He starts taking a page out of this government's book in attacking the most vulnerable people in the province. He actually decreased the support for people on unemployment insurance. That is absolutely unbelievable. He froze his own salary. He gave himself a zero increase, and he went to the

guy who is making \$600 a month and reduced his salary by 3 percent.

It is absolutely unconscionable, and he talked again the same language they have been talking since 1984, the same language that this government has been talking since 1988. There is an economic restructuring going on. There is a global marketplace. What he did not do is recognize that their approach to the global marketplace is the wrong one, and I want to talk a little bit about why it is the wrong one.

There is a problem that we face in this country. It is a problem we face in Canada, in part because Canada is a wealthy country. Canada has got lots of natural resources, and it has been able to enjoy the exploitation of those natural resources living beside the largest market in the world. So we have become wealthy by extracting those resources, and in some cases doing some minor remanufacturing and selling them into a very comfortable market that is prepared to pay high prices for them. One of the problems is that we have not at the same time built ourselves a competitive manufacturing and technologically sophisticated market.

There is an interesting comment from Roger Porter, who wrote a lengthy book on competitiveness in the world. I think it is recognized as a major piece of work around the world, and it is often quoted from. But he makes the comment here that eventually dependence on natural resources will leave a nation vulnerable to depletion, new foreign sources or technological changes that reduce or eliminate resource needs. Countries with high levels of resource wealth may bypass the evolution of innovation-based economies and move from a resource economy to wealth-driven economy that spends its time in mergers, acquisitions and investments in financial assets, activities that eventually lead to economic decline, because an economy driven by past wealth is not able to maintain its wealth.

I think it is an interesting observation. I think it is an interesting statement about Canada, and it is one that is reinforced in an article that came out of this council, the Technological Innovations Council, that talks about Canada. The statement here is that Canada's ability to generate profits in the innovation sector has decreased, and it suggests that Canada is becoming an obsolete trading nation. What it is suggesting is that the kinds of things that Canada is good at are not the kinds of things that are

particularly helpful in building economic strength in today's world.

If Canada is to take advantage of its place in the world, if it is going to take advantage of the kind of wealth-generation capability that it has, because we still live close to that big market, we still have great stability and a relatively sophisticated labour force, then there have to be some fundamental policy changes that revitalize the manufacturing sector, the high-tech manufacturing sector in this country. That is a simple fact of life.

When we look at what is happening around the world with increased access to markets and increased access to labour forces, stable labour forces in other countries, the thought, as this government seems to propose that we can simply negotiate our infrastructure costs here down to a point where we will be competitive once again in textiles or in low-tech manufacturing industries with Mexico or China or Thailand, is simply wrong. We will not. We would give up far too much in our lifestyle. What we have to do is begin to move in the area that produces greatest change. Over the last two decades the high-tech area has grown from 10 percent of total world trade to nearly 30 percent of total world trade. Now what does that mean for us? There has always been high-tech.

High-tech used to be called sewing machines and steam engines and those sorts of things, and they occupied a certain niche in the economy during industrialization. What is interesting is in the last few decades they have grown rapidly, and where that growth has taken place—it is 30 percent of world trade—but where that growth, the people who are dealing in that trade, who are creating those products are the G7 countries.

There is an interesting anomaly, and it is one that I think reinforces the concerns that many Canadians feel about the Free Trade Agreement. When you look at industrial production in this country and in the other six G7 countries, the fact is that in 1980, '81, '82, '83, '84, '85, '86, '87, when you looked at the relationship between the seven countries in industrial production, we all did fairly well. Canada some years would be slightly ahead of the other countries, some years would be slightly behind the other countries.

* (1640)

The same was true in 1988. We ended 1988 actually slightly ahead of the composite of the other

six G7 countries. Between 1988 and today, we have fallen to last place. We are the only country of the G7 countries to suffer the size of the decline that we have. The fact is that this country is deindustrialized.

I know that that is seen by the members on the other side as being rhetoric, and I heard the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) earlier wax eloquent about what a wonderful thing the Free Trade Agreement was for Canada. The fact is that it is not.

It is hard for me, because I fundamentally believe in free trade. I think open global markets—the movement of capital is a fact of life that we are not going to change, the movement of people and the movement of freer, open markets. The movement of goods and people, I think, is a good thing in the long run.

I do not think this deal gives us that. I do not think this deal gives us the kind of structural access to the southern market that we might like. I think it penalizes us very heavily. I can move back and forth quite freely between the two countries, but someone who has a lesser education finds it very difficult to move. His job may move south, her job may move south, but they are not necessarily able to follow it.

I think, though, that there is a more invidious concern about what is happening with free trade, and I think there is some light at the end of this tunnel. If I read what is happening in the U.S. right, Robert Reich, who is one of the major advisers on trade and on economic development to President-elect Clinton, has written about the negative impacts of the Free Trade Agreement on Canada. In fact, Robert Reich was on Canada A.M. about a year ago making the statement that he did not understand why Canadians were not standing on their chairs screaming about the negative impacts of the Free Trade Agreement on their country.

An Honourable Member: He did not know what he was talking about.

Mr. Alcock: No, in fact, Reich does. That is the problem. The member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) says that Reich does not know what he is talking about, but Reich has taken the time to look very carefully. Reich is a free-trader. Reich believes in open trade. He thinks that it is going to lead to a better distribution of goods, a more economically

just world in the long run. He believes in this, but he also believes that the deal that was struck between Mulroney and President Reagan is bad for Canada. He can demonstrate that.

The thing that is so frustrating for me is, I do not know how much evidence needs to be piled up in front of these members before they begin to understand. I do not know how many of their constituents have to lose their jobs. I do not know how many people have to move out before they finally realize that we do indeed have a problem.

Is it a solvable problem? Frankly, the one piece of strength in the argument about the marketplace adjustment that needs to take place is that we have to, if we want to take advantage of what we have down there, the market that we have down there, undertake some fundamental changes in this country. They have to do with better training of the labour force. They have to do with much, much greater investment in research and development. They have to do with helping companies become more competitive with changing productivity levels. They have to do with providing incentives to get people ready, but they are the kind of incentives that should have taken place in the early '80s, the kind of incentives that we should have been building into this economy prior to opening that floodgate, because opening that floodgate has produced nothing but destruction for this country and it is going to be very hard to recover.

We have dug ourselves deeper and I would ask the member for Emerson or other members on that side of the House to answer one simple question: If their vision works, if their vision is so successful, why, in the case of the federal government after eight years, the first six of which were of very high growth, after all that time of their vision, have they been unable to deal with the deficit? If that is their Holy Grail, why have they not solved that problem?

They say the same things in every throne speech. In fact there are great sections of the speeches from the last six that you could simply photocopy and bring forward. With a good thesaurus, you could just bring forward exactly the same content.

(Mr. Ben Svienson, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

I wonder if they do. I suspect that some of the members do. I suspect when they get outside of the heat of this Chamber they must wonder, why is it, after being in power, after doing all of these things, that it has produced none of the results that they

hoped for. [interjection] I am talking both. I was asked whether I was talking federally or provincially. I am talking both.

The federal Tories have had eight years of this. The provincial government has had five years of this and yet what have they produced? Now, when the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) talks about an increase in some resource extraction—you know, the reality is that is the very problem that has put us into the situation that we are in. Yes, we can maintain some level of wealth for some period of time to come by simply selling off our resources, but in fact we are becoming less able to maintain the wealth in this country with that approach. We have lost the ability to become competitive. [interjection] The member for Emerson keeps—I think what happened today, we are all given their rhetoric sheet and the member for Emerson is afraid to let go of it, but the fact is from a report tabled by their own technology council, it talks about things like this.

Canada has never been able to capture as large a percentage of high-technology trade as it has in the low- and medium-technology sectors. In fact, its share of high technology trade has decreased from about 4 percent to less than 2 percent.

This would suggest that Canada is becoming an obsolete trading nation. I did not write this. This is from your Technology and Innovations Council, not from me but it does underscore the problem.

The question is then, what do you do? So now, how are you going to get around that? How are you going to begin to build some strength back into this? I think one of the things that we need to start thinking about in this country, when we talk about infrastructure and I have heard again and actually I am sorry to be referencing the member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard), but he was the latest one who read the one speech that members on the other side of the House seemed to be willing to read, but he talked about the glories of infrastructure. We are going to build roads and that is indeed a policy that has been in place. It first came forward in the Depression. It was the way to put people back to work. It was the way to build jobs but the world has changed since then. If we do not have anybody to drive on those roads, if we do not have anybody to use those sewers, the investment will give us some short-term jobs, it will bring in some people who will work to build them, but it will leave us nothing that will make us stronger five years from now, 10 years from now, 20 years from now.

That is something that we need to think about very, very hard, and we need to start thinking about the, for want of a better term, skills infrastructure. We need to start thinking about investing in the part of our economy that produces a greater skill level among people because that is the one thing that is going to allow us to be more competitive internationally. That is the one thing that is going to fuel the restructuring.

I actually heard the suggestion from the other side of the House that they feel that they are doing that, and I expect for those who do believe the rhetoric that they put out that they believe that they are doing it, but there has yet to be a substantive demonstration of that. They are making it more difficult for people to get trained, not less difficult. They are making it more difficult to go to university, not less difficult. They are shifting the burden, the cost of university, off of the backs of the taxpayer who benefits from the increased intellectual and skill capability in the community, onto the debt load of individual students. I think that is simply unacceptable.

I think that if there is one factor that there seems to be some commitment to—I even noticed today Finance Minister Mazankowski as he was talking about what he was going to do, and I would point out a couple of things to Conservative members here. In his economic and fiscal statement, I would note that in this great infrastructure program that they are so proud of, other than the possibility of some paving in Riding Mountain National Park, there is not a single thing here for Manitoba.

They are going to renew federal bridges in Montreal; they are not going to do anything about the Lockport Bridge. I notice in here their support for free trade has now evolved a little bit so effective January 1, 1993, they are reducing textile tariffs immediately. I would suggest to members of this Chamber that is going to have a very direct impact in this city, a very direct impact in this city. I want to hear you stand up and defend that. I want to hear members talk about how that adds to their vision of what is occurring in this country.

* (1650)

There are some things in this announcement that I think are okay. There is a substantive recognition of the need to invest in research and development. There is a substantive recognition of the need to invest in training, but it is eight years too late—ah, I

should not say that. That is not fair. It is never too late, but it is eight years slow in coming. Had we started this some time ago, we might be in better shape today. We might have been better poised to take advantage of the Free Trade Agreement rather than to be beaten by it the way we have been.

When the free trade debate was on here in 1988, we heard members do what they do everyday. They talked about the little projection they had in their vest pocket that was going to say that things would get better, but the fact is they have not. They have gotten worse in this province. They have gotten worse across a whole range of services.

I am saddened by the direction in this document that has caused them to cut \$100 million from regional development initiatives. I am saddened by the direction in this document that has caused them to reduce support for the most vulnerable people in this community.

If you want to spur economic turn, if you want to get people spending, the people who spend every nickel of every dollar they get are the people that have the least. It is the people who are on unemployment insurance. It is the people who are on welfare. It is the people who have no other alternatives, and to take money out of their pockets at a time when things are so desperately tough in this country and yet not do the same to yourself I just think is unconscionable.

But I think it is very consistent with the policies that are expressed by the federal government and by this government. I think it is very consistent with the actions of the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) when he decided to act against the people on income security in this province. I think it is very consistent with Conservative policy that they victimize those people who are least able to defend themselves.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I see my time has come to an end. I will pick this up and try to go a little further when the budget is before us. If I have one plea to make to the government, it is that they begin to think about the intellectual, the skills infrastructure as being every bit and I believe more important than the physical infrastructure in this province, and that they begin to treat it with the same kind of reverence and make the same kind of investments in it that they boast so proudly about when they look at investing in roads and sewers that may not have people around to use them.

Thank you.

Mr. Harold Neufeld (Rossmore): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would just like to add a few words to the debate going on in this Chamber.

I would like to start first by congratulating the Speaker for his return to the Chair, and I wish he were here, but he might be listening to the speech in his chamber. I would like to congratulate him for being returned. I enjoyed his fairmindedness, his congenial attitude, his co-operativeness, the likes of which I have not seen in the Chair.

I would also like to welcome back the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray). She was here for two and a half years before, and I welcome her back. I would like to welcome also the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister). I think he has already shown that he can fill the big shoes of the former member for Portage la Prairie.

I would also like to wish the Leader of the Liberal Party well in her next endeavor. I know she will make a contribution there as she has in this Chamber. As well, I would like to wish the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) well in whatever his next endeavor shall be.

I will be supporting this throne speech, Mr. Acting Speaker, and that is not because I agree with everything that is in there. It is because I think it is the best thing available today. I do not think that there is a premier or a government that can run this province better and more efficiently than the one we have, which is not to say, however, Mr. Acting Speaker, that it is the best way. I do believe that there are ways to improve it, and I think I will dwell more on how it might be improved than how I might support it.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I came into this job four years, seven months and seven days ago. I remember the time well. I spent some four years of that time in cabinet and on Treasury Board, and one cannot help but learn something in those four years, and some of those recollections and some of the things I have learnt I would like to speak of today.

Before I do, just let me give you a little bit about the background of my constituency. My constituency is a total urban constituency. It has had some very distinguished representatives in the past, amongst them our former Speaker, Peter Fox, former Premier, Edward Schreyer, former Finance minister, Vic Schroeder, but having said that, the

people in my constituency came to their senses in 1988 and elected a Conservative member to the House and, I might say, it is the first time that this constituency has elected a Conservative member.

I have lived, Mr. Acting Speaker, in my constituency for 37 years, and 1988 was the first time I voted for a winner. To show you how my luck runs, the Boundaries Commission saw fit to move the boundaries somewhat north, and I am now in the constituency of the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway). So again, I can look back in my life and say that once, once only, have I voted for a winner.

Mr. Acting Speaker, a little bit about my background, and it may show this Chamber how I come about my convictions, how I come about my views, which are at times thought to be somewhat right-wing. I think not. I have been accused in the past of being somewhat pinkish in tinge. It is not the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) who did say that.

My parents came to this country in 1926 from the Ukraine. My parents experienced the revolution in Russia. They experienced the Depression in Canada, and then we went through the war years in Canada, and it was only after the war years, in the 1950s and '60s, that incomes became of a size that one could save for the future.

My grandparents, who came to Canada at the same time as my parents, worked until their retirement in Altona, Manitoba. My grandfather's estate consisted of \$332, and there were 10 children, which gave each one \$33.20. My parents worked all their lives. My father worked until he was 70 years old, and his highest income year was the year in which he retired, 1966, and he made \$5,800, but all of his five children received a higher education. All of his five children have done reasonably well, and all of his five children are extremely proud of their parents. My mother will be 92 next birthday. She lives in her house and says, if I need home care, I will pay for it myself.

I think it is called pride. Pride is what built this country. Pride is what we must have if we want to continue to build this country. Pride is something we have lost. The work ethic is something we have lost. If we want to build, do not talk about creating jobs by government. Do not talk about more education. Talk about pride. Talk about work ethic. That is what is going to build this country. That is what built this country, and it is the only thing that will help us.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) talks about going to coffee houses. Now, I frequent the coffee houses in my constituency, and I frequent the same one that he has often come to. The Salisbury House on Henderson Highway is where politics is discussed and where members of all parties congregate each and every morning and give advice to their members who happen to be there. I am there more frequently than the Leader of the Opposition, and I get an awful lot of advice. I dare say that I learned more about the politics of this province at the Salisbury House in one morning than I do out of listening to debates in this House for a whole week.

* (1700)

I have a problem with the credibility or the lack of credibility for politicians. I think we all know that we have lost an awful lot of credibility, and I think there is a good reason for that. Politicians think they can direct the populace. They think they can tell the people how they must vote. They think they can tell the people what is good for them. Well, I think, we cannot see a more glaring example of political arrogance than in the national referendum of October 26, I believe it was.

I was called by a newspaper reporter early in the referendum discussions and asked what I thought of it. I said, well, it is like chicken soup, it cannot hurt you. I would probably vote for it, so we can get on with more important things that we need in this country. Having said that, the politicians came out of Charlottetown and told us what a good deal they had for Canadians. Then they proceed to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to try to convince us to vote in a certain way. That changed my mind. I said, if it is such a good deal, why do I have to be told how to vote? Give me the facts. I am reasonably intelligent. I can make a decision, but they did not and they got their due.

I want to show you an article that I clipped and it is topical because today is the day that Mazankowski brought down his minibudget and Mazankowski says, when it comes to increasing taxes, blame the deficit. Now, good Lord, and here is what it says, the deficit made us do it. Justifying eight years of Tory tax increases. Now, I do not support tax increases for the sake of paying off deficits. If we are going to have tax increases, we have tax increases to—I do not believe in deficits to

start with, but if we have tax increases, we should use them to promote the country.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

The deficit—[interjection] I will come to that. I am going to talk about the deficit. I am going to talk about what I think of the deficit. I am going to talk about what I think might be done about the deficit. I would like to read something that Will Rogers said many years ago, and this may be of interest to the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock). I can remember back when a Liberal was one who was generous with his own money, and that is as true today as it was then. He also said, it is a good thing we do not get all the government we pay for.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard [interjection] well, if we want to talk about socialism I can talk at ends on socialism, because my parents had to live through it. Some of them died through it, some of my relatives. So, if you want to talk about socialism, we can talk all we want.

What are the answers? What are the answers to our economy? We have heard an awful lot here. We have heard "spend." Everything is spend. It is spend, spend, spend.

Let us deal with the member for Osborne's (Mr. Alcock) idea that training and education is the only answer. Certainly, we need training and education. Certainly, if there is a need for the type of expertise we have to train our people, but training for the sake of training is not an answer.

I talked to a native elder in Gillam the first year we were in office, and he told me what we do not need in this country is more educated unemployed. Unless we have a purpose, unless we have a reason to train people, what are we doing? We are training more unemployed. We are getting more educated unemployed and that is not what we want. We want employment [interjection] We want fewer unemployed, you are right. The member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) says we need fewer unemployed. Of course we do, but we cannot do that in Manitoba alone. We have lots of unemployed in the rest of Canada. We have a lot of unemployed in the United States. We have a lot of unemployed in Europe. I just came back from Europe and they have a problem. As soon as they mobilize the rest of the eastern countries we will have a greater problem.

We have to learn to compete with all the countries in this world. The Free Trade Agreement may be flawed, I do not deny that. I will tell you the worst

thing about the Free Trade Agreement was that the federal government and Mulroney came across the country saying we won every point. Nobody in the world wins every point when they are dealing with a country the size of the United States. If he had told us where we would have to retrain, where we would have to change, we would have been much better off and we would have accepted it. That is not to say that every part of the Free Trade Agreement is wrong.

We are, whether we like it or not, living in a global economy. That is not a buzzword, that is a fact. We will have to compete with the United States. We will have to compete with Europe. We will have to compete with Asia, with all the trading groups we will have to compete. Unless we can become more productive than they are, we will lose. We will lose, lose, lose.

We have to become productive. That is the only way. How do you get back to that? We develop a work ethic and we develop pride. A good example of our lack of pride is the number of people on that side who refuse to sing God Save the Queen. That is to me a lack of pride in country. That is to me [interjection] No, I am not a monarchist. I am not a monarchist but that is the culture we have. That is our heritage, we have to go with that.

Unless you have some heritage, you are not going to go anywhere. I get upset when I go to a hockey game and I see the players moving around during the playing of our national anthem. I quit my season tickets for the Jets. One of the reasons was they kept moving around while the national anthem was sung. I refused to go in until it was over. That is pride. The Americans have it. When you see a World Series game you see the American players with their hands over their hearts while the national anthem is being played and they stand at attention. We laugh about it. The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) laughs. [interjection] We are not selling out to the U.S. If you think you can deal and trade only within Canada, you will have a problem.

Let us not forget that other countries want to expand their trade, as well. Let us not forget that when you live next to the biggest trading partner in the world, they are going to want to expand their trade. They are not going to continue indefinitely with, for one thing, our Autopact agreement. They are not going to continue indefinitely accepting a trade deficit with Canada. [interjection] No, it will not be in their interest to do that. It simply is not. We

have to consider trade to be global. We cannot build a fence around our own—[interjection]

* (1710)

I do believe, as I have said earlier, that the Free Trade Agreement has some flaws. I do think that the federal government did not prepare us sufficiently well to enter into that Free Trade Agreement. I do think that some of us did not accept that there would be some flaws, and some of us should have done more to prepare ourselves. When I say us, I mean industry. Industry is there to look forward into the future, and they have to prepare their own plan into the future.

Getting back to training, if we are going to train, we have to know what we are training for. I agree with the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), we have to be ready when that time comes, but to speak of that as the only answer to our unemployment situation is dreaming in technicolor.

The other thing is the Jobs Fund. We have tried that. It has been found wanting. I do think that if you are going to create temporary jobs in order, and this has been said many times, if you are going to create temporary jobs in order to stimulate the economy in order to get more people working, do things that would have to be done anyway sometime in the future, but then be prepared, when that future comes and the better times come, to back off. You have to then back off.

The Bible tells us that we must prepare for the bad years during the good years. We have not done that. So it is very difficult today to say we will spend the money that we do not have in order to create temporary jobs. It is very difficult for a Finance minister to make that decision.

Where are our resources, and what can we do with them? I think we have to zero in on that. I think we have our best resources for long-term jobs. We have ample hydroelectric power which we cannot sell to others so they can create industries but to create industries ourselves. We have to recognize that we are a long ways from deep water. We are a long ways from markets, so we have to recognize that. We have to go in for development that will not be hindered by long distances of transport.

We have lots of good water that a lot of good people would die for. We have copper. We have zinc. We have nickel. We have silica sand. We have vegetables. We have all grains. We have cattle. We have tourism. All these resources.

These are all resources, and a lot of them are renewable resources. We are not using them.

We have to develop secondary industries. We have to develop at value-added. We have lost our value-added. We have lost our value-added in the grain industry, in the flour industry. We have lost our value-added in the cattle industry. Where did we lose it? Not to foreign countries. We lost them to our own provinces.

The Prime Minister talked at length about decreasing the amount of interprovincial trade barriers. What is the greatest trade barrier we have? It is the money spent by other provinces far richer than us in order to track our own industries. Alberta has captured our value-added cattle industry through monies from their Heritage Fund. Quebec has the aluminum smelters because of the monies they have. We cannot compete with the monies that other provinces have.

I spoke with a minister of the Alberta Legislature at one time. I said to him that it was somewhat wrong to use monies from their Heritage Fund in order to attract our business, that an accident of geography should not give them a leg up over the rest of us. He said, my goodness, that is free enterprise. He said, I hope the rest of your cabinet does not think that way. I had to remind him that on a political spectrum I was probably the furthest right of any of our cabinet ministers. He could not believe that, because he already felt that I was a little pinkish.

We have to develop value-added industries with the natural resources we already have. One thing bothered me a great deal and I spoke at length about this with the management of Manitoba Hydro. We mine copper in Flin Flon. We ship the copper to eastern Canada to be refined and drawn into wire, and we buy back the wire. [interjection] The member for Dauphin said that is awful. Where was he for the 16 years that his party was in power?

They have the copper in Flin Flon. They have, within reasonable distances, ample labour forces, several reserves. They have the ability to attract the investment and they have a captive market. Now why can we not develop a copper wire industry in The Pas or in Cranberry Portage where we have ample labour? We need the entrepreneurs. We need them. They are the ones who can develop an industry without government help.

I, personally, am very much opposed to government grants to anybody. You have already heard my views on government grants to cultural bodies. I am equally opposed to government grants to industry. There is no industry in the world or in Canada that is worth its salt if they are going to depend on a government grant for expansion. They do not need the money. [interjection]

We are moving around too much. The member for Flin Flon wants to know about R & D. There is probably a place for government in R & D, but that is another subject and that is something we—[interjection] Let me remind the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) that expansion is not dependent on R & D, not totally. Most companies know when they need the R & D for expansion.

The member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) mentioned D. W. Friesen, Altona. I lived in Altona when it was started. I lived in Altona when they were a small—[interjection] They do not mind free trade. There was a small stationery store. They started the printing plant in the height of the Depression without government aid in rural Manitoba. What was the principal ingredient? It was one man.

The opposition members think that the only way to do things is with government economic aid—give them something. The only jobs you get are government jobs if you expect government to create them. I would love to be 30 years old today and go in business in competition with those gentlemen. How did D. W. Friesen or Dave Friesen start his business? D. W. Friesen went into business because he had a vision, and he spent hours working at it.

I can give you other examples, and I will. Al DeFehr in Winnipeg, I remember when he started in North Kildonan in his garage in the back of his house. He built clothes dryers at night, and he delivered them to Eaton's during the day. Today, that has grown to Palliser Furniture, the largest family owned furniture manufacturing plant in North America. Where did it start? How did it start? Not with government help. Unfortunately, they have seen fit over the years to access government funds.

I will give you another example. John Klassen started Monarch Industries, and the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) knows him well. He started it during the height of the Depression, not with government help. John Klassen started Monarch

Industries, not with government help, also during the height of the Depression. Nels Huebert started what is now Weldad. It was then Fibreboard in the height of the Depression. He started as a coal dealer where he personally delivered the coal with a sleigh and he pulled the sleigh.

* (1720)

Those were people with a vision. Those were people who were prepared to work. Those were people who knew that work was the only way out of their condition, and that is the kind of people we need back in Canada today. We need those kinds of people, the people who are prepared to work, not the people who think that government should be the answer for every single problem they have. Government is not an answer. Government is there to help, but only help those who want to help themselves.

A father cannot help his children if they are not prepared to help themselves. He has to help them help themselves. I am a father. We have children and grandchildren. That is one of the reasons I became involved, because I thought I could make a difference.

We think we have problems today, and I have already mentioned the eastern countries. When those eastern countries are mobilized, when their labour force is mobilized we better be ready to compete against them because they will drive us out of the marketplace totally. So we better be ready. It will take a generation or two.

I found, Mr. Speaker, my cousins who were lost in Russia for 55 years. I found them two years ago almost today. They, two of them, have now immigrated to Germany and I visited with them last month, and they tell me about the work conditions in Russia. I know about their natural resources, but they do not have the one ingredient that is needed. They do not have the work ethic. They do not know how to work, but they will learn, and when they learn we are in trouble, unless we are prepared to put out as well as they are.

When I graduated as a chartered accountant, Mr. Speaker, I went to the United States to look for work. I thought I might want to move there. They wanted people from Canada, because people from Canada were prepared to work, they said. That is what they told me. That is no longer the case. Americans have a better work ethic than do Canadians, and we better recognize that when we start talking about the

Free Trade Agreement being the problem. The problem is we are not prepared to compete. We are not prepared to take lower wages if it is necessary. We are not prepared to work a little harder. We are not prepared to produce more.

We are only prepared to complain. We complain that government does not do enough, and we have to stop. We have to think about tomorrow and we have to think about our children and we have to think about our grandchildren, and what they going to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, our economic policy has not caused unemployment. Unemployment is a global problem today. Yes, we could create jobs artificially by building more roads, by building parks, but where are we going to get the money? Where are we going to borrow the money?

The billions of dollars that are being borrowed by the United States, and they will get first call on the money. The billions of dollars that have to be borrowed by the Canadian government, and they will get a call before Manitoba on the money, and the billions that have to be borrowed by Ontario. Manitoba will stand in line, but monies are not as easily borrowed as they once were. Germany is going to need an awful lot of money in the next couple of years. Japan has to bring some money back rather than send some to North America. They have to bring some back for their own economy. The Arab worlds have to bring some back. Germany was a big supplier at one time; they have to bring it all back.

So we have a problem, and we cannot simply write off the problem by saying government is looking after it. Government should have a strategy. What strategy can we possibly have when we are broke and we have to borrow money.

An Honourable Member: How about borrow from the Bank of Canada?

Mr. Neufeld: If you want to borrow from the Bank of Canada, you will invite inflation because that is printing money, and I am not sure that any of us want to print money.

Let me talk a little bit about government employment. Do we have the kind of work force in the government that we can be proud of? Are we overstaffed? Most industries when they come to a crisis realize they are overstaffed and they lay

people off. General Motors is going to lay off 30,000 people.

Let me suggest to you that we are overstaffed by a third. With two-thirds of the staff, we could provide the same programs that we are now providing without anybody noticing any difference. People would have to work. You do not have to have somebody there to talk to another person when they have nothing to do. That is what is happening.

When the federal civil servants went on strike, did you notice any reduction in your service for 16 days? I noticed a difference. The streets were not as congested, and I could get to work in 12 minutes. That was the difference, so I will invite Peter Olfert to take his people out on strike and we will see how much they are needed. I will invite him. [interjection] They should be pretty happy.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when the Civil Service jobs were secure. There was a time when they had a good pension plan. There was a time when they made a little less money than the average wage in the city and in Manitoba. Now they have retained the best pension plan in the country. They have retained better benefits. They have retained job security and they are making more money than any other like job in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any of us who have not been frustrated with government employees when you are trying to get something done. I will tell you a little story. This happened to me. I sold a car some years ago—this was before we were in office—and I wanted to get back my PST on the car. They sent me from one office to the next office and I would wait, somebody would be talking, they would not come to look after me. They would send me to another office and I would go there. They would have me fill out some more papers, and I am sure that every one of you has had this frustration. I would go to another office, and finally I would come to the last office. Here is where I am supposed to get the final filter. I see three employees standing there talking. I am standing there waiting. They talk. I bang on the desk very lightly. They do not come. Then one of the employees comes over, and I look behind her and there is a sign behind her. It says, if you do not like the service you are getting here, maybe you should walk down the hall where perchance somebody might give a shit. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I am only giving you what I read. I made up my mind right there that we were overstaffed.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about native self-government, and I will not say any more about it. My uncle taught at Island Lake more than 50 years ago, taught school. He came back and told me then what we are doing wrong is that we are trying to take those young children, teach them our ways and then send them back into the woods without their being trained in their own ways. They cannot live with us and they cannot live with them. That is a problem, and I remember that. I was a young lad and he told me that. I look back now and he was absolutely right. The things that we have done with our native population are inexcusable. There are many things that we could do but we have to work together with them. There is no point kidding ourselves that Red Sucker Lake or Shamattawa is going to be a self-sustaining community.

* (1730)

What kind of industry can we put in there that is going to sustain those communities? We have lots of communities in the south that have had to move. Towns have died because there was not enough work to sustain the people, and they had to move. The same thing applies to the northern communities, Mr. Speaker. Some of them may have to move. Gambling is not the answer either.

An Honourable Member: We are all hanging on the edge of our chairs for the answers here.

Mr. Neufeld: The answer might well be that we bring in industries that are labour intensive. I have mentioned this before. I have mentioned this with copper wire turning, a labour-intensive industry which we could, if we wished, or we might be able to supply the wire for Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Telephone System. We have a captive market. We now buy it elsewhere. Why can we not make it here? Those are things.

I will tell you something else. I saw a newscast in Montreal when I was there recently, and they interviewed a native elder, and he was opposed to gambling on reserves. The CBC reporter, and this gives you an indication of the intelligence of the CBC reporter, said, why? He said, you do not gamble with welfare money. The CBC reporter looked at him stunned. He said, I guess it could happen. The elder simply said, it does.

Think about it—[interjection] even at the Crystal Casino. Do not look at me. I am not a gambler, but

I think that if we use welfare monies to gamble, we are simply increasing a problem that we have already had.

I have some problems with our health care system. I have some problems with our educational system, but that will have to wait for another speech.

Let me just say that those of you who are opposed to aid to private schools, let us not forget that if all those students moved into the public school system it would cost you that much more. It would, because there is a per student grant.

I will leave you with this thought, that we have spent and do spend millions of dollars on transporting kids to school and spend millions more to build them a gym so they can get some exercise. Somebody might explain the rationale of that to me.

I have one more clip—

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave to extend? [Agreed]

Mr. Neufeld: I have one more clip from a newspaper and I am taking issue with newspaper reporting. It says: Unmarried with taxes. Unmarried couples will pay millions more.

Now these are couples who live in a common-law relationship, and these are couples who, over the years, have wanted, demanded and received benefits through the health care system as married, benefits through the pension system as married, and now object because they are expected to pay taxes as married. These are the kinds of headlines that you get out of the newspaper reporting today. It does not give you the answer, it does not give you the right answer. I would like if some of our reporters might sometime report a little more accurately.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to add my comments to those of others in this Chamber regarding the throne speech, but first, I would like to extend a welcome to the new Pages and to the new table officer in the Chamber here today and to welcome you back, too. We enjoy your guidance through our sessions over the past couple of years, and once again, we look forward to your guidance through this current session that we are in.

I would also like to welcome, too, Mr. Speaker, the new MLAs in our Chamber, the member for Portage

la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) and the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray). I am sure that it will be an eye opener for them sitting in this Chamber for their first time, as it was for many of us who are here today. I know it was a process that took some getting used to, as I am sure we have all experienced, but that will grow on them, as it did for the rest of us.

One of the things that I noticed in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, and it has been pointed out by many others in the Chamber here today, was the lack of new ideas or new concepts that we could have put in place to get our province moving forward. Many others have mentioned that, and of course, that to me, leaves me with the thought that what we have here before us is a government that is old, tired and worn out, and they have no ideas and no new concepts that they can bring forward to help the people of Manitoba move forward into new job creation programs, to get the unemployed back into the work force and to create a sense of hope or promise for the future.

Also in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, we did not see any promise to freeze taxes for this coming budget speech which I believe we will be seeing at the end of the winter, the beginning of the spring. The members opposite quite often like to talk about the position we are in financially in this province here, and they fail to recognize or fail to respond to the statements that have been made many times by members in this Chamber about the financial position they were left in when they took office, when they took government, that they were left with a positive, black ink in the bank account. They had \$58 million in the bank to work with, and they took that money, and they created their rainy day fund which they have continued to manipulate and use as a shell game throughout the five budgets and probably once again coming up into the sixth budget coming up in the spring.

It will be interesting to see, Mr. Speaker, whether they are able to hold the line on taxes as they like to say they are doing, even though we know they are offloading onto the municipalities in the province and to the school boards in the province, or whether or not they are going to have to drastically cut back on services to the people in the province of Manitoba, or are they going to once again offload the responsibility for some of the costs? [interjection] That is right. The member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohma) mentions the \$700-million turnaround,

and that is accurate considering that the current deficit that the government is now projecting is \$643 million. We had left them \$58 million in the bank to work with, so it is a \$700-million turnaround.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, from the condition that we are in financially in this province that this government is obviously very poor business managers.

Yet the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) wants to talk about space cadets and space projects, and we will get to that in a minute when we talk about his failure in the Churchill Rocket Range project. I am sure he will be interested to hear about that.

It is obvious that the Minister of Health does not think very highly of the Churchill project. He thinks that it is a futile effort. I take it by his comments that he has made here today that his government is not making any serious efforts towards getting that project off the ground. He indeed may be lobbying against that project.

* (1740)

One of the things that I have seen in my own community, Mr. Speaker, is layoff after layoff after layoff. We have had layoffs in the rail industry within my community. We had layoffs in the bus manufacturing industry within my community. We have had layoffs within the airline industry, and we had layoffs and business failures in general, as I am sure there is around the province.

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

My community has been seriously impacted by the layoffs, and once again this past week we saw another further announcement of future impacts of layoffs upon the employees of the rail operation, and I will move into discussion on that in a few minutes.

The only industry that I see growing in my community at this current time is the food bank, and I say that in all seriousness because I go and take part and help out in the food bank whenever I can to lend assistance to the people of the community to allow them to have a sense of pride and to also hear their concerns.

I listened to the member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) talk about people should get out and get a job. Well, maybe the member for Rossmere should take the opportunity to go to one of the food banks and talk to the people who are there. They do not

want to be there. They do not want to have to use the food banks.

It is interesting to note that the member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger) is also going to have to face this problem in his own community. I see in the media this week that there is a possibility of a food bank starting up in Steinbach. Now I would have thought that Steinbach would have been an affluent area of our province and there would not have been a need there for that, but obviously it is impacting upon them as well.

One of the things that I had difficulty with just recently, I had a young woman come to my office. She is a licensed practical nurse. She is a single parent of a teenage son who has just recently been able to move away from the support of family members and move out on her own. She is able to pay her own bills now, and she is able to pay the mortgage payment on her house that she is living in, but she is now finding herself in a position where she has to face the real prospect of losing employment through the reduction of the LPN program at the hospital at which she works.

Now this individual wants very much to be independent. She wants to remain in the work force, but what she is finding is that if she loses her job she will be forced to accept one of several choices. She can opt to move back with her family. She can look at retraining or she can go onto the Unemployment Insurance system.

She does not want to go on the Unemployment Insurance system, Madam Deputy Speaker. She wants very much to be independent, but she is going to be forced to make that decision if she loses her job. She cannot afford to go back to retraining because she has to continue to pay the bills. Yet we see the policies of this government and of this Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

An Honourable Member: Have you not heard the Liberals talk about him?

Mr. Reid: I have heard the Liberals talk about him, and the Liberals have obviously bought into the process that you set out for them. We do not set ourselves up for that future fall. We like to think about what the future ramifications are going to be. If the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard)—maybe he should take the time to go out and talk to some of the LPNs and listen to the impact that his policies of his department and his government are going to

have on people like this. [interjection] I am telling the Minister of Health that he should take the time to get out and talk to these people and to see what impact his policies are having on these people. They want to remain in the work force. They do not want to have to rely on handouts. They do not want to have to go to food banks. They do not want to go on unemployment insurance.

The government and this minister are forcing her, because she expects very soon to be laid off from her job, to face the very difficult prospect of having to look at unemployment insurance, which means she may have to give up and most likely will have to give up her home. It will create further hardships for herself and her young son.

What does this mean for the future of her son? Will she be able to provide him with future educational opportunities like the member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) likes to talk about. Get out and get a job; get out and get an education. Work for yourself. If those opportunities are eroded and removed, taken away from these people, that option taken away from them, their futures are put in jeopardy.

So I asked the Minister of Health and the government in general to consider the impact of their policies on people such as this. I listened to the Minister of Health in his discussions at the Estimates process last session, and we have a community hospital, Concordia Hospital, and Concordia Hospital has through its foundation and through support from the various support groups and agencies within the surrounding community raised funds to purchase a CAT scan machine, so that this hospital can perform the necessary diagnostic testing on patients within that hospital.

I asked questions of the Minister of Health during the Estimates last session and asked him why he was not giving the hospital the opportunity to start up the use of this particular piece of technology. The minister said to me at that time, well, they do not have a protocol in place to determine how and who is going to get the testing done and who is going to do the testing. So I went back to the administration of the hospital, and I asked them, do you have a protocol in place? They said, yes, they have had a protocol and they have supplied it to the department, and yet the minister said that they did not have a protocol.

When I asked the administration of the hospital if they had permission in the first place from the Department of Health to move forward with purchasing this piece of equipment for the community hospital, they said, yes. They went to the minister's department, and they received that approval to go out and purchase that equipment through the foundation monies. Now we find that the Minister of Health is refusing to allow a community hospital that affects my community, not giving them the authority to put that equipment into operation. That is unfortunate, because now the patients that are in this hospital are going to have to continue to be transported from the Concordia Hospital to the other hospitals to have that particular type of testing done.

Now I see that further correspondence indicates, after the Minister of Health said that he was going to penalize this hospital if they put that CAT scan machine into operation, he was going to penalize their budgets by a comparable amount, and now we see that the hospitals have capitulated to the minister's demand, to the minister's position, and that they are going to follow the minister's wishes and they are not going to put that machine into place.

After the foundation raised three-quarters of a million dollars and the service groups in the community raised at least 50 percent of the operating funds for this particular piece of machinery, the minister was going to penalize them and has forced the hospital now into a position where they will not be able to put this machine into use, forcing the patients to be transported to another facility.

I would be interested to hear from the Minister of Health, when he makes his comments, why his department has made that decision, because I cannot think of any logical reason why the Department of Health or the minister would have pushed the hospital into this position by threatening to penalize them financially if they decided to use this machine.

I listened to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) make some comments yesterday during his debate on the throne speech, and it was interesting to note; he covered several areas. He has been the minister for several—[interjection]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, I had a little bit of difficulty trying to get my point across here amongst the conversation that was taking place around me.

The Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) has made many comments yesterday and, of course, during the Estimates debate that was taking place through the past several sessions, and it was interesting to note that the minister said yesterday that we cannot make the decision for CN as to whom they should lay off or not lay off.

The minister went on to say that CN does not have to answer—neither do any of the other transportation industries have to answer—to us in terms of how they rationalize whom they lay off. Well, if that is the case, then the minister is telling us by those statements and the statements that he made in his throne speech comments yesterday that his department does not play any role in the transportation process within our province.

Now, I like to believe that there are many good people in the minister's department, and that they are trying to do the job to the best of their ability, but I have to wonder after the minister made statements like this if there is nothing that they can do to affect the transportation industry in our province.

* (1750)

Why then do we have these people employed in these jobs? Why is the minister not taking the options that they would obviously be presenting to the minister and bringing them forward, and is the minister not consulting with the transportation sectors on a regular basis? If he is not having any impact or any effect, then maybe what we need to do is just talk to the individual payroll departments of these various transportation sectors and get the employment levels once a week, instead of having a department sit there and not have their good ideas brought forward.

It is interesting to note, Madam Deputy Speaker, in 1984, there was a discussion that was taking place in the House of Commons, and I would like to read for the benefit of the members here, and we are talking about deregulation and its impact and who was the author of that, or as I would like to say, who was the godfather of deregulation in this country. I think that these comments I am about to read for the record will make it very clear to members opposite who were the godfathers—plural, Madam Deputy Speaker. It says, this is the Honourable Mr.

Mazankowski speaking. Just to set the record straight, I would like to talk about the nine months that we were in office. The Conservative government took at that time the terms of scaling down the regulatory burden and opening up the opportunity for increased competition and innovation through cheaper air fares.

For example, we took steps to relax the restrictions on the licensing of routes with respect to entry and exit. We took action to provide greater flexibility to allow more competition, the key word, the "c" word. We took steps to increase the utilization and the efficiency of the total system. We took a very important step when we relaxed very dramatically the domestic air charters because the regulations have been very restrictive. The country's major air charter company Wardair was really impotent in terms of penetrating the domestic air charter service. We took steps to relax those regulations very dramatically. Then it goes on in the debate, where the honourable member, I believe it is for Winnipeg South Centre, Mr. Axworthy, when he talks about what he did when he was the minister.

He said at the time that the members of the public, who were raising the concerns about what impact deregulation was going to have on us in this country and Mr. Axworthy says, there were times I had to take issue with those who predicted mass chaos in the industry if we attempted reform, airline crashes, labour disputes, airline bankruptcies, loss of small community services. All these were blamed on change, in other words, blamed on deregulation.

What do we see today? We see airline crashes. We see airlines in dispute, employees against employees. We see airlines into bankruptcy. We see small communities put at risk. The very things that were being raised as concerns in the country and in this province were being raised to the government, and yet we see members of the Liberal Party and of the Conservative Party saying what a good thing deregulation is. It is going to have a positive impact for us in this province, and yet there were predictions that were on record as far back as 1984 saying what the pitfalls were going to be.

What we are seeing now, as a result of deregulation, and I refer to a document that was brought forward by the member for Winnipeg Transcona, and it was a document dated June 16, 1992, just before the end of the last session. I will quote from the document, whose author is Ron Lawless, and it states, CN is being impacted by free

trade and deregulation. The emergence of a common perception of these problems and what had to be done about them is essential if we are to succeed. So it is very obvious by those words that deregulation and free trade are having a very serious impact upon CN. It goes on to say that the deficit was going to climb for that particular company and that even the modest growth in volumes of traffic that revenues were going to be flat.

Now these are statements. [interjection] The Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) says that nobody is buying this. Then I guess what he is telling us then is that Mr. Lawless, who was the head of this Crown corporation at that time, does not know what he is talking about. Now this individual was appointed by his federal cousins in Ottawa, so I guess his federal cousins in Ottawa do not know what they are doing by making such an appointment.

He goes on to say further, Madam Deputy Speaker, that there is going to be a reduction of 2,000 employees a year over a five-year period, and we found out that this was further explained by the railway when they announced that this was going to be proceeded with at a much more quicker pace when we heard that they are looking at reducing the work force by 3,500 employees per year over the next three years.

Well, one of the things that I see happening in the country right now is that railways are put into a position—[interjection] If you listen very carefully, I will explain to you what is happening, and I know it is impacting upon your government because your Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has been having to deal with this, and I am sure your cabinet colleagues and you have had discussions about this for a number of months now.

The railways have been put into a position where they are having to compete globally, as you like to talk about, and in North America in general with other Class 1 railways on the North American continent. What they are seeing and what we are seeing now is that the railways are having to harmonize their taxation structure and their operating costs with the American railways to the point where the railways are now coming to us, and I am sure they are coming to you as well, and they are telling us that they want to see an elimination of property taxes, and they want to see an elimination of the fuel tax.

I am sure that each and everyone of us in this room here today and everyone of us in the province

of Manitoba would like to see the elimination of both, but in reality that cannot happen because otherwise there would be a very serious or drastic cut in the services and opportunities for us in our province. Our education and our health programs would probably be the first to suffer. So the railways have been forced into this position of harmonization with the American railways, and now by the policies of the federal Tories and the federal Liberals, supported by this government here today.

Now this problem is coming home to roost with this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). He is now, and the cabinet, going to have to decide whether or not they are going to reduce the taxes for the railways to allow them to harmonize their programs. He is going to have to decide, as well as the other communities and the municipalities in the province, as to whether or not they are going to allow the railways to harmonize their property tax structure and what type of taxes they pay for their properties and their holdings.

So it is going to have a very serious impact, and it is going to be interesting to see how this Minister of Finance and this government are going to handle that problem. Are they going to give the railways what they want to allow them to compete with the American railways, or are they going to let them just flounder on their own after they went and created this problem in the first place?

I was very disappointed to see the lack of a program initiative or any mention of any transportation initiatives in the throne speech. We saw no mention of transportation in the last budget, and now the only thing that this government can talk about in this throne speech is roads and highways.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Transportation is not comprised just of roads and highways in this province. There is a much greater infrastructure that is in place that they seem to be ignoring, and I do not know why they are ignoring it. It seems like they are abandoning it, and there are many thousands of employees who are employed in these industries, as we all know, and they are being left, left out on their own with no government intervention.

The minister does not even make a statement expressing his strong concerns or his strong

reservations about the direction that the federal government is taking or the Crown corporations or the businesses are taking when they lay off these employees. There is no statement, just silence, the stand-aside philosophy.

I have not heard the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Driedger) speak in his debate on the throne speech about what is happening with the Rocket Range at Churchill. He has not made any mention that the community of Churchill has been waiting now for over a year for this provincial government to come forward with the feasibility study funding. The community of Churchill has already raised the \$75,000 for their share which this government said that they were going to share 50-50. So you have not even brought your money forward to move forward with that feasibility study. Are you waiting for that project to die, for Alaska to take the project, or Vandenberg Air Force Base to take the project? Is that what you are waiting for?

The North is dying while you sit there twiddling your thumbs. You have to give them the opportunity. You made a commitment to them that you would match the funding that they raised. They have raised the funding and now you sit there. So I hope that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Driedger) is listening, and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Mr. Stefanson) is listening, because the community is waiting for a decision to be made by your government. The longer you wait, the greater the risk is that we are going to lose that opportunity for Manitoba and for the community of Churchill.

We all know that there are 200-plus jobs at stake, probably 1,000 spin-off support jobs at stake, as well.

* (1800)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am interrupting the member according to the rules. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have 13 minutes remaining.

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

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Wednesday, December 2, 1992

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Petitions

Brandon General Hospital Funding
L. Evans

149 Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation
Maloway; Cummings 158

Restriction of Stubble Burning
Cheema

149 Antisniff Legislation
Hickes; Orchard 159

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Restriction of Stubble Burning
Wasylycia-Leis
Cheema

149 Liquor Control Act
Hickes; Orchard 159

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Report:
Support of Recommendations
Hickes

149 Medicare
Santos; Orchard 160

Condition of Highway 391
Ashton

150 Public Schools Act
Chomiak; Vodrey 160

Introduction of Bills

Bill 2, Endangered Species Amendment Act
Enns

149 Pharmacare
Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard 161

Bill 3, Oil and Gas and Consequential
Amendments Act
Downey

150 **Matter of Privilege**

Bill 4, Retail Businesses Sunday Shopping
(Temporary Amendments) Act
Stefanson

150 Allegations of Conflict of Interest
Ducharme 157

Bill 203, Health Care Records Act
Wasylycia-Leis

150 Ashton 157
Lamoureux 157
Manness 157

Bill 205, Ombudsman Amendment Act
Chomiak

150 **Speaker's Ruling**

Oral Questions

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation
Doer; Cummings; Filmon;
Ashton; Carstairs

150 Tabling of Unsigned Document,
December 2, 1992
Rocan 162

Ozone Depleting Substances Act
Edwards; Cummings

151

151

151 **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

151 **Throne Speech Debate**

(Fourth Day of Debate)

152 Helwer 162
Cerilli 165
Penner 171
Alcock 177
Neufeld 184
Reid 190