



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. 6 - 1:30 p.m., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1992**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

---

<b>NAME</b>	<b>CONSTITUENCY</b>	<b>PARTY</b>
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
MALLOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP
<i>Vacant</i>	Rupertsland	

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, December 3, 1992

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

#### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). It complies with the privileges and practices of the House, and it 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 Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), and

it complies with the rules of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

To the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba

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

The Brandon General Hospital is the major health care institution for southwestern Manitoba; and

The citizens of Brandon and southwestern Manitoba are deeply concerned and disturbed about the downsizing of the hospital and view it as a threat to the quality of health care in the region; and

The Manitoba government has chosen not to review the current budget to ensure that cutbacks to vital services do not occur; and

The administration of the hospital has been forced to take drastic measures, including the elimination of the Palliative Care Unit and Gynecological Wards, along with the layoff of over 30 staff, mainly licensed practical nurses, to cope with a funding shortfall of over \$1.3 million; and

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 funding of the Brandon General Hospital.

\* (1335)

#### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, I am tabling today annual reports for the Department of Justice and The Manitoba Law Foundation.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### Bill 5—The Northern Affairs Amendment Act

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that Bill 5, The Northern Affairs Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les affaires du Nord), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 200—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act**

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), that Bill 200, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

**Motion presented.**

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, we are introducing this legislation to ensure that the protection of children is undertaken throughout an independent body. These amendments will provide that the Children's Advocate report directly to the Legislative Assembly as the Ombudsman does at this point.

The current legislation is unacceptable and may jeopardize the safety of children in Manitoba. Children's Advocates in other provinces have publicly stated that they think it is important that Children's Advocates report to the Legislature rather than to the minister, and we are urging the government to listen to and support our legislation because we feel that it is important that the children's rights in Manitoba be protected in a nonpartisan way. We cannot afford any incident where the government's own interests take precedence over the interests of Manitoba families and children.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 6—The Real Property Amendment Act**

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 6, The Real Property Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 7—The Builders' Liens Amendment Act**

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance

(Mr. Manness), that Bill 7, The Builders' Liens Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le privilège du constructeur), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Introduction of Guests**

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge to my right where we have with us this afternoon Mr. George Henderson, the former MLA for Pembina.

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

Also with us this afternoon, seated in the public gallery, we have, from the Manitoba School for the Deaf, eleven Grade 5 students. They are under the direction of Ms. Ricki Hall. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

Also this afternoon we have sixty Grade 5 students from the St. Andrews School. These students are under the direction of Sandra Mulholland. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar).

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

\* (1340)

### **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

#### **North American Free Trade Agreement Government Position**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions for the First Minister on federal-provincial relations.

Today, the parliamentary committee dealing with trade is hearing presentations from Manitobans on the effect of free trade on Manitoba jobs, on Manitoba opportunities and on Manitobans, period.

In August of 1990, this Premier said he was opposed to free trade with Mexico. Shortly thereafter, when he received a majority vote, he said his bottom line was to support free trade if it met six conditions. That trade agreement was released publicly in August of 1992, and the government minister said he would make the position of the Manitoba government public in three weeks.

In the Speech from the Throne it again says, our bottom line will be determined by the six conditions.

In light of the fact that the committee is meeting today in Manitoba for the last time, and in light of the fact that the Premier has not told us whether it has met their bottom line or not, will the Premier please tell this House and Manitobans how this agreement fits for Manitoba? Is he in favour of it or is he opposed to it? Will he tell the Prime Minister tonight what the position of Manitoba is? He is the last Premier and the only Premier in Canada who has not yet taken a position. Will he take it today in the House?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, we were the first province that put together conditions that we felt were appropriate. I might tell you that those conditions were also ones that were shared, for instance, by Governor Clinton in his election campaign. Several of those conditions were directly the conditions that were contained within our letter to the Prime Minister, I might say.

That was because Manitoba gave, rather than a knee-jerk reaction, as the Leader of the Opposition has given to it, a very thoughtful consideration to it and looked at trade as being an absolute necessity for a province such as Manitoba and a country such as Canada. So we said that when more than 20 percent of our standard of living is dependent upon trade, we have to ensure that trade is fair, that trade is done on a basis that is beneficial to Manitoba and to Canada. We, therefore, did a very thorough analysis and came up with the conditions, which I say as well were very much the conditions that were put forward by Governor Clinton in running for the presidency.

More particularly, Mr. Speaker, we have taken the time to take the proposed agreement to consultation with all sectors of our economy. That is what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) has been doing, going through a very thorough consultation process to determine how that agreement might affect the Manitoba economy, all sectors. In the course of that consultation he has come up with a very comprehensive analysis and a very comprehensive comparison of the terms and conditions vis-a-vis the six conditions that we put forward.

That will be the basis of Manitoba's response. It will not be knee-jerk. It will not be one that is just simply a philosophical response. It will be one

based on what is good for Manitoba, what is good for Canada, what will strengthen our economy, what will help us to overcome the difficulties that we face in the restructuring that is going on throughout the world. That will be the basis upon which he will get a response, a very thorough and considerate response in the future.

\* (1345)

### **Federal Mini Budget Unemployment Insurance Reforms**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** This is the only Premier in Canada who has not taken a position, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely pathetic to watch the government across the way not be able to discuss and debate the benefits and jobs in every sector dealing with Manitoba's economy. It is a disgrace, and this Premier is a disgrace on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, a second question on federal-provincial relations to the Premier. The Premier is meeting with the Prime Minister today. We have a number of issues that are on the federal-provincial agenda for Manitoba. Just yesterday, the heartless federal Conservatives made major cuts in the UIC program in Canada, again, for the second time in the last four years, cuts that have been criticized by women's organizations, by other people who are most vulnerable in our society, and these cuts in UI represent about a \$15-million reduction in Manitoba's potential payments in unemployment insurance.

In light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the social assistance in Manitoba has gone up over \$90 million in two budgets in this province based on the economy of Manitoba and Canada, what impact will these cuts have on Manitobans? Does the Premier support the changes made by the federal government yesterday? What will he be telling the Prime Minister today? Will he oppose those changes or will he support the federal Conservatives?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, we have grave concerns about many aspects of the federal statement. We have grave concerns about the possibility that workers will be unfairly treated by their employers as a result of the judgments that have to be made with respect to the release of employees and whether or not dismissal is unfair and whether or not that disqualifies workers for UIC compensation.

We think that there is great potential for abuse, and we have very grave concerns about how that will work because we believe, above all, the system is supposedly in place to assist workers during a period of misfortune in which they are without a job and also to assist them in retraining for the new opportunities. These changes have the potential to introduce some serious aspects of unfairness that we believe ought to be looked at.

We are also concerned, of course, with the disproportionate allocation of the new additional training funds, the redirected UI training funds that appear to have been done in a fashion that will be very, very unfair to Manitoba. The numbers that we have lead us to conclude that there is absolutely no fairness, and there is no basis of distribution towards our historical portioning that we have received in the past. All of those will be issues that I will raise, obviously, in my discussion later today.

### Infrastructure Renewal

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, we wish the Conservative Premier well with the Conservative Prime Minister on these changes. They are horrible for the most vulnerable people in our society, and I am pleased we share that assessment in terms of Manitobans.

A final question to the Premier. He mentioned training quite accurately in this proposal, but there are also some real deficiencies in the statement from the federal government on infrastructure programs. In fact, only two provinces in Canada were not mentioned in specific infrastructure proposals.

We were led to believe in many statements the government has made in the past that we could look with optimism to some of the announcements made by the Finance minister yesterday. There are projects for Newfoundland, Northwest Territories, the Yukon, British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, Quebec, many projects for Quebec in terms of infrastructure renewal. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have been mentioned specifically in the proposals from the federal government, and Manitoba was not mentioned.

I would ask the Premier why was Manitoba not mentioned? Why were not the very crucial infrastructure proposals that we had on the table not referenced yesterday, projects like the Core Area III

program, which are both training and infrastructure programs, projects such as some of the highway programs that we were talking about, other projects for our infrastructure in Manitoba? Why was Manitoba left out of the references from the federal government and what will the Premier be telling the Prime Minister about this slight in terms of specific proposals for the people of Manitoba and for jobs in this province?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. There is no doubt in my mind that the statement that was put forth by the federal Minister of Finance has a huge gap and a huge hole when it comes to addressing Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

If you look at the list under transportation infrastructure, the statement mentions \$125 million to upgrade federally owned Champlain-Cartier bridges in Montreal, federal investments in the Port of Montreal, co-operative funding with Quebec on highway projects, \$40 million for the Alaska Highway which serves Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, new runways for airports in Vancouver and Toronto, \$90 million for roads in Alberta, British Columbia national parks, \$200 million for the Trans-Canada Highway from New Brunswick to Nova Scotia, \$800 million to \$900 million for the Prince Edward Island fixed link.

You can imagine our outrage, Mr. Speaker, when the very basis upon which the National Highways Program was developed was put together by a committee chaired by the Manitoba Deputy Minister of Highways and Transportation. That was the basis upon which the Prime Minister announced his support for a National Highways Program and then, when that program is announced publicly, to leave Manitoba out entirely of the program is an outrage and a disgrace. You can better believe that that is a topic that I will be talking to the Prime Minister about.

\* (1350)

### Crow Benefit Government Position

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, there is more than one disgrace in this statement by Mazankowski. Farmers in Manitoba and this opposition were literally outraged and shocked by the decision that was made by the federal minister with regard to the Crow and by this minister's

laissez-faire apologetic response to what the federal minister did.

Now, I say, this is who we have standing up for the farmers in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, this minister right here. First he buys into the federal government's position that the GATT is an excuse to get rid of the Crow. Then he refuses to stand up with Saskatchewan when they say they will not negotiate changes to the Crow without consultation with all the farmers, and now this response.

I want to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, why he will not stand up for the farmers of Manitoba against the federal government, why he will not stand up and fight. Can he tell us how much this is going to cost every farmer in Manitoba?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, there is no question we are gravely concerned about what the announcement said, very disappointed that the WGTA was attacked in this direction. We have been in negotiation and discussion about how to deal with maintaining the benefits of the Crow in western Canada, and I want you to know that if the member reads the document that he tabled in this House the other day on page 3, second last bullet, he will see the words "in perpetuity" in that document, put in by this Minister of Agriculture from Manitoba. "That we maintain it in perpetuity."

A year ago in 1991, the option of phase-out, no compensation which the federal government had on the table, we had it removed from the table. So we have fought long and hard to maintain this benefit in western Canada, Mr. Speaker.

I am astounded and shocked, because it was never discussed at any time that I was there, that the federal government would take this action with this payment for western Canadian farmers. I was also concerned that the safety nets might be attacked in this budget approach. I am very pleased to see that GRIP, NISA, cash advances and crop insurance were not affected at all, so western Canadian farmers are still protected by the safety nets, thank goodness. We will be meeting very soon to deal with the other issue of the impact of removal of the Crow benefit, 10 percent each in the next two budgets.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the federal minister last night about that, and the meeting is set for mid-January.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, now this Tory minister is reduced to saying that he is thankful that the federal Tories did not break their agreements with this government, with this province, that they did not break their federal-provincial agreements.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister now agree that his laid-back position on this issue is playing into the federal agenda, and his failure to stand up with Saskatchewan against this proposal has weakened the western position and played right into the federal government's game plan of divide and conquer the western provinces? Is that not what he has done?

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Speaker, I refuse to accept that knee-jerk reaction from that member who does not consult with the farmers in this province. We have consulted on a continuous basis as I told him the other day, most recently with representatives of 30 farm organizations. We discussed the issues at hand and how to deal with them.

I want to remind him, it was this minister, this province that put the words "in perpetuity" back into an agreement, where there was an attempt to take it out. It was not Saskatchewan, it was not Alberta, it was not Ontario or any other province in this country. It was this province. We consult on a continuous basis because we face some very serious challenges. Over the years, all the costs in the system get passed back to the farm gate, greater and greater costs at the farm gates.

\* (1355)

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind that member, he was in the government in 1983 when the WGTA was put in place that made the farmers pay the first 6 percent on inflation forever and a day. So the benefit of the Crow benefit is decreased in half because actions his government took in 1983 did not stand up for the western Canadian farmers in the WGTA act.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, we now protest in this House \$1,000 per farmer, and this is what this minister is doing, \$1,000 per farmer and he is doing nothing.

I want to ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) now, because he is meeting with the Prime Minister today, whether he will now admit that this is a fundamental breach of trust, a sacred trust, for western Canada and will he stand up and fight and let the Prime Minister know that he will not tolerate this attack on western Canada.

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Speaker, you talk about breach of trust, that member sat in the cabinet that took away half the Crow benefit, took it away forever and a day, and we are back at the table trying to fight to get it restored. He took away half of it. If he says this costs \$1,000 per farm gate, he took away \$2,500 per farm gate, and I would like to hear him answer how he did not stand up for western Canadian farmers in 1983 when the benefit was basically destroyed.

### Federal Mini Budget Minister's Position

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat heartened by the comments that the Premier has made in this House, and I share his very grave concerns about this decision that was announced yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure program nationally is less than a quarter of the money that is being taken away from the unemployed in this country, and I think that is a disgrace. I was surprised to hear over and over again on the radio last night the support offered for this program by our Finance minister, when he talked about how it was very consistent with his own plans and he thought it was an excellent tonic for this country. I would like to ask him, does he share the grave concerns that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, most definitely, but let me say to the member who likes to take, of course, comments out of context and build upon them, the themes that I was talking about were very specifically on the tax side. I was talking about, for instance, that the federal government was following along some of the budgetary decisions that we had brought forward in our budget a year ago, specifically, a mining tax holiday, which, of course, has put Manitoba back on the map after the decimation put on by mining policy and taxation policies by the members across the way.

So when I see the federal government bring down a taxation measure which mirrors one that we put in a year ago, and, Mr. Speaker, I also notice a 10 percent tax credit dividend on the purchase of new equipment, I say that mirrors our measure with respect to a 10 percent offset against tax payable for the purchase of new equipment. Those measures are keeping with the general themes of this government. If the member wants to confuse

that with the whole unemployment insurance, I say he is doing a disservice to the listeners. He is doing a disservice to the members of this House because that is basically an untruth.

### Impact on Employment

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I think this Finance minister is doing a disservice to this province by toadying to the federal Finance minister.

The total job creation and the infrastructure program amounts to less than half the job layoffs announced by CN. I would like to ask the Finance minister, who likes to pull out projections, what is his projection of net job loss in this province as a result of those two decisions?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, we are in no position at this point in time to provide that answer, and the member knows it. He knows very well that we just have had access to the documents as presented. He knows that we do not have the potential to analyze and give him that specific number. He knows that without even having to ask the question, but let me say in his attempt to create mischief, we recognize that there are significant changes that are undergoing in the economy.

The province of Manitoba is not immune to those structural changes and not one person in this House likes to see the impact. He talks about what might be the fallout from CN decisions. None of us likes to see that, but the reality is those decisions are being made in corporate boardrooms outside of the cabinet of the Province of Manitoba. Let me say to the member, he can try and make it appear like we are responsible for all of it, but the fact is the people in the province of Manitoba are not going to buy that argument.

\* (1400)

### Impact on Social Assistance

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** I do agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Finance minister does not know what is going on. I would ask him though to try to project one other thing, because his department does look at UI programs. They do look at the impact of federal decisions on this province. They do have a large branch that does analysis. Given the changes in UI and given the belief that this will put more people on welfare, and given the lack of any job creation in this budget for this province, what

is the net impact on our social assistance budgets in this province?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question in an absolute or a quantifiable sense. I do acknowledge that there is going to be a negative impact, unmeasurable at this time, a negative impact on the welfare rolls and, indeed, the amount that we are going to have to spend within that area. I fully acknowledge that.

The reality, with respect to some of the cautious remarks that I had made yesterday, was certainly more on the infrastructure side. It was obvious that we could see the absence of the mention of Manitoba. We also recognize that the Prime Minister is in Winnipeg today, and one would hope that there might be a further announcement coming. That is my cautious—by the way, Mr. Speaker, the statement was read almost 24 hours ago, at which time I made my early comments. An awful lot has been found out since that point in time.

### **Labour Force Development Government Position**

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** Mr. Speaker, for almost two years, while thousands of Manitobans lost their jobs, this government did absolutely nothing to create a plan for labour force development and training.

Over the past summer, some first steps were taken with labour and education groups to establish a fully representative Labour Force Development Board to address the very urgent and serious issues of training which face Manitobans.

I would like to ask the Minister of Education: Will the minister explain to the House why she has suddenly and unilaterally rejected this co-operative process?

**Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that my department has been working towards, on behalf of our government, is the signing of a Canada-Manitoba Labour Force Development Agreement. With the signing of that agreement, then we look to further our strategies within Manitoba for labour market development. In the signing of that agreement, we have been making it very clear that we will sign it when that agreement benefits Manitobans.

**Ms. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, could the minister explain why the reversal of her decision and an announcement of a so-called, made-in-Manitoba Labour Force Development Agreement involved no consultation with her two most significant partners, labour and education? Could she explain to us how this will contribute to the co-operative spirit necessary for Manitoba's economic future?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Speaker, the member has obviously misunderstood. The important point is that Manitoba has been striving to reach an agreement with Canada in order to shape the Canada-Manitoba Labour Force Development Agreement to suit the needs of Manitobans, to not simply respond to a unilateral agreement and a unilateral mechanism which has been suggested in the first place. When Manitoba does sign that agreement, we certainly look for consultations with Manitobans in the development of our labour market strategy.

**Ms. Friesen:** Sign here on the dotted line, Mr. Speaker.

Will the minister confirm that what she in fact will be proposing is not a made-in-Manitoba solution but a made-in-Quebec approach, where business appoints its own delegates, the government is represented by its own business appointees and groups such as education, vital to any training program in any province, are simply dismissed from the table, because that is what is happening here?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Speaker, absolutely not. I will not confirm that, because that is simply not true.

What the member has referenced, however, is that provinces have designed agreements to suit their particular needs as a province. Manitoba will be signing an agreement that meets the needs of Manitobans.

### **Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Agents' Fees**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question either for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) or the minister responsible for Autopac.

Yesterday, in this House, the Minister of Finance confirmed that the cabinet did discuss the request of the insurance agents' lobby to force MPIC to withdraw its plan to limit the commissions paid to insurance brokers, which would have saved insured drivers and owners around a million dollars per year.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: Why did the cabinet give a benefit of about \$2,500 to each of the 400 Autopac agents in Manitoba, forcing rates up by about \$100 on average for every motorist in this province?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act):** Mr. Speaker, I explained this yesterday. I am sorry the member for Brandon East was not listening, either that or chose to ignore the statement that I made to him about the fact that this requires a regulatory change. We saw the regulatory change at a time when the Autopac 2000 negotiations are going on between the corporation and the representatives across the province through the agents, an opportunity for them to conclude those negotiations because an entirely new package will be in place with the implementation of Autopac 2000.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** The minister really did not answer the question, but I would ask the minister: Did the cabinet or the minister responsible for Autopac receive a formal request from the Insurance Brokers Association of Manitoba? Would the minister tell the House and tell the people of Manitoba: How was this transmitted to the government? Did you get a letter? Did you have a delegation? Did a group come to see the cabinet? What was the means of communication with the cabinet? If you have a document, would you table it in this House?

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Brandon East has put his question. I believe he is waiting for his answer.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is a requirement under the act that discussion was as a result of what would have been required by way of a regulatory change.

In terms of whether or not I was lobbied or whether I was approached, I received some—actually, a fairly minor amount of lobbying and did not have any formal meetings with the association or any of that type of contact. The concern that we raised is as I described. When you are in the middle of a negotiation process that will develop an entirely new compensation package, then that process should be seen through to completion.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Well, the people of Manitoba still do not know how this lobbying took place, Mr. Speaker.

My last question to the minister, and I ask this in view of his statements of not wanting to interfere with the process of the Public Utilities Board. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Manitoba want to know in view of those statements, why did the cabinet simply not allow the Public Utilities Board to deal with the original application limiting agency fees instead of forcing MPIC to change it by increasing its loss estimates? In other words, why did the government politically interfere with the public utility process in this province?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Board dealt with the application in front of it. Nothing on my part or any actions by this government interfered with that process. The corporation has been able to deal with the rate application that it had in front of them without making changes and without going back to the Public Utilities Board.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, what he is saying is that he wants to turn over any regulatory capacity to the Public Utilities Board.

\* (1410)

### RRAP Funding Reduction

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst).

There is a very good federal program called the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program, of which I am sure the minister is aware. It provides grants and loans to low-income families in order that they can upgrade and improve the homes which they live in. It also provides older, more established communities the hope to revitalize and improve the neighbourhood and the surroundings. Last year, the federal government cut the program by 21 percent. Now it is being rumoured that the program is going to be cut by 29 percent.

My question to the Minister of Housing is: Has the minister contacted the federal Minister of Housing to protest the reduced level of support for this program, and if not, will he now contact him and demand that there be no further cuts to this important and very beneficial program to the province of Manitoba?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing):** Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program is delivered in the city of Winnipeg by the City of Winnipeg in direct contract with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and in rural Manitoba is delivered by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Manitoba Housing does not deliver that program.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** One might want to digest that and come across that the Minister of Housing does not necessarily know what the program is all about. What I am trying to get at here is that the Province of Quebec and the federal government entered into an agreement that enhanced the program, that Manitoba, in particular rural Manitoba, has not had any real benefit from this program, an area which I would have thought the government would be somewhat sensitive to.

My question to the Minister of Housing is: Will the Minister of Housing take the initiative and make his federal counterpart sit down and come to an agreement, much like the Province of Quebec has done, and do something in the economy and help the housing stock in the province of Manitoba?

**Mr. Ernst:** Mr. Speaker, in the last federal budget, there was a 3 percent cap placed on CMHC expenditures, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation expenditures. That 3 percent cap meant, over 1992, a 22 percent decrease in funding available to the nonprofit housing corporation and all the programs associated under that program, and will result in 1993 in another 36 percent decrease.

All housing corporations across the country have been significantly impacted by these reductions in Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation funding. Mr. Speaker, we are desperately trying to at least continue to provide for low-income Manitobans an opportunity for social housing, and we are devoting our resources principally in that area.

### **RRAP Funding Reduction**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, he is the Minister of Housing, and he is doing nothing, absolutely. That is sad.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is, later on this evening, he is going to be having supper with his federal counterpart, the Prime Minister of Canada. Will the Premier at least bring up this particular program while he is having supper with

the Prime Minister and get some sort of an agreement, because we know the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) is doing absolutely nothing?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** I thank the member for his advice.

### **Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Public Utilities Board Application**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, we are not sure whether we heard the minister correctly on this side of the House in reference to the process of using the PUB to bring forward a nonpolitical decision in this matter. The record is clear, and I would refer the minister to page 3 of the Public Utilities Board document, order No. 174-92, a specific reference to the fact that MPIC had to change its application, because they learned that the request of the government to amend regulations under The MPIC Act had not been approved.

Surely, would this minister not agree that if they wanted to remain true to their promise to not politically interfere that this government would have allowed the PUB to deal with the matter? The PUB would have made a decision—let us say it said yes—then the cabinet would have to pass the necessary Orders-in-Council.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act):** Mr. Speaker, the PUB and the MPIC process that they have gone through in front of the PUB—they did not alter their application. The PUB, as I recall that, has asked them as to how they would respond, and it has not cost the motoring public of this province in the changing of the rates, and that is what the PUB order was to approve, the rates of the corporation.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Again, I would urge the minister to read this page 3.

My question is: Why would the minister, if he had these concerns, not make that position well known in June, or before June, before they made the first application to the board? Subsequently the MPIC got the message.

I read, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking why is—could the minister confirm this? During the course of the hearing the corporation increased the \$5.8-million loss estimate to \$7.8 million when it learned a proposal to amend the regulations under The

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act to limit premium taxes and brokerage commissions had not been approved by the government. Would the minister confirm that?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, the corporation will not be increasing its deficit; it will be increasing its ability to manage its affairs to account for any kind of saving such as that, and there was no increase passed on to the motoring public.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask this minister then, the bottom line is, how can this government, and how can this minister, sit there very complacently and justify a \$2,500 bonus, a Christmas gift for the insurance agents of this province, while at the same time forcing excessive rate increases onto the driving motorists of Manitoba?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, the member is making bizarre allegations. The brokers' compensation package is being renegotiated right now. This is the third time I have had to point this out to the member. In that process, as we move through to the Autopac 2000 process, why would you all of a sudden abort any kind of negotiation such as that in the middle of the process when you were in fact bringing forward a new compensation package? That is exactly what happened.

### Telecommunications Industry Deregulation

**Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, deregulation of the airline industry has cost Manitoba over 200 jobs, and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Driedger) has admitted that deregulation of this industry has been a disaster.

Before the last election, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) himself opposed deregulation of the telecommunication sector when he correctly pointed out that subscriber rates would increase if long-distance rates for large businesses were lowered, which is exactly what is going to be happening under deregulation.

Yesterday, it was announced that 45 workers at Northern Telecom were laid off. Why has this Premier caved in and broken his promise to oppose deregulation? Has he learned nothing about the job losses in the telecommunication sector? [interjection]

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** I think the member should know that it is impolite to clap for his own question.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that there was a Supreme Court decision that established that the responsibility for telecommunications rests clearly with the federal government. We, I might say, negotiated with the federal government a Memorandum of Understanding that will see Manitoba representation on the panels that have jurisdiction over decisions that affect telecommunications in Manitoba.

I might tell you, from my discussions with my colleague in Saskatchewan, that that is an agreement that they would like to have with the federal government. They believe that it is a model that they ought to have in order to protect their interests in telecommunications, and they find great favour in having such a Memorandum of Understanding, Mr. Speaker.

So I think he should perhaps talk with his colleagues in Saskatchewan to see what they feel about that particular issue.

### Sears Canada Telemarketing Site

**Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my next question is also for the Premier.

Why did Sears Canada last week announce that they decided to locate their telemarketing centre in Saskatchewan, which is still deregulated? Why did this minister lose these 900 potential jobs?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, one of the key features in terms of comparative costs was the payroll tax in Manitoba which had been imposed by the New Democratic government.

\* (1420)

### Telecommunications Industry Deregulation

**Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk):** In view of the obvious failures of deregulation, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier reconsider his position on deregulation before more jobs are lost in this province?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, the Supreme Court has ruled that telecommunications comes under—[interjection] I will let the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak

respond to the question since he has all the answers.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Time for Oral Questions has expired.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**  
**THRONE SPEECH DEBATE**  
**(Fifth 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 Transcona, who has 13 minutes remaining.

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to continue my remarks from where I left off yesterday, where I was discussing the government's failure, total and absolute failure, when dealing with transportation-related issues. I was talking in specific about the Port of Churchill and the rail line to that port.

We have, Mr. Speaker, been watching this issue very closely because of the potential impact that it will have on the northern part of our province. We had made recommendations to the federal minister earlier this year with respect to the rail line to the port and how we could upgrade that line on a permanent basis by way of a four-way partnership.

Our concern on this side of the House because of the complete lack of action on the part of this government—and I talk specifically about programs where they had agreed to make equal investments with the community of Churchill, at least to do a feasibility study for the rocket range which would have given economic stimulus to that community. [interjection]

I see, Mr. Speaker, that the space cadet on the other side there, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), as he likes to refer to others in this House, is chirping from his seat. Of course, if he had taken action on this issue, we would not have to be discussing it over and over in the House here.

What we had proposed, Mr. Speaker, and what this Minister of Transportation (Mr. Driedger) and his government are going to have to face, I believe, in

the very near future is the very real likelihood that his government is going to have to make a decision on whether or not they are going to have to pick up the costs to maintain and operate the rail line into the northern part of our province. I say that based on the information that we have seen come forward by way of Directions: The Final Report of The Royal Commission on National Passenger Transportation. It made several key recommendations in that report that will affect negatively the province of Manitoba and in effect put pressure on this government to look at what few options they have to keep the rail service to the northern part of the province and in turn could put in jeopardy that rocket range reactivation.

I refer specifically, Mr. Speaker, to the fact, and I will quote from the document itself, that any railway company be allowed to abandon any amount of track without limit. I have not heard the Minister of Transportation, in the comments that he has made on his debate on the throne speech, make any reference to this document whatsoever. It is unfortunate. I know the minister should have a copy of this document by now, and this will have a great deal of bearing upon us in this province.

It goes on to further reference that, and I quote: Any subsidized remote access service, regardless of the mode, be designated to take passengers out to and bring them in from the closest convenient point where a transfer can be made to a commercial unsubsidized carrier. This, in turn, Mr. Speaker, will force Via Rail, who now services the northern part of our province on a reduced schedule, to look at—if these recommendations are accepted by the federal government and are not fought by this provincial government—only having a subsidized service for the portion where there are no other unsubsidized modes available to pick up passengers and to bring passengers to that point.

In other words, the closest roadway where there may be a bus service could be the part. If there is a bus service that goes to the community of Gillam and the railway runs to that point the subsidized section will most likely remain from Gillam to Churchill, being the only part that does not have a road system in our province.

What position, then, is the minister going to take if Via Rail says that they cannot economically afford to maintain that type of service and apply for abandonment of that service to the northern part of our province? Is this minister then going to fight the

federal government once Via decides they want to abandon this service?

We already know that CN is pulling its equipment out and is looking for long-term storage for the boxcars that they had been using to the port. What happens then if CN pulls out? Is this government then going to be faced with the option of having to abandon the rail line outright and the service to the communities along the way, or is this minister and his government going to take over operation of that rail line at great cost to the taxpayers of this province?

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we put forward our proposal earlier this year to the federal Minister of Transport, something that this Minister of Transportation for Manitoba thought was a bad idea. Yet he is going to have to make the decision somewhere down the road of what options are facing him, probably at great expense to the taxpayer.

Yesterday, I was talking about the rocket range and the \$75,000 matching of funding that this government was supposed to do. I know the minister across the way probably does not understand the concept of what this means to northern Manitoba. He probably spends very little time out of his office, never mind visiting the northern part of our province. If he took the time to go and see what impact this is going to have on the community, I am sure he would understand a bit better what is facing these people in the future.

I suggest that he take the opportunity to travel up to Churchill and the communities along the way and talk to the people there. [interjection] Yes, you flew up. There is no doubt you probably flew up and flew out in the same day. Have you ever taken the train to Churchill? No. Why not? It is part of the service. Why have you always flown everywhere in the province? Why do you not try the train? Why do you not try the bus? I recommend it.

There is a road up to Gillam and you could take the train from there; the bus to Gillam and then take the train up to Churchill. Why do you not try the train service? Take a trip up there. You might enjoy it. Maybe we can encourage some increased tourism for the northern part of the province as well.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government in their throne speech highlights indicate that there is supposed to be a review of the National Highways Program, and I am

still waiting for the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) to give us an indication of what programs we can expect for the province of Manitoba. It is my understanding that we were looking forward to having in the range of \$25 million to \$30 million investment in the Highways Program for our province.

Is the minister meeting with one his federal counterparts? Is there going to be some investment in the highways infrastructure of our province so that we can create those jobs? The minister has been silent on this. He keeps saying that he is spearheading these efforts, but I have not seen any results yet. The Lockport bridge is another good example. First we have an agreement, then we do not have an agreement. Who is penalized by this? The residents of the community of Lockport and the surrounding area.

\* (1430)

I hope that when the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is meeting with the Prime Minister today he reinforces Manitoba's position on this, that we want them to take some serious action to keep that bridge open and to invest the monies into it to make sure that it is safe for the future. Do not just put an advertisement in the paper saying, ah, the bridge is closed; we are not going to worry about it.

It says in the throne speech highlights, Mr. Speaker, that this government will work for federal government support for Churchill, and that is why I referenced yesterday and again at the beginning of my comments here today that it is more than just the federal government's responsibility for the communities in the province, that this government has to take an active role in participation in the support for Churchill and the community.

We have to take an active role in transportation in general in this province, something which we have not done in this province for several years now, obviously, because I referenced in my earlier comments yesterday, in the last throne speech there was no reference to transportation-related issues. In this throne speech there is no reference to transportation-related issues other than highways and roads. Well, highways and roads are not the only part of transportation in the province. We have to take an active role seeking programs of investment for the province of Manitoba. I hope that the minister's department is working on some programs that will lend support for transportation in our province, because we have much at risk.

The minister has not made any reference whatsoever to why his government withdrew the so-called or the reported \$25-million funding that was in place for Canadian Airlines. Why was that funding withdrawn? Why is this government not coming forward with another program? Why are there no strategies to deal with transportation-related issues in this province, like the airline crisis that we are in right now?

There is no reference to the difficulties with the crises that are facing transportation in this province. The minister's office sits mum, no plan of action, no ideas. [interjection] No interest, as the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) says. Very apparent. You think transportation is not a serious issue in the province. You have your highway through Portage la Prairie. You think there may be some federal money coming to upgrade that program for you, and you are okay in your community. So, in other words, I am okay in Portage la Prairie, but I do not care about anywhere else in the province. I do not care that I have 2,000 railway employees in my community who are facing layoff and the pending closure of this. You are not worried about the thousands of airline employees in the province. You are not worried about the trucking industries.

When I first came into this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, the minister used to say proudly that we had nine of 14 Canadian trucking firms headquartered in this province. Now we have seven of 11. What is that saying for transportation?

I reviewed my notes from the last session when I was up speaking on transportation-related issues. They are the same issues facing us now as were facing us then. I have seen no progress in this area. Airlines were facing open skies. That is a program that is still on and being discussed, maybe on the back burner now, but nevertheless still being discussed. Foreign takeovers and buyouts are still an issue. Railway downsizing and rationalization, the railways are talking about harmonizing their taxes, fuel and property, with the United States—the same issue. Layoffs are still facing us in every sector of the transportation industry, and bankruptcies. I see no action by this government to rectify those problems. They seem intent to sit idly by and let the market dictate what is going to happen to us.

I think we have some good people in the Department of Highways and Transportation. I

think they probably have some good ideas that can be brought forward to help us move out of the doldrums that we are in, out of the recession that we are in. I hope the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) will accept those ideas and bring some of those initiatives forward, because I think Manitoba needs those ideas to be put into practice, and I hope that—while the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) likes to sit there and say that my comments are irrelevant, I have seen, as we have witnessed here today during Question Period, his irrelevance in dealing with the method of payment for the producers in this province here and what effect that is going to have on the producers. He is taking no action to protect the producers or the railway jobs in this province. I guess there obviously is no interest in what is taking place.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I see my time has expired. I thank you for the opportunity. I hope that this government will listen to the comments that have been made and will take some action to resolve the issues that are facing us here and not just sit idly by while others make those decisions for us. Thank you very much.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to participate once again in support of a throne speech that really deserves the support of all members of this Chamber. If honourable members opposite really thought about it, and if they really were prepared to come to terms with the seriousness of the situation that the people of Manitoba, the people of Canada face in these times, they would break from tradition, they would break from that reactionary knee-jerk opposition and support this throne speech and vote for it. However, having been around for a while, I recognize that tradition likely will not be broken, and they will do their thing as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to express my pleasure in seeing yourself ensconced in that responsible chair that you occupy as chief custodian, steward, magistrate of this Assembly in trying to keep order. I welcome my new colleague certainly from Portage la Prairie along with the return of the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray). I offer my congratulations to the table officers, some of the new ones who have joined us. I am always pleased to note the new group of Pages who come to serve us, particularly when I have the privilege of having, I believe, one, perhaps even two of them from the

grand constituency of Lakeside. I take their presence in the Chamber very seriously because they, of course, will be watching the members. They might be reporting back home, not just to their parents, but to the neighbours about the participation and the actions of their member. I certainly welcome them, and it is one of the great traditions of this Chamber that these young people are chosen to spend some time with us.

I take this moment to explain to the honourable Pages that we have with us, as I often do to the school children and people who come to visit us in the gallery, who sometimes walk away, you know, perplexed, disappointed at the lack of decorum, at the kind of shouting that goes on sometimes, the fact that we are not always listening to each other, but, Mr. Speaker, as you know this is what parliament is all about. This is what a free and open society is all about, and we talk and we talk and we talk and we try to talk out our problems. We try to reach consensus.

There are so many parts of the world where they do not take that time to talk. It is not a very efficient way of solving problems, but, surely, we all recognize how much more preferable it is to the ways in far too many parts of the world where other solutions to problem solving take place. We see that on our television sets. We see that in so many different parts of the world and the dire consequences from that.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope to talk principally about the affairs of the natural resources in the province of Manitoba and the fact that I am very pleased that I continue to have the privilege of being the Minister of Natural Resources in this province. I say that very genuinely. I count every day a blessing having responsibility in this particular sphere of government activity.

I understand the kind of ongoing tremendous challenges and problems that some of my colleagues have in other portfolios, Family Services, that have to deal with so many of the difficulties of our complex, modern society. Their table, their fare is a daily recitation of trying to resolve these issues, some of the failures of our society, some of the deep-seated and not easy solvable problems that, for instance, the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) or the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) or the challenge that the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) have. I have, and I am very much aware of it, the opportunity of travelling

through this country, seeing so much of our beautiful natural resources, whether it is in our forests, whether it is in our lakes and rivers, and dealing with the kind of people that I deal with.

\* (1440)

I get a little sneaky every once in a while about how I try to protect those natural resources by putting up a little decoy called Fluffy. Fluffy has been very active, Mr. Speaker, in the last little while. I will not go into all of the activities of Fluffy. I am going to ask my colleague the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render) who, in the last year, has proved and shown her skill at authoring of books and novels; I am seriously thinking of asking her to begin writing a book, *The Legend of Fluffy*, and it is pursuing those evil poachers of our wildlife and showing no fear or favour, whether it is—well, I better not say anything. Just leave it at that.

But, Mr. Speaker, before I get on to Natural Resources, it is one of the advantages, of course, in getting to speak midway through the debate or towards the latter part of the debate that you are not immune to some of the other participations in the debate, and I have one or two general comments about the tenor of the debate so far.

I am, I suppose, surprised, because it is evident that my friends opposite of the official opposition simply are proving that—well, it has often been said of Conservatives, perhaps with some accuracy, that in the past, and some will even say that the very name implies that, we were the ones reluctant to change, reluctant to acknowledge the need for change. We wished to hold on to tradition; we wanted to keep riding buggies even when the automobile was upon us, and so forth.

But, in fact, what we are seeing now is new for the '90s. It is our socialist friends, the New Democrats, who are supposed to be the new thinkers, who are the reactionaries, who are the conservatives, who cannot see change for change coming at them. They want to believe that they can hunker down this country, erect trade barriers, and they can keep flying planes when there are no passengers, keep running trains when there is no freight or passengers. That is what they still believe they can do.

Mr. Speaker, change is always uncomfortable. Change is always disturbing, and I would be the first one to acknowledge that change brings about a great deal of anxiety, a great deal of real hurt.

Who would have thought five years ago that thousands of people would be looking at layoff notices in the aircraft industry, at Air Canada or CP Air? I mean, next to working for the government, Air Canada was the next best thing or even better. You got to move around a little bit more.

That is what is happening in the world. That is not just happening with our airlines. That is not just happening with American airlines. That is happening with European airlines; that is happening around the globe. It is that kind of change, that kind of competition that honourable members fail to grasp. Then, when you get a contribution like we did yesterday afternoon from the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), just the one example that she used, the concern that a Safeway store in Transcona was arbitrarily choosing for its economic reasons to move somewhere else.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what was she implying? She wants the government to run the grocery stores? She wants some central bureaucracy, either Winnipeg or Ottawa, to decide where, when, how stores or any other of those kinds of goods and services, where they should be. That is what she implied.

Even 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker, I was in this House when we had an honourable member who thought the kind of dogmatic socialism-communism practised in the Soviet Union was far too mild. He was a Marxist.

**An Honourable Member:** Who was he?

**Mr. Enns:** The honourable member for Crescentwood, I believe, he was, who still is, I believe, the chief of Economics at the University of Manitoba, Mr. Cy Gonick, teaching our young people. He professed in this House as being a Marxist, but he wanted central planning of a far greater scale.

In those days when it was not that easy to penetrate the Iron Curtain because of censorship, because of thought control, because of police control, they actually managed to get away with it for a period of time. We did not see those tragic faces of the children in Romanian orphanages that we now see. We did not see the total failure of the economy that we now see—and they admit and are being openly debated in their parliaments. No. Our people were ferried across and shown very supervised model farms. We were shown model agricultural production units. We were not shown,

and we did not come back with reports, about how serious the collapse, how serious the criminal responsibility for 40, 50, 60, 70 years of that kind of central planning, that kind of central bureaucratic control. I will even leave away, Mr. Speaker, we are not in the Cold War anymore. I will not call them pinkos. I will not call them commies. I will just call them what it was. It was centralized planning that led to that disaster.

I would think that honourable members opposite, I would like to think that my Liberal friends are not even thinking in those terms, but when I hear the member from Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) talking about the social injustice, talking about the fact that you cannot have true economic development unless a bureaucracy determines where a grocery store will or will not be, then, Mr. Speaker, we really have not advanced very far.

That is why in the main, as much as they will try—and I do not fault the opposition—obviously, we have made economic issues the central issue of this Legislature of our government at this particular time. The federal government has made it. So they have to attack us on the economic front, but surprisingly it lacks a kind of a foundation. It lacks integrity, because to the people back home even it does not make sense anymore. It may have made sense, and maybe it still makes tragically some sense in a union hall sometime, but it does not make sense to the broad spectrum of Manitobans anymore because they are really caught in that Catch 22 situation.

Raising taxes is no longer a solution. In fact, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) will report, and has reported on occasion, that raising taxes now has become counterproductive. I do not know how much more the provincial revenue will be on tobacco tax. I suspect it will be \$4 million or \$5 million dollars, partly because we have raised taxes to such a level that we have encouraged the illicit trade in tobacco, and partly we have raised spirit taxes to such a level that we encourage cross-border shopping.

I appreciate that we are taking some steps to recover and recoup some of those lost taxes, but the simple fact of the matter is that it is not returning more money to the treasury.

Mr. Speaker, we all are residents within our local municipalities, within our cities and towns, and we know what the election was all about here in the city of Winnipeg, our principal city—taxation. What was

the one promise that likely elected the new mayor, Her Worship Mayor Susan Thompson? No tax increases. So that option is not there.

When honourable members opposite speak to us about the solution to our economic problems, they touch no chord with the general public when they talk about potential or optional tax increases. In fact, you notice how they shy away from that because they realize that is like a plague, yet they talk to us constantly about more and more government intervention. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is their problem.

\*(1450)

I am delighted that we have had the courage to date, and once again with a document that is currently under discussion, this throne speech, we certainly will be making some errors in judgment, some mistakes. That is the fallibility of man. Pardon me. That is not a politically correct word and if the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) were in the Chamber, she would be calling me to order.

That is the—I was going to say the human condition, but I cannot say that either, because that is a person condition that simply exists, but I am extremely proud to be associated with a government that has the conviction to believe in the set of principles that they have set for themselves, and those are all included in this throne speech that we are debating here today.

Mr. Speaker, having said that and having the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) who has 101 things on his mind in his chair, I have said so publicly before and I will say so again, I would certainly be a happier camper, if you like, if economic conditions were such, provincial revenues were such, that would enable departments like mine to share in some increased revenues. It is, I think, a given that every minister of this cabinet would want to do the same.

I have specific reasons to say that, because I see in the Department of Natural Resources and its mandate a great number of things that could and should be done. I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the challenge of tighter budgetary times has made us and forced us to seek out more partners, more innovative ways of doing things. Let me refer to just a few of them.

One of the most rewarding programs that the province is engaged in, in the field of Natural Resources, is in our ongoing commitment to the

improving of the natural habitat for waterfowl in the southwest portion of the province, particularly under that program, the North American Waterfowl Management Plan. Mr. Speaker, it is a program that the department has been able to carry on, this government has been able to carry on, where we are targeting upwards to a half a million acres, marginal acres that perhaps, particularly in today's economy and today's grain economy, ought never to have been put to the plow. These are valuable acres around potholes.

This is a program that will maintain the last of the habitat we have in that area. More directly, this program is putting millions of dollars directly in the hands of the farmers, the hard-pressed, cash-strapped farmers in that area, some \$2 million this year alone in various forms of incentives to set aside 30 acres, 180 acres, 50 acres, 70 acres, whatever it is, to enhance the habitation for wildlife in that portion of the province. Mr. Speaker, while it is focused and concentrated on waterfowl production, anytime you set aside some land for habitat purposes, all wildlife is encouraged.

I was delighted just not so long ago to be in the community of Melita where we have added another component to that program, not directly attached to the North American program, but a woodlot development program, because it is our hope that we can encourage on some of these acreages that we are acquiring under various forms of lease or outright ownership and also the existing woodlots that are in that area, greater and greater opportunities for Manitoba citizens to get involved in woodlot farming in agro Manitoba.

I am delighted to announce, Mr. Speaker, that our fledgling woodlot operations are beginning to pay off. I understand right about now the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is being presented a Manitoba-grown Christmas tree in his office. I can report to all the members that whereas little as eight or 10 years ago, virtually all our Christmas trees were brought in from outside sources. There were always some hardy souls who took advantage of my department's offer to go out and cut their own for a relatively modest fee, but this year I am told by Mr. MacLeod, the secretary of the Woodlot Association of Manitoba, that upwards of 75 percent of natural trees will be grown by our own Manitoba growers. That is a significant portion. Those are the kinds of changes in the environment that we have.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt honourable members will have been aware, at least some have been aware, that one of the major activities of the Department of Natural Resources has been trying to ascertain what Manitobans think about what we should be doing or should not be doing on our landscape with respect to parks, with respect to what we call natural areas.

We are a government that is committed to ensuring that future generations will enjoy wilderness areas within our province. Whenever you speak about land designations of one kind or another, you bring together conflict of uses, the legitimate access to some of the resources on some of these lands, whether it is for mining purposes, whether it is for the forestry industry, whether it is for wildlife purposes. Those become very complex, and I do not take lightly the challenge that my department and I as minister face in this context.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, as indicated in this throne speech, to introduce updated parks legislation that will bring Manitoba provincial parks into the 1990s and into the year 2000 and beyond.

It is my intention to move aggressively forward to meet some of our commitments under the Endangered Spaces Program. We have that opportunity in this province and indeed certainly in good portions of this country to ensure that we can have the best of both worlds. We can support healthy industries, viable industries, in the pursuit of minerals, in the pursuit of timber resources and all the jobs that this provides, and at the same time, ensure that future generations will have the enjoyment that in some cases can only be found in those areas set aside, those areas designated as endangered spaces, so that the habitat can perpetuate the ecosystems that we have come to learn to be important for all our survival.

I was pleased to be able to sign just a week ago, on behalf of the Province of Manitoba, a biodiversity convention agreement that our Prime Minister and certainly our Premier (Mr. Filmon) were very much a part of when Canada endorsed that convention at the major environmental conference in Rio, Brazil, earlier this year. I have no doubt that Manitoba will play its full role in these developments.

Mr. Speaker, I know that if nobody else, then perhaps the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) would be disappointed if I did not raise the

issue of water as being one of the principal concerns of my ministry, as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, we have in this province such tremendous opportunities, if only my friends opposite would just take their blinkered environmentalist eyes off that for a little moment to understand. At the same time they are talking about jobs. At the same time they are talking about rural development. At the same time they are talking about value being added to some of our natural resources. Those, in my judgment, hold out by far the biggest promise for future economic development for a province like Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we have done so much investigative work. Allow me just to read one short paragraph from one of the major studies done with respect to the South Hespeler area that borders the area from Carberry south of the Assiniboine to the Red River and all the way to the U.S. border. Speaking about this area, which includes over half a million hectares of land that is so described, climate provides an agricultural production potential that is better than any other area on the Canadian prairies. I am told that there is only one very small portion of land in southern Ontario that equals this land. However, periodic droughts have inhibited realization of the full potential for the growing of special crops, et cetera.

\* (1500)

Mr. Speaker, let me give you a little—and I really want some of my friends opposite to understand. One of the principal challenges of the department is to become much more sophisticated and get a far greater understanding of our water resources, both surface and ground water, and we are moving in that direction. In the study of my Estimates, you will see a noticeable shift from what has—which has been going on for some time.

In the late '50s, in the '60s the issue before the day was to manage flood conditions, to develop drainage systems. Today, the issue is quite reversed in some instances. We underrate what water means to us.

I have one particular graph here, and these are old figures. I will not attest to their accuracy as they apply today, but to give you some idea of how—and I know this is offensive to some people who want to look at any natural resource simply as something that we cannot touch, something that has to be left in its pristine form.

The usage of a million gallons of water per day in the community of Selkirk produces \$80 million in direct annual benefits to the province of Manitoba at the Selkirk Rolling Mills. They need a million gallons of water a day to keep those jobs working, to produce \$80 million for the province of Manitoba. At Carnation we need another million gallons a day to produce another \$80 million direct benefit to the Manitoba economy. We need many more millions of gallons of water. We need 60 million gallons a day, and the water is there to produce \$11 million worth for those who are in potato irrigation. A plant like Simplot at Brandon requires 1.9 million gallons a day to produce \$63 million direct annual benefits to the provincial economy.

Mr. Speaker, surely we ought to be smart enough to know that we use this water in a sustainable way, because this government has firmly and with determination adopted the principle of sustainable development so that water is not there just for this generation's use but for future generations' use.

Secondly, I have confidence in my colleague the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings). I have confidence in the ever-growing developments with respect to regulations and that we have with respect to our environment, particularly with water, that we could use this water and return it in a way that it is not polluting our ground water shortage, in a way that it can be used again and again and again.

While we are using it, we can hopefully provide the best for our children in education, the best for those in need of health care, the best for those like my friend from Rossmere who are approaching that golden age, senior citizen status, who so often appeal to this House about the need, the care that his generation requires from governments, from big governments.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the things that we can do just within the confines of this province. These are the things we will have to do if we want to be able to compete with the global changes that are around us. I am hoping that my government, I am hoping that honourable members opposite from time to time will have the courage to be supportive of measures undertaken in this area. We have in place certain works that can help us.

The issue, of course, that I suspect later on in the new year will be dealt with in a very public way is the question of the allocation of some of those waters in some of this area. It is a matter certainly that

concerned the former member for Portage la Prairie, Mr. Ed Connery, a great deal. I know it is a matter that concerns the present member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) in a very serious way. It is a matter of concern to all of us, because it talks about the possible allocations of some waters of one of our principal sources of water, namely the Assiniboine.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage, in fact I will be distributing to all members a copy of this report which, for instance, among other things, simply reminds us that with the Shellmouth reservoir, as presently operated, only 48 percent of the Assiniboine River's assured consumptive water supply capacity has been licensed for consumptive use. In other words, there is a great deal of capacity just in the system as we now have it, if we wish to consider some of the other options available to us, if we are serious about providing jobs in Manitoba, if we are serious about creating that kind of wealth that every day members opposite ask for the social services in this province.

You see, Mr. Speaker, whether or not we shut down some industry from cutting trees in our woods or shut down a mine because it is intruding on the natural environment, that is really the easy decision. Whether Abitibi-Price stops cutting trees in an area that many people do not want them to cut trees, that is not a hard decision at all. The hard decision is: Which three hospitals and which university are we going to close down? That is the tough decision. I ask honourable members opposite to bring some responsibility when we try to sort out in the most sensitive way and in the most prudent way the appropriate use of our resources, but if we deny ourselves access to those resources, that is simply not being responsible to the very people who elected us.

You cannot stand in your places, you cannot ask day after day what we are doing about jobs. You cannot stand and ask day after day what we are doing to ensure appropriate levels of health care, about family services care, or any other kind of social services care, without tending to the economic issues. Mr. Speaker, in this province, a lot of that hinges on how you allow the ministry of Natural Resources to access some of those resources. I will give all of you an assurance because of my commitment, because of my absolute faith that it is possible to have within our fine province the finest of parklands. We have the capacity in our province to set aside substantial

portions that will not be developed, will remain in its wilderness state for future generations.

It was my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in the last days of the last session to leave this all behind me and travel to the boundary line as far north as you could travel in Manitoba to the Northwest Territories and from Lake Nejanilini go on a 14-day canoe trip along the Wolverine and the Seal Rivers. It is a beautiful wilderness experience, a realization of just how big and beautiful this province is.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in this province that we can, if we do it with considerable selectivity and only after we have done our careful examination and consulted with people, whether it is in the Department of Energy and Mines, whether it is within the Forestry branch—is this appropriate, can we set aside this particular piece of land forever under the Endangered Spaces Program? I am satisfied we can.

I suspect that one of the more lively aspects of my departmental work in the coming year will hinge on how we set out and how we proceed to do this, how we set out and how we proceed to draw up a new parklands act that clearly sets aside the fact that parks are there for people enjoyment. Parks are there for wilderness enjoyment. Perhaps we have to do a better job in defining which is which.

\* (1510)

Many people forget that virtually the entire provincial park system was superimposed on existing forestry reserves. The forestry reserves were there first, and 35 or 40 years ago, when the provincial park system was started, it was just a natural to put the park system, the provincial parks, the Big Whiteshell parks, the Nopiming parks, onto existing forestry systems, because very often forestry operations already had put some access roads into them. So people could access into these parks, but it was always understood in Manitoba that those parks would be for multiple use, that they would be available for carefully managed logging.

Mr. Speaker, that definition is falling into some considerable controversy in the last little while, and it is often aided and abetted irresponsibly by members opposite. I suggest to all members opposite, balance is what we need in this instance. We can have it. Balance is what we have. We need the jobs. We need them not just for the sake of providing something worthwhile for people to do in this province. We desperately need the wealth that

is created out of our resources. You see, honourable members want to keep forgetting that it is a question of wealth creation. Simply all of us working for governments do not create wealth. We pay our taxes and we do our things, but all we can do is provide a service, but to whom are we providing a service if we are not creating wealth?

In the livestock business—you know, we sell a lot of our grain, too much of our grain to the world for two cents a pound, but if you put it through a hog, it is 70 cents a pound. If you put it through one of my animals, a beef animal, it is a dollar a pound. Now that is value added. [interjection] That is past history. Regrettably, it is even better if you put it through a processing plant and you sell the bacon at \$2 or \$3 or \$4 a pound for the pork chops and the beef at \$3 and \$4 a pound. Regrettably, your forebears just of our previous generation, it was the Schreyer administration that kicked them all out of here. That has been done; those jobs are in Alberta or in the States, by punitive, antilabour legislation, antibusiness legislation. Yes, it is just that simple, antibusiness legislation, by ensuring that Manitoba was not a climate where the necessary investment would take place to rebuild the plants. We had the industry here. We were processing all our own beef, a good portion of Saskatchewan's and a portion of Alberta's up until the early '70s. Why did it disappear? If I offend honourable members opposite by suggesting they had something to do with it, I simply leave the question. It disappeared because the New Democrats took over government for the next 15 years and, after the end of the 15 years, we have no more industry.

There is no use crying over spilled milk. We still can do other value-added things. A lot of them have to do with a combination of water, land and special crops. A lot of it has to do with our natural resources that my department has a mandate over to supervise—mineral extraction, timber extraction. Done with sensitivity, done with some imagination, we can at the same time draw in that great resource of encouraging tourists and visitors to come to our parks. We have between five to six million people come and visit our parks. We only have a million people in this province, so we have a lot of people coming from other parts of the country, other parts of the world to visit our parks in our short summer season.

Our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is to develop our natural attractions that will increase those

visitations. As I can attest to, they have been improved and increased at a little place called Oak Hammock. Members opposite may have forgotten that place. That is why I built that little hacienda with an attached veranda for ducks and geese and mankind—well, personkind—to enjoy. They are coming, both, record numbers of birds and, in a short period of time, record numbers of people. Most encouraging, so many of them will be young people, school children, that will come for the first time coming out of an ever growing urban society to have some direct contact with Mother Nature.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to making further contributions.

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolsley):** Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I rise to respond to the Speech from the Throne.

Since we were last assembled here, life for many Manitobans has deteriorated. We are approaching the Christmas season and, if you talk to teachers in inner city schools, you will know that the Christmas season is the one that they dread the most. The expectations of children are raised very high by the glitz and the advertising that are part of our 20th Century world.

That disappointment, I think, can be seen in the children of inner city schools and it is reflected in their behaviour for many months afterwards. Such, I think, will be the experience for many more Manitobans this year as they face that decline in their wages, that downward spiral in wages for skilled workers that so many people are facing. Manitobans across the province are finding themselves faced with a loss of jobs and with unemployment for their own family and in their own neighbourhood.

But it would be impolite, Mr. Speaker, not to welcome you back, to welcome the new members, for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) and for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), to welcome the new table officer and the Pages, some of whom, I gather, are travelling quite long distances to work in the House this year. I wanted to assure the Pages particularly that, although we often seem very rushed, busy, perhaps we do not always express our appreciation at the time. I wanted to let you know that in spite of all that, we do certainly understand the difficulties under which you work and appreciate the duties you perform for us.

Mr. Speaker, I think you have also had an interesting year. It has been one, I think, that has given you a number of interesting opportunities to meet with Francophone legislators from across North America, and also, in your role on the Commonwealth Parliamentary Executive, you have had the opportunity to travel to London and to meet with other Speakers from across the world, in fact, who share your goals in maintaining the fairness of our democratic forums. I want to welcome you back, Mr. Speaker, to assure you of our continuing support in the task that you perform with such equanimity and such good humour, and I do so with genuine respect.

What did the Premier (Mr. Filmon) hope to accomplish with this astonishing retreat of press releases that are masquerading at his sixth throne speech? This government, Mr. Speaker, has had six opportunities to chart a course for Manitoba. They have had six chances to give some hope and guidance through the dramatic changes that are affecting our country and our province.

The general reaction that I heard in the press and on the street is that this year's throne speech was no different than the others, and I think one of the most startling things that I found in the reaction that I heard on the street is that no one is really fooled anymore. There is, in fact, a growing realization that what is said in those throne speeches is indeed a fair representation of the limited vision and ideological perspective of the current Manitoba Tory party.

\* (1520)

But, of course, Mr. Speaker, there are some differences. I think there is a little less bravado in this one, less of the mindless boosterism of past speeches, and there is a recognition that Manitobans, like Canadians, are looking for more than the candy floss, more than the platitudes of R.B. Bennett, more than the transparent reassurances that tomorrow will be sunny and warm. It may be, even now, that ministers have become too embarrassed to continue to blame their difficulties on the NDP government.

If you have ever wondered, Mr. Speaker, as I have, what is contained in those big briefing books that they bring to the Legislature every Question Period, I think what you will probably find on the first page is "Blame it on the NDP"; page 2, "Blame it on the NDP"; page 3, "Blame it on the NDP"; page

4—hold it, [interjection] There is no room for it; page 5, "Conditions are temporary, do not adjust your set." On page 6 we heard today, "It is an international problem," the old Trudeau mantra.

I think one day we may find that there will be a page 7 where they will acknowledge the foresight and the fiscal planning of the government of Howard Pawley, which gave them the Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the rainy day fund which has sustained their last six budgets.

What is most striking, of course, is what is missing from this throne speech. Member after member on this side of the House has spoken of that. There is no analysis of the past year, no sense for Manitobans of the context of this package of retreat promises, platitudes and limited proposals. One can understand why this past year has been a painful one for many Manitobans. We have seen little shift in the overall unemployment rate. It remains exceptionally high among young Manitobans. It remains high in the city of Winnipeg, and it remains unconscionably high among aboriginal Manitobans, both on the reserve and in the city. In Snow Lake, for example, we are seeing an entire community disappear from the map.

In the strategic industries that Manitoba has targeted under both the NDP and this government we have seen our province lose projects and industries to Saskatchewan and New Brunswick. Even the advantage that we might have created in pharmaceuticals is unlikely to materialize. The federal Tories to whom everyone on the government benches sends their loonies and their support are set to tip the market economy by regulating in favour of their large corporate allies in the patented drug business. Make no mistake about this.

I think perhaps one of the most delicious parts of the throne speech was when the Lieutenant-Governor's substitute, the Administrator, started reading the sections about the offloading of the federal promises and literally the chuckles went through the House. It was not just on our side, and it was not just in the press gallery. Right through the House, people saw through the transparency of those crocodile tears that were being shed on behalf of federal offloading.

Make no mistake. Every Tory member in this House sends his money, sends his support, continues to support Brian Mulroney, continues to defend him in this House even today, in spite of the outrage that they profess to support.

All around us this Christmas we see the impact of the deregulation initiated so long ago by Lloyd Axworthy and the federal Liberals. Canada's transport system is facing the most severe crisis in a generation. The consequences for Manitoba families have been severe, as we have seen the loss of jobs at Air Canada and in Transcona over the past two years. The current crisis and the consequence of it for the airlines pose a very large problem, not just for us, but for all Manitobans.

The loss of the jobs at Air Canada and in the Gemini reservation system will be felt very quickly throughout the province. Particularly, they will have an impact on the life and economy of downtown Winnipeg and the North Portage Development. It will be severe, Mr. Speaker, and the anxiety of many of those families this Christmas season is literally palpable in the city and surely should have formed part of the economic context of this throne speech.

This Tory party is a party of self-congratulation. They boast about being right on course. In the words of the Premier (Mr. Filmon), they have never been prouder to be a Progressive Conservative. Are they so out of touch that they cannot hear the fears and worries that are on the lips of all Manitobans, city and country, rich and poor, those with jobs and those growing numbers without? There are some in my caucus who believe that this is the case, that this is a government which is arrogant, isolated and bewildered by the economic changes of the world around them. Indeed, there is much evidence for such observations.

If you ask yourself why are they so apparently blind and impervious to the increasing hopelessness around them, I think you must admit that there are other conclusions that must be reached. Like other modern Tories before them, they have decided that the restructuring of the Manitoba economy in this way was both inevitable and desirable. Like other Tories in England, the United States and Ottawa, they believed that high unemployment is a price worth paying for the anticipated benefits of a global economy, and that was a deliberate, calculated risk that all these Tory, free-market governments took with the lives and futures of millions of families.

High levels of employment, they believed, would be acceptable because, and I genuinely believe they thought it would be temporary, but it would only be temporary if the government had made the necessary changes in the economy to create the

worker adjustment policies. It would have been temporary had they found the economic niches in advance that would provide some economic stability for Manitoba and, above all, it might have been more temporary had they provided for the education and training that are required for any community in the new economies being created around the world.

They did none of this. They supported the Free Trade Agreement and its extension to low-wage Mexico. They applauded the high interest rates of the Bank of Canada as necessary in the fight against inflation. They understood clearly who benefited from those high interest rates, but will they ever admit that it is those exact same interest rates which have given all our communities the financial crisis that they face, those same high interest rates which have crippled the efforts of governments at all levels to find the funds to deal with the social crises and those same high Tory interest rates which have made it impossible for us to find the educational remedies that are now required on a large scale across this country?

We find none of these reflections in the throne speech. What the throne speech gives us is airbrushed Manitoba. There is no mention of the need to address the issues of unemployment, job creation or retraining because, fundamentally, Tories believed that unemployment is a price worth paying. They will, as this throne speech makes clear, stay the course, steady as she goes, with Captain Filmon and the crew, and steady as she goes to those people I have talked to over the past summer who have seen their \$22 an hour skilled trade job fall to \$12 an hour, and then as that job melted away to a minimum wage job, and finally at the age of 50 or so, they find themselves facing the welfare roll that they know could be their fate for the rest of their working life.

Let us not be deluded into thinking that free trade, deregulation, a high dollar and high interest rates had nothing to do with the crises we are facing. Each played their part. Each is a fundamental key to Tory policy. Each of them took us down the road of closures, bankruptcies, loss of homes and farms, unemployment and despair, and that is the true face of conservatism today.

In Manitoba, the party of Duff Roblin, which once had a progressive face, has been replaced by the ideologues of the free trade market who are prepared to reinvent Manitoba. They accept high unemployment. They have a real agenda to use

this crisis to create a Manitoba which has a smaller public sector and fewer social services.

\* (1530)

The cry for less government is one of the mantras of these new Tories. They foster the belief that public policy has a very limited role to play, and we heard it very clearly from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) the other day, a very limited role to play in our society.

They have two advantages in expounding this particular philosophy. They have powerful allies in some corporations, including the media, whose interests are served by no regulation, no national boundaries, no taxation and no limits to corporate power. Secondly, when the Tories are in power, they are able to pursue policies which deliberately diminish the role of government and offer self-fulfilling prophecies to the general public as well as to those whose interests are served by the weak, ineffective governments such as we have seen in Manitoba for the last few years.

In fact, I was struck in a small way by the speech of the member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) the other day, when he talked about his frustration in a government office. He had not received very good service. He talked, he banged on the desk. The employees eventually came over, and he read out a sign, which I will not repeat here. [interjection] Unparliamentary language, yes. What did the former minister, the member for Rossmere, conclude from the poor service and the somewhat insulting sign that was behind these government employees? He concluded that they were overstaffed.

As a member of the Legislature who sits next to the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme) every day, did he once, for example, ensure that that sign was removed, as it should be removed? Did he inquire into the conditions of work in that particular location? Did he make any effort to change the nature of government services that he was faced with? No. His answer is, they are overstaffed, government is ineffective, government is weak—a very small example, Mr. Speaker, of the self-fulfilling prophecy of Tories in action, whose real agenda is to diminish the role of government and to diminish the role of public policy.

Why are the Tories floundering in education? Why are there no systematic training opportunities being offered? Why are there so few programs of

labour adjustment here? Why do we have the pathetic spectacle of a Premier (Mr. Filmon) faced with a loss of hundreds of jobs from CN pleading to be treated fairly by his Ottawa masters? Why is he not insisting on retraining grants, adjustment compensation and a federal contribution to the rebuilding of Manitoba's infrastructure? Is it incompetence, as one might suspect? Partly true. Is it lack of imagination? Partly.

Has this government already reduced sections of the Civil Service to the level where they do not have the capacity to respond, in a policy sense, to such blows? Yes, that is partly it, but is it not that fundamentally the new Tories do not believe that public policy has any role to play in mitigating the impact of the market in this way? The tragedy of the long-term impact of federal and provincial Tory regimes is that the reduction of government and its ability to deal with economic crises has led to a loss of public confidence.

When a community does not believe that it can, through its democratic institutions, shape its own future, then I believe you begin to face the disintegration of society. The market is global, but democracy is local, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that one of the most important tasks after the next election will be to rebuild that sense of community in Manitoba and to restore to people the sense that public policy has an important and effective role to play in shaping our world.

It was Margaret Thatcher, not Gary Filmon, who proclaimed that there was no society any longer, just individuals, but it is Gary Filmon who cut \$10 million from our community colleges, eliminated 900 positions from the Civil Service, refuses to act on the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, has no plans for the inner city of Winnipeg, reduces the role of the community in Child and Family Services, and has no intention of dealing with the issues of unemployment our community is facing. By the time the new Tories have finished with this country there will indeed be only individuals at the mercies of global capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, the social services and the opportunities for mobility through education will have been considerably diminished as a result of the policies of the federal and provincial Conservatives. Yet have such policies ever formed a part of the electoral platform of either of these Tory governments?

What they do make much of, however, is their false claims to have kept taxes down. The call for

no more taxes clearly suits the interests of those Conservative supporters who are now, as a result of high interest rates and federal tax changes, appropriating a greater proportion of the national wealth. It is clearly also the case that the middle-income earners across this country and across this province are bearing the cost of providing essential community and municipal services.

There should be no tax increases for this group who, I know from my own constituents, are finding it hard to repair the damage of the high interest years and to cope with the GST. They know that they are looking at a long-term future under this government where they must pay an increasing share of the cost of municipal services and education or watch their community deteriorate and their children's future threatened. No one I meet is under any illusion that these federal and provincial Tory governments have not increased the tax burden on the ordinary people. They are well aware that the burden of support for our institutions and community has shifted to the middle-income earner.

The evidence is mounting that the Tory governments in Ottawa and Manitoba are changing the face of our society to one that is inherently more unequal, which offers fewer opportunities for mobility. These governments have closed the doors on many of our fellow citizens. In their unemployment policies, their international economic policies, they have surrendered to market forces the crucial responsibilities for our survival as a community and a nation.

What we have seen in Canada is a marked shift in the burden of taxation from those who can pay but do not, to those who increasingly cannot pay but must. This is all in the context of a gradual narrowing of the ownership of wealth in this country.

We all know the horrifying numbers for the United States where under Reagan and Bush 60 percent of the increase in national income has gone to the richest 1 percent of the people. Like the members opposite, Reagan and Bush believed that a rising tide raises all boats and that the wealth would find its way in diminishing amounts to others, the disastrous trickle-down theory. The shocking truth, Mr. Speaker, is that the poor in the United States have become much, much poorer. The poorest fifth of the country with an average income of just over \$8,000 per year saw their incomes decline in those years, decline by 9 percent. The richest fifth, over

\$110,000 per annum saw their incomes increase 29 percent, and the richest one percent of Americans, over \$500,000 a year per annum, increased their wealth by a stunning 77 percent. That is the consequences of the trickle-down theory.

You may think this has no effect on Manitoba and Canada, but it does. The same pattern is emerging here, though not to the same extreme. The more closely we become tied to the American economy, through free trade and the Mexican free trade agreement, the more we are tied into their wage structure and their limited social safety net.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, these free marketeer Tories have rewritten history in their own image, to portray the end of social democracy, to portray the end of history, to portray a triumphant march of the market economy. Perhaps Clinton's victory has put something of a damper on that imperial style. Certainly those who voted for and worked for a Democratic victory understood the necessity of a return to active government and democratic control.

\* (1540)

It is no less the case in Manitoba and Canada. This is a government which has stood aside while we have lost jobs—Tupperware, Catelli, Ogilvie, Campbell, Liptons, Paulin, Air Canada, CN, Via Rail, CP, PWA and the government of Manitoba. We have lost thousands of jobs, and every Manitoban now, it does not matter wherever you go, has known somebody who has lost their job, is on UIC or is facing welfare or has gone to Alberta or British Columbia to look for work.

These losses have been compounded by the systematic transfer of federal jobs out of the province, in transport, in environment, in the military and others to the point where even the devout Tory Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) thinks that we have paid our share. But this government seems devoid of any influence in Ottawa, and the losses continue, as we saw even today in the Mazankowski economic statement.

Most disturbing, as the opposition has so frequently pointed out, is the loss of long-term jobs in the manufacturing sector and the absence of any hope for those Manitobans, both young and old, who have seen their world disappear, because as you talk to them, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is happening. The world that they have known in their working life or that they had expected as a result of

their education has simply crumbled. People are looking for leadership, for economic plans and for a new future for Manitobans, and I do not think that any Manitoban will either forget or forgive the destructiveness of these Tory years.

Given all of this, what vision does this sixth throne speech offer to our fellow citizens? Well, there is Sunday shopping. Got a problem? Sunday shopping is the answer. We will have the opportunity to debate that soon, but it hardly seems an appropriate answer to the many serious problems facing Manitobans, and I think it is being dealt with like that by most of the public and the press.

I suppose the new vocabulary of innovation is one of the most noteworthy aspects of this speech. I wish that the government's past record could give us some expectation of success here, but I am particularly shocked, Mr. Speaker, that there are no new ideas, no innovation in the area of training or post-secondary education.

The university review has a very limited mandate. The community colleges have been in limbo for more than a year and are still in limbo waiting for direction from their new boards and waiting, too, for the next round of cuts, which will fall heavily on their shoulders. Yet thousands of Manitobans are unemployed. Too many of them have inadequate basic education. Thousands of them need, demand retraining in the new technologies. They want work. They want the new technologies. They want education. They want the training opportunities.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) has spoken at length about the lack of concern in this throne speech for jobs and for the unemployed but, equally, Mr. Speaker, it must be stressed that there is no recognition here of the absolutely critical necessity of training and retraining.

In spite of Tory ideology, we cannot rely on the private sector for this. It has become common knowledge, in fact, that Canadian employers spend less than half of what is spent in the United States on training and one-eighth of what is spent by the British and German private sector on training and retraining in the labour force. Yet the only initiative we have seen from this government is Workforce 2000. It has been a long time in getting up to speed. It grants money to the private sector, and it does not necessarily require an increase in the proportion of monies devoted to training by Manitoba companies.

Where are the long-term benefits to the economy and to a training culture in this process?

Nor can we rely on the federal Tories, who do talk training and yet, in 1991 and 1992, cut \$100 million from the Canadian Job Strategy and then froze all future contributions. Even then, they continued to claim as their contribution the \$1.8 billion being taken out of UI funds from the employee and the employer. In real terms, the federal government is providing less now than it did in 1989. There will be no help there.

This government of Manitoba cut \$10 million from the community colleges. It has given no priority to the development or to the enhancement of technologies in the community colleges. The research and retooling of community college staff is seen to have little significance for this government. Yet training and the technologies should be at the centre of any strategy for the renewal of the province, but where is the recognition of this as a concern, let alone any plan or strategy to meet the needs of the Manitoba economy and the thousands of individuals who are joining the ranks of the unemployed.

There is no secret, Mr. Speaker, to the success of the economies of Germany, Japan and others. They continue to provide highly skilled, motivated and educated workers. They invest in programs that encourage business and government, including local governments, to work together. They have fostered a broad recognition in their respective communities. The co-operation of labour and business and education is essential. Compare that to the role of this government who have carried forward the old policies and the old antagonisms of earlier Tory governments.

They have encouraged the co-operation with labour by attacking FOS, by eating away at the rights of workers to bargain collectively, by diminishing the work of the Workers Compensation Board and by taking an adversarial position with labour on almost every possible occasion. Their much vaunted Economic Innovation Council has two out of 20 labour representatives. The lecture series which masqueraded as a conference which the government held a few weeks ago had about the same proportion of representation, 10 percent of labour, their 10 percent solution. A solution that they paraded with great pride as a great achievement in the House the other day. Yes, it is a beginning, Mr. Speaker, and it may represent

progress for this Tory caucus, but it is insufficient to create the climate of change, reform and co-operation that will be required to alter the conditions of life for Manitobans.

It is clear now to everyone in Manitoba that there will be no new ideas from this government. They buried their heads in the sand. The reports of the Economic Council of Canada, the Science Council, even the Ontario Premier's council all offer real alternatives for planning for economic growth. None of them involve revolution, but they do involve a commitment to active government; a commitment to investment and training, and education; a commitment to real substantial and honest partnership with labour to address our communal economic future.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the intellectual well has run dry across this Chamber. They are dispirited, and it is a sorry sight. Now is the time for that final stand-aside gesture. Stand aside and allow those who believe in government to serve, those who believe in co-operation with labour and business and education to bring us together, those who believe in public education to open the doors to training that has been closed to so many Manitobans.

\* (1550)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the market is global. We are indeed faced with an international crisis, intensified in Canada by the Free Trade Agreement, high interest rates, high unemployment policies and deregulation, but for the moment, democracy is local. We have the power to change the conditions of life for some of our people, but we have a government that has not only closed its ears to Manitobans, but which has closed its mind, and therein, lies our real tragedy.

(Mr. Jack Penner, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

**Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Acting Speaker, it is my pleasure to now respond to the Speech from the Throne, one which I believe did offer Manitobans hope and encouragement and energy from this side of the House.

First of all, I would like to extend congratulations to the Speaker in his returning capacity, because I know that his position is not always an easy one in this House; there are many opinions and many behaviours which he is required to manage. I think

he manages them very well and with tact to all sides of the House.

I would also, Mr. Acting Speaker, like to take a moment to welcome the Pages because I believe that these young people really play a very important part in the work of our Legislature. I have had the personal experience of depending upon them and recognizing that we as members really do benefit from their commitment. I do recognize, too, that our Pages take on an extra amount of work because they continue with their course load in their school programs as well as freeing up a certain number of days a week to come to be with us in the House.

I really look forward to having a chance to get to know them better and to watching them as they become acquainted with the operation of this House, and something which, I hope, will inspire them and help them as they continue on in their career paths.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I would also like to take a moment to welcome our new members to the House. I would like to start by welcoming our new member, the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister). It really is a great pleasure to take the time to get to know our new member. Certainly, I see that he is working very hard on behalf of his constituents and has become a very vital and energized member of our caucus, and I look forward to working further with him.

I would also like to take a moment to welcome the new member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray). I am looking forward to getting to know that member as well, and look forward to working with her in the House on matters that I know are of real mutual interest to both of us.

Then, Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to take a moment to extend best wishes to the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) as she has announced her intention to step down as Leader and to provide a recognition for the work she has done and to wish her well as she is now making the decisions that she has described for her own future. We do wish her well on this side of the House and I personally wish her well. I also mention the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) who has also tendered his resignation in this House, and I wish him well as he makes further decisions about his future on behalf of himself and also his family.

Mr. Acting Speaker, it is now my first opportunity to take part in a full session as Minister of Education

and Training, and I am looking forward to this opportunity. I can tell you that to this point my opportunities as minister have led to real excitement and energy, particularly in the field of education. I have had to learn a great deal. There was no doubt about the vastness of the work in education across this province, but I have really sincerely enjoyed the learning process.

I am happy that my personal background, with my graduate work in education, has provided me with some experience and a framework to begin working in my portfolio. Then my active work in the school system before I was elected as a member of this Legislature has also been a great help, because my work and my training as a school psychologist, which is a specialty among those people practising in the discipline of psychology, has allowed me to be part of many schools across this province, several school divisions, and it has also allowed me to work within the system, within the school system with young people from kindergarten right through the end of Grade 12, and to have had the experience in a very first-hand way before I assumed my portfolio as Minister of Education, to really see first-hand the issues and the concerns and the challenges that face education in Manitoba, stakeholders in education in Manitoba, the challenges for parents, the challenges for young people, the challenges for teachers and the challenges for educational leaders such as superintendents.

I have had a very good experience so far, and part of that experience has been the first-hand opportunity to work with school divisions for a start. When I became minister, I had the opportunity to meet face to face with school divisions and to hear from them not just on paper but in meetings where we were able to discuss their communities, their challenges, what their issues are, and I have certainly enjoyed the opportunity to work with those school divisions.

I have also had the opportunity to work in the post-secondary area as well and then to meet with representatives of that area. In my own work background, I did teach at the University of Manitoba and now have the pleasure of meeting my students as they are now taking their place in the work force. That opportunity to teach at the post-secondary level really helped acquaint me with the issues of the university. But, as I have said before, at the time of my election, I was also a

student at the university, so that very recent experience on both sides of the post-secondary educational system has really helped me as I begin to talk with people in post-secondary education.

I have enjoyed the opportunities that I have had to meet, throughout the time that I have been minister, with post-secondary representatives, representatives of all four universities in Manitoba, representatives of the colleges and representatives of people in Manitoba who are working in training programs.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I think it has really been an important part of my time as minister to note that I have had the opportunity to meet with organized groups, with educational stakeholders but, also, with individual Manitobans. I have made a great effort in my time as minister to make sure that individual Manitobans believed that their individual concerns and issues were also very important to me and that time was made for those individuals to meet with me either in their home divisions or in my office.

Since I have become minister, I have tried very hard to do a lot of visiting. It has been very important to me not to simply hear from Manitobans while I am in my office in the Legislature but instead to hear from Manitobans in the places where they live, so I have begun a system and a routine of visiting across this province. I spend two days a week in the field. That two days a week has allowed me to visit with school divisions, to visit with our colleges, to visit with our universities. I have genuinely been impressed by Manitobans' interest in education. It is certainly a part of Manitobans' lives, it is certainly something that they are eager to talk about. I think it is very important to provide Manitobans with the opportunity to speak about education.

I also have to say too that as minister I have really just in my life as a Manitoban, apart from being minister, had the opportunity to see some very positive things about our school system. Just last evening, I was a celebrity reader at the Festival of Trees and when I went to read to young Manitobans I also had the opportunity—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner):** Order, please. I am wondering whether the honourable members, if they do chat, whether they could do it a bit more quietly so I can hear the minister speaking instead of them. Thank you very much.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** In my visits as recently as last evening, I had the opportunity to hear two wonderful

choirs from Manitoba. I heard the St. James divisional junior choir and I heard the Glenlawn Collegiate jazz singers. When you want to experience something that is extremely energizing and exciting about our school system, that was a wonderful opportunity. There were many Manitobans who enjoyed that great success. I was very pleased to have been there to have heard them and had the chance to speak with the teachers, the young people and their parents. There are many opportunities, Mr. Acting Speaker, for us to experience strengths of our education system in Manitoba.

\* (1600)

I have taken the time, as I said, however, to visit within the system. I visited within the K-12 system. When I make visits to school divisions, I make a point of visiting first of all with parent groups if they would like to have some opportunity to sit and discuss their issues.

I visit with school boards and take the time to meet school boards to talk about their concerns in their home area. Then I go into the schools and I make a point of actually going into the classrooms. I have an opportunity to speak to teachers in the classroom. Teachers have been very kind in taking a few moments from their class time and allowing me to speak to students. What that has allowed is an opportunity for a real feel for education in Manitoba, no longer just the recipient of some of the messages, but an opportunity to actually go out and experience education in Manitoba.

I plan to continue those visits, because I have then heard from people directly on the front line, from parents who are wanting me to see first-hand what their concerns are regarding perhaps their own child's circumstances to see that first-hand. It has been very, very helpful. One of the things that has happened as a result of it is that I have received lots of letters from children, from school divisions and from teachers across this province of a very personal nature. Children now have decided that they can actually sit down and they can write the minister a letter, and they can tell me the things that are on their minds.

I want to make sure that I have put on the record how much I have enjoyed that correspondence with students and with teachers and with parents across this province because, again, it is a very personal experience in education.

I have spoken to parents. Again, I would like to come back to parents, because I think that their involvement within our education system is very vital. We certainly referenced that in the throne speech and wanted to make a point of stating how this government recognizes that the role of parents is vital to the education system, and also the role of teachers.

I have had the pleasure in these visits that I have had in the community to sit in staff rooms with staff of schools and speak directly about their concerns so that they are not just hearing via a letter what the plans and the challenges of education are but that we are able to speak about these face to face.

When we do speak about them face to face it is very clear that education and the changes that are coming to education are extremely exciting. They are exciting in the field; they are exciting to families. We have a very exciting job to do with all the partners in education.

I have also enjoyed visits to our community colleges, and that has been a very helpful experience, to sit with the deans and the instructors of our community college programs and to talk with them about some of the innovations and the exciting developments that have taken place within our community colleges and, also, to step into some of the programs in our community colleges, to sit with those students to find out what motivated them to either continue on in a sequential way into the program that they are in or what it was that motivated them to return to the educational system and what they hoped to achieve as a result of being a part of that educational system. Again, it has been a very first-hand experience in working with the colleges.

I have also had the same opportunity to visit the universities. I have visited with the boards of governors of all of the universities and had a chance to hear from the boards as managers and from the administrators, the presidents what are the challenges, what they see ahead.

I also take as much time as I can to meet with students at the university level simply by being out at the universities taking the opportunity to meet with them or the regular meetings that I have with the presidents of the students associations. That has been a very, very big help in terms of keeping a very close contact with that side of the educational system, the students, the recipients of the education.

What are their issues? What are the strengths and the weaknesses that those participants are seeing within the system? I really want to make a point of talking about the importance of regular contact with students, because they are the ones who have made the decisions to attend a course, and it might be a university course, it might be a college course, it might be a short-term training course, but to make sure that we have had the opportunity to talk about what brings them there, what they are looking forward to and what kind of assistance can be offered to these students or how they see the strengths and what they are saying to people when they are out in the community about the work that they are doing.

So the visiting has been extremely helpful as we are now looking at this process of reform and education. There is no doubt that we have a great potential in Manitoba and that we have to take advantage now of the opportunity that we have ahead of us.

Education is going to be an extremely important place for us to focus our attention, and I am very pleased to have the opportunity to influence some of the decisions that we will be making.

As a result of the visits that I have made and the contacts in the community, there have been some issues which Manitobans have wanted to make sure that we as a government and that I as minister knew about, and I would like to start with our K-12 system to talk about what those issues are, as I have been told about them.

The first issue, Mr. Acting Speaker, on the K-12 side which has been raised to me is the issue of standards and accountability. There has been in Manitoba a great deal of discussion about standards of curriculum, and parents, teachers and educational stakeholders want to make very sure that our curriculum is of a standard that will allow our young people to then go on to whatever post-secondary courses they would like to achieve, and that it will allow them to be competitive, not just within Manitoba and not even just within Canada, but competitive around the world, because there is a strong recognition now that we are not dealing just with those within our immediate geographic area, but instead we are looking around the world. If we do not achieve the best and provide the best, someone else will do it for us or do it in our place, and Manitobans want to be sure that we have a way of evaluating our standards to achieve the very best.

Manitobans have also in that same area said that they are very interested in accountability. They want to make sure that the standards of the curriculum that we are implementing are actually being transmitted to the student population and that there is a sense of accountability, that students are achieving what we hope and believe that they are achieving, and they have asked this government to take a look at the issue of accountability, and they have named that as a very specific interest and challenge for us in government.

The second area that Manitobans have raised, and I think it is also a very important one, is that they have said, while we are looking at issues of standards and accountability, we also have to make sure that our teachers then are provided with the training in their preservice years so that the training actually matches the reality of the classroom, and that in fact the teacher training will allow our teachers then to translate the standards and accountability to the students whom they are working directly with.

In addition, Mr. Acting Speaker, they also have said that they want to make sure that teachers in the classroom who are presently teaching are supported so that those teachers can continue to move with the ever-increasing challenges of our curriculum.

We recognize that education in Manitoba now has many additional components, and that we are also working with technology such as distance education, and that we need to make sure that our teachers are prepared in teaching practice to work within the system that we have at the moment and to move along in the system as we develop it through the process of reform.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the third area that Manitobans have raised as an area of interest is the area of the learning environment, because what they have said during the time that we have been speaking is that with an excellent curriculum, strong measures of accountability and support to teacher training and to teachers while they are working, we still have to make sure that there is a learning environment in which young people, or adult students, are able to achieve what they would like to achieve. They have wanted to make sure that we are able to begin to pay some attention to the kind of environment that students are working in.

\* (1610)

We have taken all of those issues very seriously, those three main categories very seriously, and our response is that we will be looking through our process of reform to make sure that we have a very strong plan to deal with those. We would like to make sure that we do it together.

Mr. Acting Speaker, Manitobans are also asking us to do some balancing. Manitobans are saying to us that they would like to make sure that we have a trained work force, that our students come through the educational process prepared and with skills to apply that to the workplace. It might be not only technical skills, but attitudinal skills of how an individual, a Manitoban would settle in in the workplace, get along with peers, manage the relationships of the workplace. So they have wanted to make sure that through our curriculum we are able to begin to develop attitudes as well as technical skills for Manitobans to work.

The balancing part is that Manitobans are also saying, we are not just training people for the work force, but we are also providing an education. We are also making sure that our students in Manitoba are coming through the system with an education that allows them to be very personally successful, that there is a self-satisfaction, an intrinsic value to their education.

So that is one of the challenges of education in these next few years, to make sure that we have met the balancing required in the education that we provide for our students.

Mr. Acting Speaker, in the post-secondary level, one of the challenges that we have been asked to make sure that we work with is the development of a learning culture. I have used those words very specifically. I have used the learning culture as opposed to a training culture, which has been used many times by the other side of the House, because I think it is the learning, the active part of learning which is what we are asking and what Manitobans are asking us to help develop. It is an attitudinal sense as well as a practical sense that we are in fact turning into a learning culture.

In addition, in the post-secondary area, Manitobans have asked us to look at what kind of assistance and support we can provide for people so that they can progress on to post-secondary education.

One of the very big challenges that I have had as minister is to look at the Canada Student Loans

Program and to look at some of the strengths and weaknesses of that program. In particular, Manitobans have brought forward concerns around the weekly loan limit. I have discussed that in this House before.

One of the challenges that I have had is to meet with the federal minister responsible for the Canada Student Loans Act and make sure that he has heard the opinion and the concerns of Manitobans regarding the Canada student loan and to ask him very directly to look at making those changes and to inform us of those changes as soon as possible.

So I have had two face-to-face meetings with the federal minister and in addition, as Minister of Education, I take part in the Council of Ministers of Education across Canada. When that Council of Ministers of Education met here in Winnipeg in September, we discussed very seriously this concern for student assistance which is all across Canada. As ministers, we then took a group approach as well and made sure that we wrote a letter to the federal minister responsible so that the concerns of students across Canada were represented.

When I do represent these interests I make sure that I have had the opportunity, first of all, to meet with students in Manitoba so that I can take their opinions they have expressed face to face and very directly to the federal minister. Then when I come back from those meetings, I have made sure that we have also had a meeting so that I can keep those students who are affected by this as up to date as possible about the plans of the federal government and what has been told to the provinces.

Those two issues, the learning culture and the matter of student assistance, are issues which, I think, go across the whole post-secondary system, but when I look at very specific parts of the post-secondary system I would start with the colleges. Our colleges are moving towards college governance April 1, 1993, and that is coming very soon.

The reasoning behind this move is to allow the colleges to be more receptive and more responsive to the needs of their regions for training programs so that Assiniboine College, for instance, may be able to develop programs very responsively to the needs of the agricultural community.

It has been a very important move to provide for each of those colleges, then, a board of governors,

and through those colleges and through their board of governors, to allow the decisions to be made at a very local level and representative of the communities who will benefit from the training offered by those community colleges.

We have named interim boards to the community colleges because we had wanted, before the permanent boards were named, for the colleges to have the opportunity to begin to respond to some management by the public. At the moment we have a very close relationship with the college, and by the naming of the interim boards, it does allow for the new system of accountability to have a trial period and to have an opportunity to work it out so that when we move to full governance on April 1, the colleges will be very ready for the change in accountability and the move.

In addition to the colleges and their movement to governance, we also are very concerned about the training in Manitoba. Some of the issues that have been raised regarding training are, first of all, that we in Manitoba make sure that we have a very comprehensive and involved labour force strategy. I can tell you that the Department of Education has been working to develop a comprehensive labour force strategy, labour market strategy for the province of Manitoba.

We did have several years ago the Skills Training Advisory Committee, which was one of the first steps, and some of the recommendations of that particular report were to say that we needed to make sure in the planning of our strategy that we had involved all segments of Manitobans, that we made sure that we involved business, industry, labour, community, education. That is a report that we have taken very seriously.

We have also, Mr. Acting Speaker, been negotiating a new federal Canada-Manitoba Labour Force Development Agreement, and with that agreement we will come to an agreement with Canada regarding the use of training funds and how those training funds will be funneled into Manitoba and how they will be used.

But I think it is very important on the training side and in relation to that agreement to recognize that agreement is not strictly a boiler plate agreement, an agreement that should operate with no changes. Instead, that agreement has been shaped by the provinces that have so far signed it, and we in Manitoba are working very hard with the federal government to make sure that we have a

made-in-Manitoba agreement, an agreement which suits our province with our geographic and our population and our demographics, that that agreement is the best one possible for Manitoba.

I do look forward to our signing that agreement as soon as possible and also making sure then that with that agreement we are able to involve Manitobans in the planning of our labour-market strategy.

We also recognize in planning the labour-market strategy that we do want to make sure that the interests of business, industry, labour, education, institutions are also incorporated into it, and that we make sure that there is a mechanism for their voice. So we will be making sure to consult Manitobans, to have the opportunity to incorporate the opinions of Manitobans, as we develop how Manitoba will very specifically implement the Labour Force Development Agreement.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the word "partnership" has been used. I still think it is one of the best words to describe what we are trying to do in the area of education totally. We would like to make sure that all the interests are represented. I think one area of reform that has already begun in education in Manitoba is that we have certainly opened our minds to those who have an interest in education, but we have made sure that we have not just restricted the interests of education and educational reform to educational stakeholders only. We have also said those people—and parents, business, industry, labour, students. We want to have the two-way communication in education so that our system has the very best minds, the very best ideas working toward its development.

\* (1620)

In our training area as well, in addition to partnership, we are also looking at the role of sectoral planning. We want to not look at maybe just very individual and ad hoc kinds of planning, but we can work together with sectors of this province to make sure that the work done is complementary and supportive. Part of the experience has been that, with sectoral planning, we are able to attract other kinds of business and industry and labour and training. So the sectoral planning, I think, is another important movement forward.

Mr. Acting Speaker, in the area of training, the other very important issue that has been raised during my discussions with Manitobans is the issue

of articulation: that we want to have a look at how Manitobans can progress from one part of the educational system into the next; that we recognize students who have perhaps studied at a community college, have worked in their fields for some time, may wish to attend a university program. We want to look at how they can articulate the skills and the training that they presently have and apply that into the next kind of a program that they would like to embark upon.

Then, Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to speak for a moment about universities. We recognize that our universities in Manitoba have a very great role, but the presidents of the universities in my discussions with them had said before the announcement of the university review that they wanted to be very clear about the role and the mandate of universities in Manitoba, because we are moving into the 21st Century. So the way that this government has been looking at the issues relating to universities has been through our University Review Commission.

The University Review Commission has a very broad mandate, because it looks at a number of issues, a range of issues as they relate to university, issues such as accountability and governance structure. It also has an end part of the mandate which says to the commission: and other matters that are of importance to Manitobans are to be considered by the University Review Commission. So there has been a very great attempt to structure and to give some direction in terms of areas to be examined, but we have also wanted to be very clear to Manitobans that, as they see other issues, those issues should also be included in what is brought forward.

Mr. Acting Speaker, those are the issues and the challenges that Manitobans have raised about education in the time that I have been minister, and I have had an opportunity to speak to them. We do have several initiatives currently underway to deal with some of those issues. I would like to speak about those for a few moments before I get into the initiatives of reform of this government.

We had commissioned a panel on legislative reform of The Public Schools Act because we recognize in this province there has not been a significant reform of our Public Schools Act since the early '80s. In fact, there had not ever been a series of public hearings to reform The Public Schools Act in Manitoba, and so this government, Mr. Acting

Speaker, appointed a panel, and we asked that panel to go out and hear from Manitobans exactly what the reform should be.

That panel took their work very seriously. They went out across Manitoba. They received over 1,000 submissions from Manitobans, and I have been told that those submissions represent the interests and the concerns of over 6,000 Manitobans. So I think that they were successful in reaching a number of Manitobans, and they received information on the areas which they were asked to look at, areas such as roles and responsibilities of parents, roles and responsibilities of school divisions, roles and responsibilities of students within the system, and roles and responsibilities of government.

Mr. Acting Speaker, one other point that Manitobans raised was that though they believed that they were very well heard by this committee, they wanted to have the opportunity to look at the recommendations and the information before this government drafted legislation and brought it forward, because they wanted to make sure they were accurately represented and that we would not go through an extremely long and cumbersome process of amendments at the committee level. So I have spoken to Manitobans and made sure that they understood that this would be possible for them.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I know my time is limited, so I would like to simply list a few of the other initiatives which are currently underway. We did put in place a new education finance formula in January of last year, and school divisions have expressed, first of all, the fact that they now believe they have something they can rely upon. They also said that they would like to make sure that this was not written in stone in the first round and that there would be an opportunity for that finance model to undergo some shaping as issues were raised by divisions to be sure that it was as responsive as possible. So I have had an advisory committee on the Ed finance model. That committee has been working very hard and has been responsive to the school divisions of Manitoba. I will be examining their report, and we will look and see that those issues that have been raised are taken very seriously.

Mr. Acting Speaker, again, my time is running out. I want to speak briefly about distance education because we have also heard from Manitobans of the importance of distance education and its very

important role in some of our smaller schools across the province, some of our more isolated schools across this province.

We have put together a task force on distance education. I have received Phase 1 of their report, and that is out to school divisions for review, and I am looking forward to Phase 2 of their report within the next few weeks. This task force has worked extremely diligently, and this government has taken their work very seriously.

We have also established the Student Support branch, because we recognize that students are at risk across this province of sometimes not being engaged in the educational system, and we want to make sure that local solutions for the engagement of at-risk students are put in place. So this government put forward \$10 million, and local schools were encouraged to bring forward plans on behalf of students. Now we are in the first year of funding some of those plans, and I am looking forward to seeing the results. I have had a chance to visit across this province some of the programs put in place by the Student Support branch. It has been really an interesting and an exciting opportunity.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I also have to say that Workforce 2000, an initiative of this government, has been a very important and a very successful initiative. We have had over 1,500 workers trained. We have had over 11,000 employees in larger Manitoba companies take advantage of the training opportunities, and we have had 1,800 employees trained in the area of aerospace.

So we recognize that this partnership, the partnership between our business and industry and labour in Manitoba and the Manitoba Government to assist in their planning, has been very successful.

In closing I would just like to say that this government now is looking at reform. We have a solid basis of initiatives in place and we have heard from Manitobans. Manitobans are asking for better assessment and evaluation. They want to know where we stand. They are wanting to know clearly about roles and responsibilities, and they are asking for an increased emphasis on reading and mathematics and on training skills, and we have heard them.

The Manitoba education forum will be a very important step in achieving these goals, but if I can leave you with one thought it is to say that we want

to make sure we achieve this in partnership with Manitobans, that we want to make sure we have incorporated the ideas that Manitobans bring. It is vital for us to work together.

The process of change that we have embarked upon is not always going to be an easy one. We recognize that it will not always be easy, but we have to keep our communication between our groups open, and we have to keep working together.

\* (1630)

We have to look for long-term solutions, Mr. Acting Speaker. We are not looking for quick-fix solutions such as I have heard from the other side of the House. We are looking to capitalize on our potential and to make our public education and training system the very best that it can be.

Manitobans should be proud now, and we expect them to continue to be proud with the education system that we have here in Manitoba. I will end by saying this is an exciting time for education. It is the key to the future, and I thank the constituents of Fort Garry for allowing me to represent them in this House, and for the opportunity to work as a Minister of Education and Training for Manitoba.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Acting Speaker, once again it is a privilege for me to be inside this Chamber and respond to yet another throne speech. Let me first start off by welcoming a former colleague and presently a colleague once again, the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), an individual who has contributed in a very large way to the Liberal Party in itself in many different ways, and also to welcome the new member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister).

I anxiously await his participation in the debate. I can say that he is following an individual who is going to be awfully tough to beat. Many had thought he was a maverick of sorts, and it will be very interesting to see how the residents of Portage la Prairie will be represented this time around.

I would also like to acknowledge the presence of the new Pages. It is always encouraging to see high school students witnessing or participating in the democratic process. I can at least advise them that they will see some things that might turn them off at times, but all in all it is all for a very worthy, worthy cause.

I once again compliment the table workers, the individuals in the public gallery, the individuals who

actually have to type what we are saying. Those are the individuals, of course, in Hansard.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I wanted to pay tribute to my Leader, the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), who has been not only a Leader of the Liberal Party to me but also a very good friend. She has provided me with many different opportunities both within the Liberal Party and outside of the Liberal Party. She has demonstrated her confidence like no other political leader in this Chamber has, in terms of as a House leader where she and my fellow colleagues in the caucus have entrusted me 100 percent. I did not need to go back to consult once I had been given permission to go ahead and negotiate a deal, and I think that says a lot about leadership and the qualities that the member for River Heights brought to it. Once she gave the responsibility, whether it was to a critic or to myself as House leader, she entrusted us with her full confidence.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) has done many things for the Liberal Party, for Manitobans and, I would argue, for Canadians. We look back to when she first came on as the Leader of the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party was nowhere. Many had said that you could have an annual general meeting in a phone booth. Well, the Liberal Party has gone a long way since then through her leadership from the '86 to '88 to the 1990 election. We are now in a situation, thanks to the current Leader of the Liberal Party, to be able to ensure that the Liberal Party will be a major force well into the future and to the turn of the century.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I did want to—because I noticed in listening to everyone thus far whom I have heard, no one has made reference to the Constitution, and I wanted to make very brief reference to it because this is something in which very few people actually stood up for what Manitobans and in fact Canadians wanted—very few people.

We had a free vote in our caucus. Mrs. Carstairs, myself, the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), and there were others who were on the no side, but in particular—[interjection] Well, for the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), I was on the no side, and I often wonder where he was on this or many members of his caucus, but they were not allowed to talk on the Constitution, or they were nowhere to be seen. But, Mr. Acting Speaker, you saw a Leader that fought on principle and won a very good

fight. [interjection] Well, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) will have his opportunity to put his words, and hopefully he will address the whole issue of the Constitution, but I just wanted to allude to the fact that this is something that Mrs. Carstairs put a lot of effort and energy into and, I would argue, had a very substantial impact on the outcome of the whole constitutional referendum.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I wanted to go into the throne speech at this time. You know, it was interesting, the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) said she was going to step down as Leader of the Liberal Party because she felt tired, and after hearing the throne speech, it makes me wonder why she stepped down when I have seen a throne speech that had absolutely nothing in it.

There was no new initiative except for one that I detected, and that new initiative was a Liberal initiative, something that was being talked about back in 1986. What they did with that particular initiative is they changed a word. Instead of a Pharmacare card, it is a health card.

Well, that is really all I am going to talk about with respect to the throne speech because that is really all that was there. Rather, I am going to take this opportunity to speak on a number of different issues.

I want to start off by talking about the economy. Time after time, Mr. Acting Speaker, we see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and other ministers who will stand up, and they will try to defend the record of Manitoba by coming up with all these wonderful statistics.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there is an argument that can be made that the government will use the stats that are in their favour and the opposition will use the stats that are in their favour, but I want to suggest to you that what my constituents are thinking about and what Manitobans and the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) constituents are thinking about is the bottom line.

Let us go back into October of '88, when in fact there were 84,000 part-time jobs, 415,000 full-time jobs. In October of '92, there were 98,000 part-time jobs and 396,000 full-time jobs. Now the government would say that it is the net loss of 5,000 jobs. Given the recession, given the world economy and what is happening in Canada, they could even argue that that is not all that bad.

Mr. Acting Speaker, it is bad because you have to look at what has actually occurred by losing the

number of full-time jobs from 415,000 to 396,000. One has to ask the question: What type of full-time jobs are we talking about? These are not the service-oriented, McDonald's-type jobs.

We are talking about jobs in the manufacturing industry. In October of '88, there were 63,000 full-time jobs in the manufacturing industry. In October of '92, there were 49,000. That says a lot in terms of what has been going on in the province of Manitoba. That this government's plans, philosophy, whatever you want to call it just is not working.

We see it in terms of what has been happening with the population. You have a population shift where we have provincial migration at a negative. We have had a net loss of individuals ever since the third month of 1988, all the way up to the sixth month of 1992. All of the quarter reports have been on the negative side. We have more people leaving the province of Manitoba, because they do not have hope. They do not have any hope. This government is not giving them any hope. Other provinces are doing much better than the province of Manitoba.

\* (1640)

The Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) will often comment that our unemployment is much lower than all the other provinces. Well, quite simply, if you have a net decrease of 592 in three months and then 1,600 in the next three months; 3,600 in the next three; 3,600 in the next, you have, in the work force, those that are losing the jobs are leaving the province. Those that do not have any hope are leaving the province. So the unemployment statistics are not necessarily reflecting in terms of how well the provincial economy is doing.

The Liberal Party in its opposition has brought forward in the last couple of years ideas in which we have thought would help the economy. One of the examples I want to cite is the 3-percent sales tax drop for three months, to drop it from 7 percent to 4 percent in order to increase retail sales, possibly prevent some individuals from shopping across the border, to give an incentive for Manitobans to shop within Manitoba. The impact would be very positive, and I must admit this is not a Liberal idea. This is an idea that Sterling Lyon used in the early 30s. The dean of this Chamber will know that—[interjection] In the early 80s, my apologies.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, I do not know why the government does not take advantage of more of the ideas that are coming across from the opposition benches, because there have been plenty of them in all of the different departments, because I sat through the Estimates and I have heard many of the different ideas that have come forward.

I want to touch on health care, because health care is an issue which everyone, no doubt, feels very, very strongly on. We are at a time when everyone recognizes that there is a need for health care reform, and let me preface any comments I make on health care by saying that we did introduce, so that it would be very clear to all Manitobans, to all political parties in this Chamber, that the Liberal Party supports the medicare system. We in fact introduced Bill 51 in the last session.

Under Bill 51, we want to put into legislation public administration the comprehensiveness, universality, portability and accessibility, the five fundamental principles of health care. We want to put that into legislation.

Now, the reason why I want to start off by saying that is that whenever anyone talks about changing health care you leave yourself open for criticism that might not necessarily be legitimate, that might be more opportunist. We received that criticism from the NDP critic of Health. When our critic of Health stands up to ask a question, she makes reference to our critic of Health being an acting, the other Minister of Health.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I would argue that there is a difference, that opposition has more of a role than just to oppose, that we have a role to provide a responsible alternative to what is currently there. When the government does something good we will tell them they have done something good. When they do something wrong, we are going to tell them they have done something wrong.

When I explain to my constituents about health care reform, and I must admit the critic of Health was at one of the meetings that I was at in which I had the opportunity to talk about health care reform and, also, so was the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett). I believe that even the critic agreed with what I was saying. I had former NDP MLAs come up to me and tell me that it was a very well-delivered speech, that it made a lot of sense. I had professionals telling me that.

I am going to give it in a nutshell in terms of what I said, that what is most important in reforming health care is the services that we are going to be giving to the individual recipients.

The example that I used at that time is, if we have to close some health care beds and we can open up personal care home beds and enhance home care services for our seniors, that is not NDP policy. That is what the NDP oppose, for the critic for Education on the NDP side. That is the way in which we should be moving.

You can go into any given hospital, at least in the city of Winnipeg, in rural Manitoba, I would argue that you could even go into some of the hospitals there, in particular in Brandon, and you will find that there are seniors that are in those hospitals that do not have to be there, that they could be in a personal care home.

By shutting down one health care bed where you have a senior, you could open up a personal care home bed. You can also provide home care services for two other seniors. You can improve the quality of health care services to all, and it is not going to increase the cost of the health care department by one dime.

Mr. Acting Speaker, if you do it on a larger scale, you are going to be able to create beds for individuals that need operations for hearts, for whatever the operation might be, where we have the line-ups. That is tackling the whole question of health care responsibly. That is how you enhance our health care services. We all have a responsibility not to go for the headline. It is very easy to say to your constituents that the Tories are cutting or taking away health care beds, and you can give the fear into the minds of the individuals, but there was not one individual that disagreed with me, that came up to me and disagreed or opposed what I was saying on that particular evening, even the critic for the NDP or the Deputy Leader for the NDP (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis).

When I think of health care, I think that there are a number of other things. We need to spend more on prevention. By spending more on prevention, we are going to save more at the other end. I would like to see a real debate on the medicare system. What is a health care service?

We have been criticized, our Leader, the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) has been criticized for saying that we should maybe charge a quarter for

the slippers that are given out. That is something that we were criticized for and were told that we want to implement a user fee. The NDP says, yes, that is true, but the NDP in Saskatchewan now charge to get your eyes examined. To me that is more of a user fee than charging a quarter for a slipper. How do you justify something of that nature? That is what the NDP will preach. It is wrong, because it is not in the best interests of Manitobans.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I want to move on to education. I am very disappointed in the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey). We had thought that, the Minister of Education having replaced the former Minister of Education, we would have seen something substantial happening in the Department of Education. What was one of the very first things that she did? The whole review package, the whole idea of reforming the school divisions and the boundaries and so forth were put on the back burner indefinitely. [interjection] Yes, that is what the Minister of Education is doing.

Mr. Acting Speaker, do you know that we have well over 350 school trustees? In some cases there is no candidate to run, so one has to be appointed. In the city of Winnipeg, we have 11 school divisions. One school division has over 30,000 students, and other school divisions have less than 3,000 students. There are so many inequities that one can point to.

I am a property taxpayer, and I am going to make a suggestion for a solution. I live in Winnipeg School Division No. 1, which happens to be, for those who live in Winnipeg No. 1, the heaviest property tax of all the different school divisions. In Winnipeg 1, total levy—and this comes out of the Finance department—for 1991 in Winnipeg 1 is \$1,021. That is on a house valued at \$70,000. Compare it to St. James, house of the same value, \$752. There are many different inequities that are there.

\* (1650)

The first thing this minister does when she comes in is that she is saying that she is going to put it on the back burner. Well, I would have suggested to you that the whole idea of changing the boundaries, of revisiting the number of school divisions and the number of school trustees that we have should have been a higher priority than reducing the number of city councillors in the City of Winnipeg.

How does a small rural school division compete with the larger school divisions that have larger tax bases, larger resources in terms of providing expertise to the principals or to whoever it might be, to students? Why, if we tackled this issue and had the review, then we could be spending less money on administration and putting more money in our classrooms. [interjection] Well, the NDP critic says, how much? Well, we would have likely had a better idea in terms of how much had the review gone ahead. The NDP policy is status quo, leave it the way it is; if anything, increase the number of school divisions. That is the NDP attitude towards this, and that is not good enough, Mr. Acting Speaker.

I look at education, and now that we mention NDP, let us hear another area of responsibility that the NDP have no responsibility. That was very poorly worded. Let me try that again. Let me tell you another way in which the New Democrats are hypocrites. That makes sense. [interjection]

For the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), this will be a good one. Private schools. The NDP philosophy is to preach class warfare. They figure by preaching class warfare, they will be able to manipulate the vote. That is the only reason, Mr. Acting Speaker, that they do not support private schools. Ed Schreyer, when Premier, supported it. Howard Pawley supported it. Whenever the NDP stand up to criticize private school funding they talk about Balmoral, they talk about Ravenscourt, the two biggest. Well, are they the two biggest?

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I think the critic for the NDP better look twice before he says that they are the two biggest. Let us talk about two others. Why not St. Joseph The Worker School Inc., which happens to be in Transcona, which happens to have 133 students? Many of the individuals who have students going there are on welfare. They are not rich. They are not part of the elite. They are collecting welfare.

What about St. Edward's School? St. Edward's has 206 students. The member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) represents that school, Mr. Speaker. They have individuals who work two jobs in order to have their students going there. They are not rich. They are not elite. Why do the NDP preach only the two private schools? Why do they choose to discriminate against the rest of them?

What can be done? Well, why not look at Saskatchewan or Alberta or Ontario, two of which

are under NDP administration. You will find that they give much more money towards Catholic schools. What the difference is, Mr. Speaker, is that is when you have the NDP in government. That is the difference, and that is in fact unfortunate.

So when I look at education and I see those two points, as I say, I am disappointed in the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey). We need that reform. I am disappointed in the New Democrats because they preach, as I say, class warfare, and that is what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to comment on social assistance. We in Manitoba waste a lot of talent by leaving individuals on social assistance. We have individuals who have been on social assistance through different generations, and we need to take a much more proactive approach to dealing with individuals who are on social assistance.

There are many things that can be done in order to do that. A couple of examples that I would like to cite is that right now there is a limit in terms of how much an individual receiving social assistance can make. After they make that, if it is \$1 more, they lose \$1 on their welfare cheque.

It is providing incentives, possibly on 60-, 40-cent dollars so that there is an additional incentive for someone to work the extra hours. It means providing courses. It means enabling individuals to better their educational skills to better equip them to enter into the work force through providing courses. [interjection] Well, Mr. Speaker, that is an area in which, as I say, there can be a lot of improvement. If the will of the government was to proceed and to do something for those that are receiving social assistance other than helping them get on to social assistance, as we have seen in the last four years, we would be much, much better off.

I also wanted to talk about housing. Earlier today I brought up the question with respect to the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst). [interjection] To the Minister of Housing? No, I knew that we do not deal—we do not have a direct impact on it. The federal government provides the loans that are forgiven and additional loans. The City of Winnipeg administers it, 50 percent of the cost. The administrative cost is calculated in terms of how much the individual applicants are going to be receiving. That is what covers the cost of the administration.

But the point that I was trying to make, and I think everyone inside the Chamber caught on to it except for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst), was that the provincial government does have a role to play. The Quebec government recognized that, entered into an agreement. We have a national government that has cut it from approximately \$1.2 million. Now it looks like they are going to be cutting it by an additional \$400,000. At least this is what is being talked about. What is the Minister of Housing doing? Why is he not on the phone, talking to his federal counterpart, doing what the Province of Quebec did and enter into an agreement? Why does he not?—because there are so many benefits. The Province of Quebec detected the benefits.

You know, the city of Winnipeg has benefited tremendously by this program. All you have to do is just drive around some of the areas. Go down to the administrative offices and they can have pictures that will very clearly demonstrate it. You can come down to my office. I have a few of them and I can show it to you.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is something that rural Manitoba should also be benefiting more by in a very large way. Portage la Prairie has many homes that would benefit from a program of this nature. So does the city of Brandon, Thompson and others. All of those rural areas would benefit by an enhanced RRAP program, one that would see the provincial government participate just like the Province of Quebec has chosen to do. There is no reason why we cannot do it unless, of course, the government of the day does not believe in rehabilitation of our current housing stock. If that is the case, the long-term cost of letting houses deteriorate are going to be so much greater, the neighbourhoods themselves do not benefit from it. I encourage the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) to pursue this very aggressively because, as I say, other provinces have done it, in particular, the province of Quebec. This is a program that we need in Manitoba, and it is very worthy of pursuing.

Housing co-ops, Mr. Speaker, I have had other opportunities to speak on housing co-ops. In fact, I have introduced the resolution on housing co-ops. I believe that housing co-ops are a real, viable alternative to the current nonprofit housing units that we presently have.

\* (1700)

I look at the riding that I represent—whether it is Gilbert Park; the riding that the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) represents, Blake Gardens; the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) represents—I believe it is Burrows—Lord Selkirk. There are thousands of nonprofit housing units in Manitoba, where the government is the landlord and the individual living in the residence is a tenant.

There is a better way and we can convert. Agreements can be achieved to allow these units, if not for no other reason but on a trial basis, to convert into housing co-ops, because what you have done by doing that is no longer are they a tenant to the government, they are a part-owner of the place in which they reside. I would argue that would do wonders in terms of bringing up morale, of ensuring individuals have an opportunity to participate in the management decisions.

I personally believe that they could do a better job than a government agency can. So this is the type of direction that we believe that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) should be moving in. I would be privileged if he wanted to have a trial area and was wanting to use Gilbert Park. We have a very active tenants association; Amie Chartrand is the current president and has been working very hard. I know he has contact with Saul Schubert, the deputy minister. There are many housing units that would love the opportunity to be able to try something of this nature. I encourage the Minister of Housing to act on it.

There is some concern that I have in terms of the Infill Housing Program. I will be raising those concerns once we go into the Estimates. I know, with the former Minister of Housing, he and I had gotten into a few debates on this particular issue. I do plan to continue to find out why it is the government has chosen to move in the direction that they have and then will base my decisions after I hear a few more of the arguments. That could be a very good reason, especially if we can allocate some of those resources over to RRAP—[interjection] R-R-A-P.

Well, then I also wanted to talk a bit about Labour. Another area that I am the critic for. The Labour Adjustment Unit has received one year; it was a third of a cent for every worker in the province of Manitoba. Another year, it was 2 cents for every worker in the province of Manitoba in terms of an increase.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the global economy and what is happening with free trade, first with the States—and the current Conservative government is determined to move ahead with free trade with Mexico. It does not matter what either the Liberals or the New Democrats or the people have to say, they are moving ahead with it. Here, while we are seeing and witnessing this change in the work force, there really is no real increase at all, period, to such a fundamental need as a labour adjustment unit, something that is going to help those individuals who are being laid off, whether it is in the manufacturing, the produce, whatever the industry, textile.

They do not have the resources, and I think that is somewhat tragic. You have to be able to invest in individuals, in the people. If you do not invest in the people of the province, the economy is not going to improve.

Final offer selection—and I have talked about final offer selection so many times—I think clearly demonstrates why the Liberal Party is best positioned to really deal with labour legislation, to deal with what is in the best interests of the worker.

I know that both the Conservatives and the NDP would question me on that particular statement, and all I would do to them is suggest that they read over the hours and hours and hours of debate in final offer selection and take me to the side and try to convince me how the workers benefited by what took place on final offer selection. Mr. Speaker, the worker did not benefit. The Tories brought it in because of the Chamber; the NDP opposed it because of a very few select individuals in the union movement. [interjection] Well, coming from the Deputy Leader of the New Democratic Party (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), she has got to be very careful because everything I say I can prove beyond a shadow of a doubt.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Well, if I have leave to speak till 5:30, I will be more than happy to expand on it.

**An Honourable Member:** Table it.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** I do not even need to table it; all you have to do is read Hansard.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move into another area that I am responsible for, the critic for Multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is a wonderful thing, and I think everyone in this Chamber would agree to it. When I think of multiculturalism, I think in terms of a lot

more than the song and the dance that we see during Folklorama, and I know that there are a number of individuals here that participate in Folklorama. That is because it is a lot more than song and dance.

We are talking about social and economic and political integration into all aspects of society, whether it is the Chamber of Commerce, whether it is within the union movement, whether it is in this Chamber or in City Hall, wherever it might be. When I think of multiculturalism, that is the type of multiculturalism that I think about.

I had an interesting example that was given, and maybe one or two of you might have heard this particular example, but it was given to me from a constituent of mine who teaches at one of the local schools. She made reference to a student teacher that had come into her class.

The student teacher went down the class to find out what they had for breakfast. The first student said that she had—I believe it was fried rice and pork. The student teacher was somewhat mystified about this and continued to go down. The next child that answered that particular question from the same ethnic group as the first child said, well, I had fried eggs or eggs and toast or something of that nature. At the end of the class, the teacher brought the student teacher to the student who said that she had the eggs and toast and asked if in fact that was what she had for breakfast. The response was, well, no, I had the fried rice and pork. The reason why she said that is because she felt that was the right thing to say.

Well, I have had fried rice and pork for breakfast. That is part of our heritage, and that is what, again, multiculturalism is all about, the heritage and cultures of all the different ethnic groups.

People, whether they are individuals such as the student teacher or if they are more of the extreme individuals, racist or whatever it might be, Mr. Speaker—it is an educational process. The only way we will really and truly become a multicultural society is by having education. Education is so very important.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that my light is already flashing.

I wanted to comment very briefly on tourism. Tourism is a very important area that I believe that this government has not given enough time to. One of the things that can be done, and the member for

St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) has commented on this, is the whole idea of taking tourism away from the Department of Industry and Trade and having it go to a department such as Highways, so that we can have more effort put on tourism in the province because it is one of the areas in which the province should be able to expand upon.

\* (1710)

Mr. Speaker, I am really cutting this short. I am going to go right down to the last line that I have on here and talk about the issue of the two domestics. I have a Resolution 35 in which I would hope that the members from this Chamber would give the leave that would be necessary in order to allow it to come to a debate, because we have two Manitobans who are being asked to leave Canada, for all intents and purposes, that the Minister of Immigration has not been able to justify.

I would hope through the government and the New Democrats that we will in fact see some sort of consensus that would allow this resolution to be debated.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Bob Rose (Turtle Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me today to first of all welcome you back as Speaker. I will admit I have not had any experience with anyone else in the Speaker's Chair, but you do remind me of a teacher I had many, many years ago who had the ability to join in the fun sometimes in the class and at the same time, with nothing much more than a glance, bring order to the classroom. I do not suppose any school teacher has ever had a more unruly class than this group is from time to time, and I admire and appreciate the way your wisdom and fairness continues to promote good debate in this Chamber.

I would also like to welcome our new Pages and tell them beforehand I do appreciate the good work that they do for all of us. I would also like to welcome back the staff, the Clerk's staff, both the new and the old, and we still, as MLAs, very much appreciate the assistance that they give us on a daily basis in helping us perform our duties.

I also welcome, Mr. Speaker, this, my fourth opportunity to speak to the motion to adopt the throne speech, as moved and seconded so capably by the member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) and the member for Portage (Mr. Pallister), or more accurately I suppose, to speak to the amendments, as proposed by the Leaders of the Opposition

parties. More experienced members in this Chamber are accustomed to returning to another session with changes in the make-up of the membership of the Legislative Assembly. This is my first experience, again, with such a change.

I would like first of all to acknowledge the contribution made to our province by the former member for Portage, Ed Connery. Each of us brings a different style and a different viewpoint to our discussions. Ed Connery's aggressive approach to problem solving and his penchant for meeting problems head on was a valuable addition. Rookie MLAs like myself learned from his guidance and his generosity. I wish Ed and his lovely spouse Bev all the best in retirement from exceptional hard work and service to the province of Manitoba.

I would also like to welcome, as others have done, the new member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) and the new member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray). People who sometimes despair of the democratic system should have taken heart in the process on those two by-elections, because they have resulted, I think, at least from early indications, that both Portage and Crescentwood will be capably represented by their new MLAs.

I viewed also with interest, from my vantage point in this top southeast corner of the Chamber, the musical chairs in the Liberal caucus, the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) moving halfway up the ladder or, in this case, down, perhaps poised for the next move. We have the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) moving closer to his natural friends. This was a surprise, because many of us expected him to stay close to the aisle to facilitate an early exit. We note the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) going nowhere, and the Leader, having decided to resign, impatiently awaiting the results of all this shuffling behind her.

**An Honourable Member:** The only one who has not moved is Gulzar.

**Mr. Rose:** Gulzar has not moved.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the two recently announced changes. Tuesday's official resignation of the member for Rupertsland, Elijah Harper I think marked an end and perhaps a beginning, but an ending certainly to the representation of the first aboriginal in this House.

Now being the first in anything is never easy. I am sure that there are many women who can attest

to that as they take their places in all elements of our society. So, in itself, being the first aboriginal earned Mr. Harper a place in history. That recognition will be more than just a statistic, for he brought the hopes and fears and aspirations of his community to this Chamber. With the fickleness of Meech Lake, fate providing the opportunity, he illustrated the truth of that Shakespearean quotation:

There is a tide in the affairs of men,  
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.

His simple no in this Chamber captured the imagination of Canadians and, for that matter, people in other countries. There is beauty, simplicity and a certain amount of poetic justice in using the rules developed by other cultures to highlight lack of recognition of our original culture.

Historians will long debate whether the demise of Meech Lake was good or bad for Canada, but there will be no question Elijah Harper used his opportunity as our first aboriginal MLA to represent his people well.

The other recent announcement of the resignation of Mrs. Carstairs as Leader of the Liberal Party is also, I think, worthy of comment. I will admit a decade ago, as a card-carrying member of the Progress Conservative Party, to watching with some glee as Pierre Trudeau decimated the Liberal Party in western Canada. There was amusement as a supporter of another party in watching the provincial Liberals choose and discard Leader after Leader. Then there was downright puzzlement at their last choice, Sharon Carstairs. I did not know then, of course, of her determination, her capacity for hard work, her ability and her genuine concern and aspiration for good government in Manitoba.

I do not think it is an exaggeration to say she single-handedly restored the Liberal Party in Manitoba and, for that matter, as the member for Crescentwood suggested the other day, in western Canada.

In the long run, well, in our partisanship, we, as in sports, cheer for our own team. Our citizens are better governed if there is an articulate representation for the many different points of view. Mrs. Carstairs has restored that to Manitoba politics, and I have to note on the way by that, if there is anyone who brings different points of view to this Legislative Assembly, it is the Liberals.

I spoke earlier of fate, and I think of the 1990 election when my tide came along, more like a trickle really than a tide, but a change at least for many of us in this Chamber, for had not Mrs. Carstairs success in 1988 denied a majority government, bringing about the 1990 election, quite a number of us would not be here today, this 3rd of December 1992.

I do not know where we would be, but I submit to you that Mrs. Carstairs had a very direct effect on many of our lives and, more indirectly, on the lives of all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that both Elijah Harper and Sharon Carstairs will be noted in history, and it has been a pleasure and an honour for me to have been in the Legislature during part of their tenure.

I am also convinced that history will be kind to another member, our Premier Gary Filmon, in a different and perhaps less dramatic way, but recognition just the same of a Premier already respected as a statesman, or statesperson, if that suits better, respected as a statesperson across Canada; a Premier who, with his cabinet and caucus, recognized the dramatic changes taking place in our society, recognized the need to adjust to these changes, recognized the inevitable disaster that awaits a society that continues to borrow from our children and their children in order to finance today's standard of living, recognized the necessity of being part of an emerging world economy and, most important of all, recognized that our citizens have the ability and determination to accept these new challenges of a changing world if allowed to be unfettered with punishing taxes and crushing debt.

\* (1720)

All these recognitions and more are reflected in the throne speech as this government continues to develop a climate where our citizens can function to their full potential. Our province will be well positioned when this recession ends, and it will end.

The reaction of the of the two opposition Leaders, as illustrated in the two amendments before us, was predictable, and I was heartened to note at least three different media outlets using that very word to describe the reaction of the opposition parties to the throne speech—predictable—predictable because Manitobans are coming to understand that the opposition parties refuse to deal with the reality of changing times.

Yes, we can continue to be in a recession and, no, it was not mentioned in the throne speech. The opposition seems to be very upset about this; why, I do not know. Perhaps they get some satisfaction out of gloom and doom. When everyone knows we are in a recession, stating the obvious is hardly necessary, and it is this recognition of the obvious that causes continued deficit financing which the opposition is again quick to point out.

We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there are some casualties as we move through recession and the changing times. We only have about 90 percent of our people who are gainfully employed, and recognition of necessary and increased social services as well as maintaining our health and education standards requires this kind of deficit investment.

The trick is to understand the balance so as to be well-positioned for the future, and nothing I think, Mr. Speaker, illustrates the lack of understanding of deficit financing on the opposition benches, nothing illustrates this more than their continued insistence that the Howard Pawley government left a surplus. It is still costing us Manitobans \$500 million a year interest on this NDP surplus.

Now, I agree that if you govern in times when the economy around you is booming and at the same time raise taxes 17 times, there should be a surplus, but our government cannot deal with should-have-beens and might-have-beens. The first thing our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has to do every year in preparation for a budget, before anything else, is fill in the line of \$500 million interest on the NDP surplus left to this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have also noted a new buzzword emerging from across the way, reregulation. I am not sure what this means or what the definition is, but we will not dwell on those niceties. The point is, what does it mean? Will their definition be as accurate as their definition of a surplus?

The member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) commented on the reregulation of business in NDP provinces, that after being taxed and regulated into insolvency, they will be reregulated into continued operation. Does this mean the employees will be reregulated to continue working even though there is no money to pay salaries? Is this the long-awaited NDP solution to escalating health care costs, to reregulate hospitals, doctors, nurses, the entire health care complex to continue to function without

compensation? What nonsense, Mr. Speaker. Had this kind of new think been in place 50 years ago, we would be left with firms like Consolidated Buggy Whip to fuel the engine of our economy.

Time does not permit comment on all the opposition contributions to this debate. Anyway, I think all Manitobans recognize that much of the rhetoric in this Chamber is just that. But it is worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, I think, to watch for little things, the spontaneous indicators.

I direct attention to a question from the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) a few days ago. It was a good question, and I paraphrase: What jobs are being created in rural Manitoba by the REDI program?

The minister responded with the example of the expansion of the Ayerst plant in Brandon made possible by substantial assistance through the REDI program, creating not only direct jobs, but in the neighbourhood of 1,000 related jobs. Well, thundered back the member for Swan River, when is this minister going to show some leadership and create some real jobs in rural Manitoba?

Real jobs, Mr. Speaker? Does the doubling of a plant's production not create real jobs? Does the doubling of production units on farms all across Manitoba create real jobs? Does the demand for more horse trailers, more barns, more corrals, more fences, more transportation create real jobs? The list goes on and on.

What does the NDP caucus define as a real job? Painting a fence, planting flowers in the ditch, measuring the streets in Fairfax, Manitoba? Is this the only real job, one that is short-term, has no lasting economic benefit and is paid for directly by the taxpayer long after the job has disappeared? [interjection] Little spontaneous comments, Mr. Speaker, among the rhetoric that tells us so much about the position of the official opposition.

Now, I know the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) has only a few colleagues with much understanding of rural Manitoba, but with her farming background she should take the time to explain to her colleagues that one does not plant a crop one day and expect to harvest it the next.

In two short years this government has prepared the fertile development fields in rural Manitoba. The REDI program, Grow Bonds, round tables, all are attracting positive response as the people in our

rural communities come to understand that this government is serious about providing fertile ground in which the initiative and hard work of our people can flourish. They realize that we finally have a government in Manitoba whose rural development program goes substantially beyond a can of green paint.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I exaggerate for the sake of effect. The last administration in Manitoba was not entirely all bad, nor is the current government administration perfect.

When the opposition point to deficits and debt in other provinces and other countries, they are correct. Constant deficit financing is not confined to political philosophy but, surely, it needs to be confined to the past. What is important is that we recognize that we are rapidly reaching our limits. The changing times demand carefully controlled deficits in times of recession and stabilized and reduced debt in times of growth.

Many, many of our citizens realize this, but not all, and surely it is time, just as all political parties practised continued deficit financing in the past, now for all political parties to show leadership to recognize this terrible threat and follow a responsible course, just as does this government and this throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about a project that is taking shape in my constituency of Turtle Mountain. In fact, it is across all of southern Manitoba, including the constituencies of Arthur-Virden, Pembina and Emerson as well. It is not a big project. It is not an expensive one and, I assure you at this point at least, not a project that the government has promoted financially or does the government take any credit for. We MLAs involved have acted as cheer leaders with encouraging words and a few bucks from the constituency allowance, but this developing project illustrates a couple of characteristics to which the honourable member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) referred to yesterday, pride and hard work, characteristics that we have been losing and need to regain.

\* (1730)

A few years ago some interested people formed the Boundary Commission North West Mounted Police Trail Association. This group chronicled the historical events of the western movement from Emerson of the Boundary Commission to survey

and establish the border between Canada and the U.S.A. along the 49th parallel. This same trail was used by the North West Mounted Police as they moved westward to bring law and order to the developing Saskatchewan and Alberta provinces. This energetic group annually re-enacts the journey as close as possible to the original trail with a wagon train and accompanying outriders.

In 1991 the provincial government recognized this historical route by officially declaring Highway 3 from Morden to Souris and adjoining highways from Morden to Emerson as the Boundary Commission North West Mounted Police Trail.

One of the very first visitors from out of province and out of country to this trail, Mr. Speaker, was a group called ICOMOS, the International Council on Monuments and Sites, the principal adviser to UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. This group toured across the trail for three or four days last spring, examining all the various historic sites that are available to see along this historic trail. Now, not content with this, and I am coming now to the current project, the association—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Pursuant to Rule 35(2), I am interrupting the proceedings in order to put the question on the motion of the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition party, that is, a subamendment to the motion for an address and reply to the Speech from the Throne. Do members wish to have the motion read?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** THAT the Amendment be amended by adding thereto the following words:

And this House further regrets that:

1. this government's state of intellectual exhaustion has prevented it from taking the actions required to improve Manitoba's economic performance, and provide a stronger basis for growth both in the short term and long term;

2. this government has failed to respond to the needs of the people of Manitoba during the recession in that it has not provided any job training and retraining strategy;

3. while criticizing the federal government for offloading education costs, this government has itself transferred education costs from the provincial tax base to the property tax payer, and failed to articulate specific reforms to the education system

except substantial cuts to the funding of the education system;

4. this government has not made sufficient efforts to consult and involve the public in its reform proposals for the health care system;

5. this government has not implemented a comprehensive, co-ordinated, independent Health Reform Monitor, to monitor and report publicly on the progress and impacts of reforms in the health care system.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** No? All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader):** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Call in the members.

The question before the House is the motion of the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition Party (Mrs. Carstairs) that is a subamendment to the motion from the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Do members wish to have the motion reread?

\* (1740)

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, okay. All those in favour of the motion will please rise.

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

#### Yeas

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carstairs, Cerilli, Cheema, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Edwards, Evans (Brandon East), Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Gaudry, Gray, Hickey, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wasylcyia-Leis.

#### Nays

Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Manness,

McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Pallister, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Sveinson, Vodrey.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Yeas 25, Nays 28.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Six o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being 6 p.m. this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

# Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Thursday, December 3, 1992

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Reading and Receiving Petitions

Restriction of Stubble Burning  
Edwards 196

Brandon General Hospital Funding  
L. Evans 196

#### Tabling of Reports

Annual Reports: Justice; Law Foundation  
McCrae 196

#### Introduction of Bills

Bill 5, Northern Affairs Amendment Act  
Downey 196

Bill 200, Child and Family Services  
Amendment Act  
Barrett 197

Bill 6, Real Property Amendment Act  
McCrae 197

Bill 7, Builders' Liens Amendment Act  
McCrae 197

#### Oral Questions

North American Free Trade Agreement  
Doer; Filmon 197

Federal Mini Budget  
Doer; Filmon 198

Crow Benefit  
Plohman; Findlay 199

Federal Mini Budget  
Alcock; Manness 201

Labour Force Development  
Friesen; Vodrey 202

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation  
L. Evans; Cummings 202

RRAP  
Lamoureux; Ernst; Filmon 203

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation  
L. Evans; Cummings 204

Telecommunications Industry  
Dewar; Filmon 205

Sears Canada  
Dewar; Filmon 205

Telecommunications Industry  
Dewar; Filmon 205

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Throne Speech Debate

(Fifth Day of Debate)

Reid 206

Enns 208

Friesen 215

Vodrey 220

Lamoureux 228

Rose 234