

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, May 29, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for Education ending March 31, 1988.

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Natural Resources Development Act): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of Channel Area Loggers, Ltd., 1987-88, and also Moose Lake Loggers, Ltd. for '87-88, as well, annual report.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): I would like to table the report of the Manitoba Beef Commission, 1987-88; the report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, '87-88; the Manitoba Mediation Board, 1988; the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation, '87-88; Farm Lands Ownership Board, '87-88; Milk Prices Review Commission, '87-88; and a report to the Legislature on The Agricultural Producers Funding Act, dated June, 1989.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): I am pleased to table the Annual Report, 1987-88, for the Manitoba Arts Council; the Annual Report, 1987-88, for the Manitoba Intercultural Council; the Annual Report for the Legislative Library, 1987-88; and the Annual Report, 1987-88, for the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL NO. 10—THE BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 10, The Beverage Container Act; Loi sur les contenants de boissons.

MOTION presented.

* (1335)

Mr. Roch: To make a few brief remarks, the purpose and intent of this Bill is essentially to give an incentive for people to keep, especially in the rural areas, all of Manitoba litter free. It is essentially an environmental Bill and adds to the whole intent of Governments everywhere into further recycling and encouraging a clean environment. I will get into more details when the Bill comes up for reading in principle. Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 19—THE GROUND WATER AND WATER WELL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 19, The Ground Water and Water Well Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les eaux souterraines et les puits.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, I would like to direct Honourable Members' attention to the presence at the Table here today where we have Patricia Chaychuk-Fitzpatrick, who has been appointed Clerk of Committees to replace Janet Summers, who has been appointed Members' Benefits Officer.

I am sure all Honourable Members would want to welcome her to the staff of the Assembly.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Also with us this afternoon, in the Speaker's gallery, we have with us today Linda Haverstock who is the Leader of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan.

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

Also with us this afternoon, seated in the public gallery, from the Bertrun E. Glavin Elementary School, ninety Grade 5 students under the direction of Mrs. Wenden and Mrs. Podolsky. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Silica-Sand Plant Provincial Investment

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, Dow Corning has applied for a land-use permit to construct a silica-sand research facility on the Manitoba Hydro property in East Selkirk, the second phase of its project. Taxpayers have already contributed a substantial sum toward the first phase of this project. The Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) has indicated that the Government would become a partner in the second phase. While we all support new industry in this province and hope that the Dow Corning project will materialize and meet all of our expectations, we must be vigilant with respect to how tax dollars are used in attracting new industry.

My question to the Minister of Energy and Mines, how much does his Government expect to invest in Phase 2 of the project, and under what terms and conditions?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, the arrangement on Phase 1 was for the provincial and federal Government to invest approximately 25 percent of the total cost. The arrangements for Phase 2 are being negotiated on the same basis. The total cost is expected to be somewhere between \$10 million and \$15 million. The Dow Corning have announced in their news release this morning that they expect the cost to be in the neighbourhood of \$10 million. The provincial Government and the federal Government are negotiating with Dow Corning, and the involvement by the Manitoba Government is expected to be in the neighbourhood of 25 percent.

Revenue Source

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Mines, can he confirm to the House today if the federal Government has guaranteed any aspect or any funds to this particular project?

* (1340)

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, the negotiations are in process, and I do not think it is the proper place in the House to negotiate this matter publicly. As far as we are concerned at the moment, the federal Government will participate in the same manner as they have in the first phase of the project.

Mrs. Carstairs: Knowing the way in which Manitoba has been treated by the federal Government on numerous projects, including a decline in funds for the Western Diversification Fund, from what source of revenue does he expect the funds from the federal Government to come for the development of this particular project?

Mr. Neufeld: I do not presume to speak for the federal Government and indicate the source from which they are going to get the monies to invest in the project. It is my expectation and the expectation of this Government that funds will be available for Phase 2 of the project.

Mrs. Carstairs: The expectations of the federal Government have not resulted in actual cash dollars to the Province of Manitoba, and we look only to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting for an indication of their lack of willingness to help to contribute to Manitoba.

Manitoba Hydro Preferential Rates

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a new question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, from past experience, we know that the Government has no clearly defined policy with respect to hydro rates it is prepared to offer industries who express an interest in setting up in this province. Can the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) tell us, what rate has he set with Dow Corning for preferential hydro rates, and how low a price is he prepared to give them our power for?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has just said, we have a very clearly defined policy on hydro rates. The Dow Corning Company have asked, as it was indicated in the press, for a 20-year agreement as to hydro rates. We are negotiating on the published rates on the basis of 1992, anticipated rates of 1992. There will be an escalation clause which will approximate inflation. The final agreement with Dow Corning has not yet been reached but the basis of our discussions are on the published rates for high hydro users in Manitoba.

Silica-Sand Plant Negotiation Process

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a question to the First Minister, can the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) tell the House today if he has entered into the negotiations with the federal Government in order to guarantee their contribution to this particular project?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I know that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) does not in any way give any responsibility to any of her colleagues so she would not understand this process.

The fact of the matter is that Ministers and departments are responsible for the things that they have been charged with the responsibility for. They go out and they negotiate, and the Manitoba Energy Authority has been designated by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) to enter into this kind of negotiation to come to an agreement between the Government of Canada, Dow Corning and ourselves. That process of negotiation is under way. We have every reason to believe it will result in the same conclusion as the negotiations for Phase 1 did, and that is that there will be a fruitful agreement that will be beneficial to all people, Manitobans, Manitoba Hydro. We will get jobs, we will get investment and all those things.

* (1345)

I think what we should be asking the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) is, is she against a major investment in the Province of Manitoba? Is she against a project that, if it comes to fruition, will result in more than 200 jobs, in major, major investment, job creation activity in this province and good economic benefit? Why are they against every development decision that this Government takes? Why are they against Repap, 400 jobs, a billion dollars of investment?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Why are they against Dow Corning? Why are they against the developing of

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

Mrs. Carstairs: But you know, the laissez-faire attitude which this particular Minister has with his first cousins in Ottawa has resulted in nothing but cuts to Manitoba.

Silica-Sand Plant Environmental Impact Study

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): We want to know today, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) if this laissez-faire attitude is also going to extend to the devolution and development of this particular plant. Will the Minister tell us today if he will be conducting an environmental impact study to determine what environmental implications of the silicone plant will exist, and also the effects of strip mining?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we have not yet received a proposal to the department regarding this development, but I can tell you that the department has been involved with the corporation in helping to establish guidelines and criteria, along with the local planning district on site selection. When a proposal comes forward, the corporation has already indicated that they are prepared to fully cooperate with all environmental regulations.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): We will be watching that announcement to the Minister. If we are going to put \$10 million worth of Government money in that project, Mr. Speaker, we want \$10 million worth of equity, both in terms of the project and \$10 million worth of equity in terms of the technology.

Cardiac Care Waiting Period

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Now, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). We were raising issues last week with the Government and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to no avail in terms of the serious issues in the Department of Health on the funding situation and a number of health care facilities, the lack of any decisions, the administrative situation in the Department of Health.

Again this weekend, we have had our worst fears confirmed with publicly revealed information, as I am sure the Minister of Health is aware, that the waiting list for cardiac surgery has doubled in the last year since May, Mr. Speaker, and it is causing serious problems for the delivery of health care in this province and serious problems for the families who have to go through the trauma of waiting for these situations.

I would ask the Minister to describe to the House and explain to the House the situation on this serious health care issue, and what action he and his Government are doing about the administrative situation in the Department of Health affecting patients in Manitoba.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the Honourable Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Doer) has posed this question. The allegations made by Dr. Parrott on Friday are essentially the same allegations that were made in late

December, early January, and those allegations were not supported by the administration of the Health Sciences Centre in December, early January, nor are they supported by the administration of the Health Sciences Centre today.

But, Mr. Speaker, when those allegations were made early this year, I took the situation very seriously, and this Government took the situation very seriously. As a result, we have in place a Cardiac Care Committee which is headed by a prominent physician in Winnipeg, who is not directly associated in his medical discipline with cardiac care.

The mandate of that Cardiac Care Committee is to investigate the allegations of waiting lists and deaths on waiting lists that the surgeon has made, which have not been confirmed by the administration of the hospital, to examine the role of two open-heart surgery programs between the two teaching hospitals, and to find ways in which Manitobans can be better served within the open-heart surgery program of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, that Cardiac Care Committee is functional, is operating, and is inviting participation of all physicians, including Dr. Parrott.

* (1350)

Health Care Administration

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): We have confirmed that the waiting period of time was six to eight weeks in St. Boniface and 12 weeks with the Health Sciences Centre in Winnipeg in '87, the dates that the Minister quotes, early '88. It has now doubled and our information from nurses in the area indicates that Manitoba has indeed had the waiting period doubled, putting many, many patients and families in a very serious situation.

Last Thursday, I tabled in this House and I will retable in this House a copy of the budget of the Health Sciences Centre which indicates an \$8 million shortfall. It is labelled, "inadequate available funds" by the administration itself. I would ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) what is he going to do about the administrative situation where they do not know their existing budget. There is a shortfall in the cardiac area, and people and families in Manitoba have been put in trauma by the Minister's lack of action in this very important area.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate again my honourable friend's questioning because one of the pieces of information he did not put on the record is that at the St. Boniface program, the waiting list, the time for surgery has remained relatively stable over the last number of years. Only at the Health Sciences Centre has this circumstance developed. That is one of the issues we wish to have investigated by the Cardiac Care Committee.

My honourable friend, the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer), wishes to have his cake

and he wishes to eat it too, because if he accedes to the argument that six people, as alleged by Dr. Parrott, have died whilst awaiting open-heart surgery in 1988, then surely my honourable friend with the New Democratic Party must assume blame for one-third of those because they were Government for one-third. Secondly, because they have said that our Budget last year was essentially their Budget with our Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) name on it, then they must assume responsibility for all the deaths.

Mr. Speaker, I have told you and tried to explain to the House in January, as well as today, that the hospitals disassociate themselves with the statements made by the surgeon, including the prevalence of deaths on the waiting list. If my honourable friend wants to get into those individual cases, I am prepared to do that.

Cardiac Care Waiting Period

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we did not allege any deaths to this Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), but we will allege and we will be able to support the fact when we were in Government the waiting list was half as much as it is now. When we were in Government, we had the shortest waiting lists of any province and of any Department of Health in Canada, which is really seriously at risk with this Minister.

My question to the Minister is, he just quoted St. Boniface Hospital. We have just become aware this morning and I have written the Minister just coincidental to this morning's information from a patient, a person named Mr. Les Childs from Thompson, Manitoba, who had to wait nine months, was delayed three times to go into the St. Boniface Hospital for cardiac surgery. My question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Will he do something about the situation at the Health Sciences Centre and also the St. Boniface Hospital with the information we have just provided?

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have exactly explained to my honourable friend who chooses not to listen that indeed we have struck a Cardiac Care Committee headed by a prominent Winnipeg physician. - (Interjection)- My honourable friends in the NDP now would probably suggest backing up the Brinks truck.

An Honourable Member: What about the \$2 million they need?

Mr. Orchard: One of my honourable friends in the New Democratic Party is now saying, what about the \$2 million they need. Not even the Cardiac Care Committee is able to indicate whether that would be an appropriate use of resource.

Surely my honourable friends would want considered decisions made in cardiac care because we are rather unique in Manitoba in that we have two programs operating at two teaching hospitals. The one at St.

Boniface does approximately 450 procedures per year. The other does approximately 200 per year. The waiting list at one has doubled, at the Health Sciences Centre, over the last few months, while St. Boniface has remained relatively stable. I think those are questions that deserve answers, and we are seeking those answers. In the meantime, we will trust to the professional judgment of physicians to determine the appropriate scheduling of open-heart surgery and not leave that up to the Members of the Opposition.

* (1355)

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Health Sciences Centre Budget

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this Minister has committees, it has advisory task forces, it has every little fluffy word in the book for not doing anything about the health care system in this province. My question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), why does he not deal with the budget at the Health Sciences Centre that is below inflation right now, which is labelled by their administration to be inadequate in terms of the funding for the patients of Manitoba? What is he going to do about the deteriorating health care system in this province in terms of his administration, and deliver a budget to that facility that is at least equal to the challenge in the health care financing that it deserves to meet the patient need of Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I reject the hypocrisy of the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer). You cannot say that the inflation rate—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), on a point of order.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I realize we are now entering the third week of this Session. I thought we have done rather well in terms of avoiding some of the excesses in terms of unparliamentary language that we saw from certain Members, particularly this Member, last Session. I do believe that the statement about hypocrisy was unparliamentary. It is on both our lists, both prohibited and unprohibited, but I think the intent of the Minister was unparliamentary, not in keeping with the decorum that we seem to have managed to be able to maintain in the House thus far this Session. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to call the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to order so that we can at least attempt to maintain that decorum.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. As the Honourable Member has quite aptly pointed out to all Honourable Members of the Chamber that the word does show up on both lists, unparliamentary and parliamentary. As I have said previously, we are not at a tea party, and I would ask the Honourable Members to choose and pick their words wisely.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) has said that the level of increase to the Health Sciences Centre is below the rate of inflation. That is false. It is approximately double the rate of last year's inflation. Secondly, my honourable friend cannot have it both ways. If the difficulties at the Health Sciences Centre have emerged because of lack of funding, then he cannot claim that last year's budget, hence funding to the Health Sciences Centre, was simply a rubber stamp of what the NDP were going to do. The health care system is under a better management system than it ever has been, and I take credit for that, as my colleagues in Government take credit for that and reject the kind of out-of-context, untrue, hypocritical . . .

Cardiac Care Waiting Period

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, the waiting period for all surgical procedures in Manitoba hospitals is continuing to increase and health care professionals are leaving as a symptom of a do-nothing syndrome created by this Minister and this First Minister (Mr. Filmon). There are 90 patients at the Health Sciences Centre waiting for eight months for by-pass surgery. For them, the waiting period amounts to an open-ended death certificate. Can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell us why the waiting period for by-pass surgery has doubled under his rule?

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, if I understood my honourable friend's question, I cannot confirm, as he alleges, that the waiting list is now eight months for 90 patients. I simply do not know whether that is factual or not. I do not believe that to be the case. However, I will investigate that allegation by my honourable friend.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is wanting to know what is causing an increase in the waiting list at the Health Sciences Centre when the St. Boniface waiting list has remained relatively stable over the same period of time. That is exactly what we are attempting to come to grips with. I reiterate again, and I cannot reiterate it often enough, that the statements made by the physician at the Health Sciences Centre are not backed up by the administration of the Health Sciences Centre. So when you have circumstances where the waiting list has grown and the physician is responsible for that waiting list, it needs serious investigation.

We intend to do that. That is in process now, as it was last month with the Cardiac Care Committee, because those are questions that need to be answered.

* (1400)

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, on September 2, 1988, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) said that the waiting period was caused by summer closures. The Tory summer is almost one year old. My question is, can the Minister of Health tell us today what step he will

take now, and not setting up too many committees, what steps he will take today so that these patients do not have to wait for eight months? Does he have any plans today or not?

Mr. Orchard: There are steps in place right now to attempt to alleviate the problem at Health Sciences Centre. But my honourable friend surely must want to rely on the professional integrity of those physicians who are deciding who receives the open-heart surgical procedure. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot determine which person ought to be advanced to the emergency list and receive surgery. That is the job of the admitting physician and that is done so that people whose circumstances change whilst on the waiting list will receive appropriate care.

I want to offer to my honourable friend just a couple of pieces of information so that he knows that the hospital is attempting to come to grips with this issue in a reasoned fashion. The Health Sciences Centre wishes to point out—and this was in January when the identical issue was raised by the same surgeon. They said, No. 1, it is very difficult for any doctor to establish the relative risk of any patient on a waiting list, but that is their job, Mr. Speaker, and a tough one it is. It said, it is not possible to have no waiting list service because patients need to be prepared medically for the surgery and need also to consider the implication of surgery on themselves and their families.

There are two more points, Mr. Speaker, that I think are important to the discussions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions should be as brief as possible.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister would table that document.

An Honourable Member: I think he should have anyway, that he read from.

Mr. Orchard: There is no rule in the House that says I have to table speaking notes, Mr. Speaker, and I wish the Member would learn the rules.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), on a point of order.

Mr. Ashton: On the point of order, the Minister made it quite clear he was reading from a document and the standard practice in the House is to table such documents. He made no reference to speaking notes, and I think it is only common courtesy to Members of the Legislature who have sat patiently through the Minister's rather lengthy answers for him to at least table the document.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), on the same point of order.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Honourable

Member for Thompson, the House Leader for the third Opposition Party (Mr. Ashton) goes a little too far when he asks Members on the Government's side to table their own speaking notes. I mean, a lot of us have briefing books in front of us. Is that what he is asking for? I mean, at some point, we do get to the point of being ridiculous in some of these requests, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) simply said that he was referring to his notes and I take him for his word on that. Order, please. There is no point of order. Order, please; order, please. I have recognized the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

Children's Hospital Staff Shortages

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, why does the Minister have to wait for a crisis? He had six months, he never did anything. My question is, last Thursday this Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) indicated that the financial situation was not responsible for the academic brain drain. Today, the Health Sciences and media clearly indicated the opposite. Can the Minister of Health tell the House why he misled the House and what steps he has taken to stop the further bleeding of critical shortage of staff at Children's Hospital?

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): The Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) asks the Minister of Health why he misled the House. Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister of Health is to be asked that question by the Honourable Member, implicit in the question is that the Honourable Minister of Health deliberately somehow misled the House. Now I suggest, in the context of the way the question was put, the Honourable Member ought to withdraw that and put his question in a different way.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader does not have a point of order. The word "mislead" does show up on both lists again. He did not say "deliberately misled."

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I did not realize the depth to which my honourable friend could dip in his attempt to make crass political points.

I refer my honourable friend, because I knew that my honourable friend with his lack of research in the Liberal Party would come back on this issue, I refer my honourable friend to page 94 in my answer, and I said "it is not a monetary reason in a number of these instances." I stand by those facts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my honourable friend the reason why a number of these individuals have left pediatric sub-specialties in Winnipeg. One has become the Member of Parliament for Winnipeg North, hardly a monetary reason, or maybe it is. Mr. Speaker, another individual has left to become the head of a department in another major hospital in Canada. I am not aware of any financial implications, they are not indicated. A third individual left to change careers. He is now working

as the registrar for the College of Physicians and Surgeons, not a monetary issue. A fourth one has not left because of a money situation. A fifth has left for money, as well as career advancement. A sixth . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I am having trouble when my honourable friends accuse me of misleading the House and then do not want the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order. As the Honourable Minister has quite—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. As the Honourable Minister of Health quite ably pointed out to us, this same answer did appear in Hansard previously.

Centre for Aging Status Report

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On August 17 of last year, amid all kinds of ceremony and pomp and circumstance, it was announced that Manitoba would be the site of the \$23.9 million centre for aging and rehabilitation product development. The initiative was to be cost-shared between the Western Diversification Office and the Government of Manitoba. It was also to create some 500 jobs in Manitoba's private sector.

My question is to the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Downey). Could the Minister give us an update on this project and what consultation has he generated with the Manitoba seniors community?

Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Seniors): Mr. Speaker, let me assure you that, in the short time that I have had as Minister for Seniors, we have been actively working on their behalf to develop some areas that may assist them in achieving a better way of life in this province, and this is one of the areas that we will be further looking at. I can assure the Minister (sic) that I will take his specifics of the question under advisement and return with the more detailed answer.

Mr. Carr: I appreciate the promotion from the Member from the critic to Minister, but I assure him that is the prerogative of my Leader and not of him.

Mr. Speaker, the promise was made at the time, back in August which is now nine months ago, that there would be a board of directors established and there would be consultation with Manitoba's senior community. Can the Minister tell us today and reassure us, and through us the people of Manitoba, that this \$23.9 million project is very much on the rails and about to be announced?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, as critic, I am not sure what the Liberal Member has done on this, other than wait

until this particular time in which he could probably grandstand in front of the people of Manitoba in Question Period.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

* (14 10)

Budget—Federal Western Diversification Fund

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): If I cannot get an answer from the Minister, maybe I will try his boss and ask my supplementary to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). Yet another blow was dealt to Manitoba's economy and it was levelled by Michael Wilson's Budget. In that Budget, the form of some \$40 million was cut from the Western Diversification Office at the same time that 113 staff jobs were increased. While the bureaucracy goes up, the grants go down.

Because Manitoba has already been badly treated by the Western Diversification office and has not received its fair share, my question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) is, can he assure us that no proved or projected programs of the Western Diversification Office will be adversely affected by Michael Wilson's leaked Budget cuts?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, would you mind getting the adult day care centre under control, please?

In response to the question from the Member for Ft. Rouge (Mr. Carr), we have no reason to believe otherwise.

Land Development Policy

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): My question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). Today the Conservative Government announced the second case of privatization of existing Government property in the last week. Last week, we were concerned about a specific issue. Now we are more concerned about an emerging trend.

The Government of course is giving up public sector land to private land developers for up-scale housing. Mr. Speaker, our concern is that this Government is turning its back on the needs of those who require housing and require renovation in their housing, in order to accommodate land developers and those who require up-scale housing. This latest land deal is the second major departure in the previous Government's—and what I thought was this Government's—land development policies, which focused on meeting needs, social needs of those who require housing and renovation and, secondly, focused on providing housing at the lower end of the market.

Can the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson) clarify what the Government meant

in their release today when they indicated that this development would have to be compatible with the local neighbourhood? What specific criteria does she feel would make this particular development compatible with that neighbourhood?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I might indicate for the edification of the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) that in both cases the proposals were under active consideration and pursuit by his administration when they were in Government, both the proposal in south St. Boniface and the proposal on the Fort Osborne complex, active consideration.

As a matter of fact, I was told by one of the proposers, in fact in each case, that they believed Cabinet was about to approve, that the former Cabinet—they quoted in one case the present Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) who was then the Minister of Urban Affairs as saying that Cabinet was about to approve the specific proposal.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), on a point of order.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): The Premier (Mr. Filmon) is quoting totally false information in this Chamber, just like he did last Friday, and I would suggest that he answer the question put to him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member knows that a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable First Minister, to finish his answer.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the meaning of compatibility with the local area development is a matter that will be decided and discussed at the public hearings that will take place in terms of appropriate land use, the public hearings that must take place in order for this development to proceed, public hearings of the City of Winnipeg. They will be held duly, as they should be, following all the rules and procedures for land use, changes and proposals in the City of Winnipeg.

Fort Osborne Complex Neighbourhood Compatibility

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): In a press release today, it very clearly states that proposals for the Fort Osborne site were evaluated using the following criteria, and one of those criteria is compatibility with the local neighbourhood. Now the First Minister is telling us that they really did not know what those criteria were. He does not know what compatibility is, and it is a matter for public hearings, Mr. Speaker. Well, that is not good enough.

I would ask the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mitchelson), can she define the specific criteria that were contemplated in this news release when she indicated that the Fort Osborne site proposals have already been evaluated with respect to compatibility with the local neighbourhood?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer that question for the Honourable Member for Churchill. Quite clearly, the reason the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation and the Historic Resources Branch of my department was involved in the proposal calls for the Fort Osborne Barracks was because the buildings that are on that site are of significant heritage value.

We spent much time, along with the Department of Government Services, my department and that department, going over those proposals and ensuring that the heritage buildings that were on that piece of property were going to be maintained and preserved as best they could.

It is not the Manitoba Government that is going to be developing that property. We had indicated quite clearly, because it was going to cost the Government of Manitoba about \$10 million, up to \$10 million, to restore and maintain those buildings, that we wanted the private sector to become involved in developing that property, preserving the heritage buildings and assuring that we had some sense of good development.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowan: Mr Speaker, there are two criteria in the news release, or there are four, one of which is preservation of relevant heritage resources, which the Minister answered. Yet the Government fails or refuses to answer what they consider to be compatibility with the local neighbourhood. We will continue to ask that question.

Ladco Land Development Deal Finalization Date

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): My question now is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). During the last campaign, he promised as part of his campaign commitments that the Government would sell off one of their properties in Winnipeg for \$3 million, one of the properties held by the Government. I would ask the Minister, him having made that statement on April 21, is this the sale or was the sale to Ladco, the \$3 million sale which he committed to during his campaign, and when was that deal struck?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Member knows full well, we are certainly getting more than the \$3 million from each of the sales, and the combined total is in excess of \$15 million for the two parcels.- (Interjection)- Has the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) some information he would like to share with the House?

The fact of the matter is that during that campaign we gave indications of what we considered to be

potential sources of revenue for the Government, and one was that we could sell off excess land. Where it was profitable and productive for the Government to do so, we would sell off excess land.

Rather than have being done what the NDP had done way back in 1973, purchasing land in south St. Boniface, having interest paid for 16 years, driving up the value of that land or the cost of that land to the stage where one could never get its value out other than by developing it, we have now proceeded to do what is prudent and wise and businesslike to do, and that is to develop, have that land developed in concert with private developers to maximize its potential and finally return some money to where it belongs, the pockets of the taxpayer.

Law Enforcement Review Agency Winnipeg Police Association

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae). In the last two days, the Winnipeg Police Association has sent out the message that they do not think their actions should be subject to review by the Law Enforcement Review Agency. This attitude by the association that their actions are beyond review, and their threat to launch lawsuits against claimants for lodging complaints that turn out not to be successful are not acceptable to this side of the House. Yet, the defense by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) of LERA has been conspicuous by its absence.

My question is, will the Minister today state for the record that with power comes responsibility and that the police, like all other professions, must be subject to review and are not above the law, as no one is?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the Honourable Member's question today on a matter of what I think is of significant importance to all Manitobans. I can assure the Honourable Member that I agree wholeheartedly with him that no one in this province is above the law and that there is certainly need in our society to have agencies, as in the case of the Law Society, to which the Honourable Member must subject himself, if that were necessary. He must of course, as his colleagues, obey the rules set down by our laws and also by the rules set down by the Law Society. Similar to the Judicial Council, which is there to watchdog the judges in our society, so too we have the Law Enforcement Review Agency, Mr. Speaker, which plays an important role in our society and for the protection of our citizens.

* (1420)

Mr. Edwards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Minister of Justice for that affirmation of the importance of LERA.

Reform

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, for the same Minister, it has now come to light that recommendations for changes to LERA were given to this Minister back a year ago, exactly in May of 1988. The Minister, unfortunately true to form, has sat on that report for a year now. Will the Minister do something and table those recommendations today so that all Members may assist in encouraging him to do his job in a timely fashion and assess and perhaps implement these recommendations?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I would not want, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) to go on being offended in her feeling or her allegation that only her questions have been deemed silly by Honourable Members on this side of the House. I would assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that some of the questions put forward by the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) are also silly.

In that respect, the Honourable Member made the silly statement, Mr. Speaker, in his question that, true to form, this Minister has been sitting on certain matters. Well, I need only ask the Honourable Member to read my contribution in the Throne Speech Debate, because there is quite a listing of the achievements undertaken by my department since I was named Minister. With respect specifically to issues relating to the Law Enforcement Review Agency, the Honourable Member can read the newspapers as well as I can, indeed uses them as his research document of the last couple of days to tell him and to tell everyone that there are views on both sides, from the view taken by the Police Association that there should be no LERA to other views that there should be amendments. Well, Mr. Speaker, the department reviews those suggestions, reviews reports, reviews and monitors the activities of the agency to see that it provides the maximum protection for all Manitobans.

Mr. Edwards: Let the Minister defend his delays to the people of Brandon with respect to the Brandon Court House. Let him defend his delays of the court backlog which he has waited a year to come up with something about. He promised that a year ago. He said in December he had a plan. Seven months later, he finally comes up with a plan.

J. J. Harper Inquiry Winnipeg Police Association

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my final question to this Minister, in the first week of March, \$25,000 of provincial funds were set aside as being made available to the Winnipeg Police Association to appear and pay lawyers to appear on their behalf at the J. J. Harper inquiry. My question to this Minister is, can he assure this House that none of those funds have been used to fund the application by the police to frustrate the entire efforts of this inquiry through court action in the Court of Appeal? Can he assure us that none of those funds have been used by that

association to frustrate the whole purpose of the aboriginal justice inquiry?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member's preamble was equally as silly as some of the questions put by the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs).

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Honourable Member with respect to the Brandon Court House, which he raised in the preamble to his question, that the Brandon Court House was the subject, I believe, of no one's election commitments except my own, and action is being taken as I speak with respect to the Brandon Court House. The Honourable Member talks about court houses when his own colleague, the Honourable Member for Elice (Ms. Gray), saw fit to withdraw or withhold support for changes to the Minnedosa Court House to see that it be repaired. That was done in spite of the opposition of Honourable Members opposite.

With respect to backlogs, the Honourable Member asks another silly question similar to the silly question he asked back a year ago with respect to the Land Titles Office. With respect to the question the Honourable Member asked about the police association, indeed we will not need assistance . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I remind the Honourable Ministers that answers to questions should be as brief as possible and should not provoke debate. The time for oral questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the adjourned debate of the address of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Johnson), and the proposed amendment of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), the amendment thereto, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) who has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks on Friday, I was addressing some comments by Liberal Members from their seat with respect to our intentions when this Throne Speech Debate comes to a vote in this House.

I had started off those comments with a quote by the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) which appeared in the newspaper not that long ago when the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) said, and I quote, "I think I have enough credibility within the Liberal Party of Manitoba that they know that Sharon Carstairs does what Sharon Carstairs thinks is best for Sharon Carstairs, and hopefully that is also best for the Liberal Party." That certainly gives us some indication of the pecking order of priorities for the Liberal Leader and that is what is best for her first, that may or may not be best but hopefully is so for the Liberal Party. Nowhere in that quote does she anywhere indicate that she has

any concern for what is best for the people of this province.

It is obvious from that statement that the Leader of the Liberal Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) does not care about her Party, does not care about her province, does not care about policy and principle quite as much as she cares about what she thinks is best for Sharon Carstairs.

Now we know why she wants that election, and I am not surprised that she wants that election. I am surprised that some of the backbenchers want that election at this particular time, but I do think they have been trained very well by the Leader of the Opposition who, when she assumed responsibility for the caucus after the last election, said that she had a lot to teach them. With respect to undying commitment, with respect to blind loyalty, she has taught them very well because we see them day after day, like a bunch of trained seals, stand and defer to the Leader of the Opposition, stand and clap on cue for the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs).

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, William Chornopyski, in the Chair.)

I have to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I do admire discipline, they are probably the most disciplined caucus I have seen in this House in a long time in paying undying reverence to their Leader on every occasion, even when it is not remotely deserved.

Let us talk about the dilemma that some of us face in this House with respect to a Throne Speech which we believe fails on at least two out of three counts, and I believe it will be shown to fail on the third count. Voting out the Government at this particular time, which could possibly—I do not know if it would or not—put in power a Liberal Government, now that is a really scary thought—as they used to say on a TV program, “very scary.” Why is that a very scary thought? Why is that a frightening proposition? What would happen if she and her gang were to gain power in this province? How long would it be before Manitobans would be paying for their meals, paying for their toothpaste, paying for their slippers, when they are sick and in the hospital? How long would it be before the Liberal Leader brought forward in a concrete policy that commitment, that promise that she made during the last election?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, she is very clearly on the record as having said she believes that is one way to confront the funding in the health care crisis. I know the Conservatives toy with user fees quite often and I know they have a general inclination to user fees. The fact is, because of the minority situation, I believe we have been able to dissuade them from imposing user fees in this province. I am not certain we would be able to do that in a majority situation, but as long as they are in a minority situation I believe we are safe from them imposing user fees.

* (1430)

I could be proven wrong and I hope the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) does not go out to do that. The fact is, I believe we are in such a position that we are

safe for the time being. I do not believe that we would be as safe if a Liberal Government got in power, which was led by a Liberal Leader who has already said she believes that people can afford to pay for their slippers and their toothpaste and whatever other amenities, as she terms them, when they are in the hospital.

They are sick when they are in the hospital, they are ill, they do not have money, they do not have a bankroll to carry them through. Most of the people in this province when they go into a hospital are suffering not only serious physical hardship but serious economic hardship. They do not have the extra money like some may have to be able to pay for their toothpaste, to be able to pay for their slippers, to be able to pay for their mouthwash, to be able to pay for their meals.

What sort of system are we going to have? If you can pay for steak, you get steak and if you can only pay for macaroni and cheese or bologna that is what you get? Are we going to base the criteria in the hospital on not what you need to be cheered and made better but on what you can afford to pay, because that is where that two-tier approach takes us.

How long would it be before a Liberal Government would impose their user fee or a means test for Home Care, because that is what their Health critic has hinted at as a way of saving costs to the Home Care Program? That is what the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) has hinted at as way of saving costs for the Home Care Program. You know, toying with these sorts of ideas are really quite dangerous. They are dangerous to the concept of universality. They are dangerous to the system which we have built up, which is one of the best health care systems in the world, bar none. They are dangerous to the Liberal caucus, because I can tell you that those are comments that are clearly on the record. They are public comments and we, on every occasion, will take the opportunity to remind the public of what lies beneath that exterior of arrogance and ego.

When I say arrogance, I see some of the Members cringe on the Liberal benches, and I do not use that word without some reference. I am reading from the Southwest Lance, Tuesday, May 23, 1989, and the question is: are the Liberals ready? It is a column entitled, “Viewpoints” by Mr. Bob Beaton. I will read just the first paragraph and the last paragraph.

“Liberal Leader, Sharon Carstairs, has shown Manitobans on many occasions that she is not short of confidence in her own abilities and she has now extended that confidence to her band of rookie MLAs.” Then it goes through the article about some of the things they have said in the past, but the last paragraph in that article, I think, is a telling one. It says that—maybe the last two paragraphs—Carstairs is correct to point out that the Filmon Tories should no longer rely on those excuses as a shield against criticism or a defence against inaction, and those excuses of course are they have not had time to do anything, the same type of excuses we heard the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) reiterate today in this House and repeat time and time again. But the next paragraph, I think, is equally as telling and it says, “One just thinks that Carstairs would impress more people with her own

abilities if she presented them with a little less arrogance.”

What does that tell us? It tells us that the arrogance of that Member is beginning to show through to the media, beginning certainly to show through to Members in this House. I tell you it is beginning to show through to the public in this province. How long would it be before that arrogance resulted in user fees? How long would it be before that arrogance resulted in people paying for their meals? How long would it be before we would ever see hydro development in the North again, under a Liberal Leader who went up North and called perhaps one of the finest construction projects in this province, Lemonstone? Lemonstone! When will we see hydro development under this province with a Leader who has that sort of attitude? I think it is going to be a long time before we see it under the Tories, but I think it will be a lot longer before we would see it under the Liberals who would bring to Government that sort of disparaging perception of hydro development in this province.

How long would Churchill stay shut down under a Liberal Party that says it will not pressure the Canadian Wheat Board to treat Churchill fairly by directing it to ship at least 3 percent of Canada's grain export shipments through the port on an annual basis? They stand side by side with the Conservatives on that issue. The Wheat Board is the only way that we are going to get grain through the Port of Churchill in the short term. It is the only way we are going to keep the Port of Churchill alive in the short term. Yet we have the Conservatives and the Liberals banding together to ensure that the area, where pressure is most needed, will not be brought to bear.

Quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the Liberal Caucus is much more right wing in some of their policies than are many Members of the Conservative Caucus. Now, I chose my words very carefully there. I said that I think much of this caucus is more right wing than many of that caucus, because there are some very powerful people in the Conservative Government who are really quite right wing, but I think they are being kept in check by the circumstance.

I would not want to see any election, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that could only possibly have the effect of changing some names on some doors but would not change the policies or the approach of the Government, whether it be Liberal or Conservative. Given the obscene ego and arrogance of a Leader who does only what she thinks is best for herself, I believe that an election in this province at this time would be a very risky venture for the future of the province.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even although I believe the Conservatives have failed in presenting their Throne Speech, I will not be voting to bring down the Government at the conclusion of the Throne Speech Debate, not because I particularly like the Throne Speech—I do not. I do not like the Throne Speech because I think it fails miserably to address the urgent needs of Manitobans and their families. I think it fails to address the needs of working Manitobans. I believe that the Conservative Throne Speech lacks vision. It ignores the blatant attack on this province by a federal

Conservative Government. The Throne Speech gives short shrift to seniors. It does nothing to address the needs of the homeless and thousands of families living in substandard housing. It turns its back on the North, and I am appalled by the way in which the Conservative Government, in their Throne Speech, snubbed the Port of Churchill.

No, it is not a very good Throne Speech. It is weak and it is timid like the Government that wrote it, but I prefer that approach to a Throne Speech that might be written by a Leader driven by sheer ego and unbridled arrogance and motivation based solely on doing what she thinks is best for her. When I say those words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not pulling them out of the air. I am saying them because that is the statement that she made. Those are her exact words. They are not taken out of context, they are not misrepresented. They are a true indication of what lies beneath the surface of the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) and the Liberal Party.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find this Throne Speech lacking in many ways. I want to address a couple of specifics in the amount of time I have left—and I might just ask you, how much time would I have?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Approximately five minutes.

Mr. Cowan: Five minutes should be enough time. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that the Throne Speech totally ignored the Port of Churchill. Not only that, but the Mover of the Throne Speech totally ignored the Port of Churchill, a Conservative backbencher. The Seconder of the Throne Speech totally ignored Churchill, not one mention of Churchill, not one word about the crisis facing the port in their speech.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): I did.

Mr. Cowan: I will come to that. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) said that he did. Before we get to the Minister of Highways, let us look at what the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) said. One of the Members of the all-Party committee on the Port of Churchill, one of the influential Cabinet Ministers who sits right next to the Premier, in his comments on the Throne Speech said nothing about the Port of Churchill.

Now I will give credit to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) because he spoke about the Port of Churchill. I will give him credit for having spoken about the Port of Churchill, but I will not give him credit for having accomplished anything over the past year with regard to the Port of Churchill. I do not fault him personally and I do not question his motivations because I think he is motivated with all sincerity. I think he is strongly motivated to speak out on behalf of the port but, in spite of that, all that has happened under his tenure and the tenure of his Government is that there will be no grain shipped through the Port of Churchill this year, after only two ships having gone through the port last year.

I think that is a condemnation, not of his willingness to speak out on the Port of Churchill, but on the fact

that he cannot get his own colleagues in his own Cabinet to listen and he cannot particularly get his colleagues in the federal Cabinet to listen.

* (1440)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is why we feel it is necessary to send a delegation to Ottawa made up of representatives of the grass-roots supporters of Churchill on June 8, and that is why we think it is necessary to go on our own. We had thought quite seriously about an all-Party delegation but, when we looked at what we would be saying when we got to Ottawa—and the primary purpose of that particular trip was to get grain shipped through the Port of Churchill and the primary way to get grain shipped through the port of Churchill is to bring pressure to bear on the Canadian Wheat Board to ensure that grain is shipped.

If we were in a meeting and we were making that point and both the Liberals and the Conservatives ganged up on us again, like they did in one instance in this House last year to prevent a debate from taking place, which I thought was quite timely, on the Port of Churchill, if they were to gang up on us in that meeting again, their philosophy, their approach, would mean that Churchill would not have the opportunity which it deserves to exist this year, so I fault them.

I put them together in the same boat, no pun intended. I fault them for their unwillingness to put pressure where pressure is needed to ensure that the port survives, and that is why we felt it was necessary to bring to that delegation, to bring to that meeting through that delegation, members who represented the strong desire to ensure that the port survives and were prepared to put pressure where pressure was required in order to see that happen.

I am very disappointed about what has transpired by this Government and by the federal Government with respect to the Port of Churchill. We will not give up that fight, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We will fight the Liberals on it and we will fight the Conservatives on it, and we will fight alongside the many tens of thousands of supporters of the Port of Churchill out there who know what the problem is and know how to get action.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to health, I have indicated earlier that we have some very grave concerns that this Government has sat on its hands while the very system of health and the universal nature of the system of health has come under attack by the federal Government. I do not know why they are afraid to speak out on that issue when they are prepared to speak out on other issues like the Portage base. I do not know why they are afraid to attack the federal Government on the clawback to seniors' incomes, pension incomes, and on the clawback to family allowances when they are prepared to speak out on the base at Portage.

I do not know why it is they choose to speak out on some things and ignore others. I hope they are not just motivated by the fact that those two bases exist in constituencies that are held by Members of the Cabinet, but I do say that it gives rise to some very serious questions when one looks at the record of what they

speak out against and what they do not speak out against.

I want to, in other comments perhaps at a later junction, talk about how I think the change in policy in land development in this province is going to create high-income ghettos and exclude those most in need and will turn the province around from providing social housing which is required and low-income housing which is required in order to accommodate the needs of their friends, the major land developers.

Having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and in closing, no, I do not like this Throne Speech. It fails on at least two criteria out of three. It will most likely fail on three but, notwithstanding that, I think the risk would be greater if at this time this Government were to be defeated and we saw any possibility, any slight possibility, that a Liberal Government would be in place that would be based only on what is good for the Leader, not based on what is policy, not based on what is principle, not based on what is required for the people of this province, but only based on what Sharon Carstairs thinks is best for Sharon Carstairs.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): . . . They have sunk to the all-time low. I see the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) leaving now. He has made his comments. I see he is yelling from the Chamber. He has made his comments and I see that his Leader is in the same boat as the ex—

-(Interjection)- Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will withdraw. I see you are speaking to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly and I am sure I know what it is about. I will withdraw any reference to the Member's either being absent or staying in this House that I have made heretofore.

I want to speak on the Speech from the Throne. I want to touch on issues both in my critic areas and also the broader issues affecting the province as a whole. I think it is an extremely important Speech from the Throne. I think it is given at a very important time in the development of Manitoba as a partner in this Confederation of ours, and I think that we as legislators in this province have a duty to respond sensitively but also with strength to the challenges which face us as a province.

I sense a lack of both that ingenuity and that sensitivity and the strength on the part of this Government, and I think that is very well reflected in this Speech from the Throne. We need look no further than the past year in analyzing the last Speech from the Throne and the very many hollow promises which were made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me start by taking a brief look at the response given by the new Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae). I want to deal with some of the issues which he raised and some of the reasons that he gives for supporting this Speech from the Throne because, as I think we witnessed today in this House during Question Period, this Minister has an enormous and troubling habit of turning what are very serious issues for Manitobans into quite trivial issues, and he deals with them in a very flippant manner.

I for one, as a Manitoban but also as a member of the legal profession and as a Member of this House,

take great exception to that flippant attitude that he takes to many of the issues before him. I do give him the fact that he came into office with some very, very serious problems facing the department. I think the entire province was facing major issues, and I think that the position of the new Government was not to be envied in many departments. Certainly the Justice Department had had its problems, most recently with the Ticketgate problem.

I want to talk about the comments today that the Minister made and the comments in the Speech from the Throne that this side of the House somehow does not stand up for rural Manitoba and does not like his City of Brandon. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, quite the contrary. The community of Brandon was promised a court house. They have very recently, after a year, received assurances again from the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), which he made in his election campaign, that yes, it would be done. Were they given a time line? No. All that was done was that a committee was struck, another committee, to look into what the plans would be.

I look forward to this Budget. I look forward to seeing a capital commitment to the court house itself. With the expansion of the courts into rural Manitoba and into the rural urban centres like Brandon, it will be extremely necessary to make provision for the adequate resources.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that indeed victims' groups in Brandon, including one put forward by the Brandon Police Department, have been left out by this Minister. Funds which should be available to those groups are being held up and I believe, quite the contrary, it is the Minister of Justice who has forgotten his roots and has forgotten his commitments to rural Manitoba and his own home of Brandon.

Going on with some of the comments which were made by the Justice Minister (Mr. McCrae), he talks about the expansion of the Unified Family Court. Well, what we saw in the announcement made by the new Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) up in The Pas a few weeks ago was a commitment to expand the court. That is true. There was a commitment made to appoint new Queen's Bench judges and to provide a rotation into northern and rural Manitoba.

However, as I have said all along, there is no sense in expanding the court system and the court facilities without also expanding the other essential parts of the Unified Family Court. I am talking of course about conciliation and mediation. There is the Minister from Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) barking from her chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but the numbers speak for themselves. The numbers are such that there is absolutely no fathomable way that the adequate mediation and conciliation services can be given to northern Manitoba with the meagre provision which has been made by this Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the court itself, with the provision of the extra judges and the presumed rotation which will be put into effect, will be undercut and will be

severely compromised, I say, by the lack of what is the most progressive part of the Unified Family Court, and that is provision for conciliation and mediation services.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Just on the point of conciliation and mediation services as part of the Unified Family Court system, I would ask the Honourable Member if he would take a very quick, brief question at this time.

Mr. Edwards: At the end of my speech, I will be happy to take a question from the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), and I presume that by his hand gestures from his chair that he does not intend to stick around and listen to the rest of my speech. I encourage him to do it.

I suspect that the Minister was going to suggest that he had appointed or had made provision for three new positions in The Pas. If he looks at the delays and if he looks at the time constraints for travel around northern Manitoba, he will have absolutely no doubt that he has vastly underestimated the needs in those areas. All he need have done was speak to some of the practitioners in that area who deal with the immense delays and who deal with the problems that this Government has failed to address on that, as I say, very progressive aspect of the Unified Family Court.

* (1450)

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the response from the other side, I can see that I have hit them, as it were, where it hurts. They are barking from their chairs suggesting that somehow they have been fair to the North, they have been fair to rural Manitoba. They have been anything but. We have seen consistent and inconsistent approaches towards rural Manitoba.

They say their decentralization plan is going into effect. The substance of it so far has been a Cabinet office in Brandon and six jobs in Minnedosa, six jobs, I might add, which were replacement jobs. Albeit it was very, very important to replace those jobs in that community, but the fact is that those were jobs which were taken by the previous administration and they were put back.

The next comment which I want to bring to the attention of this House that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) made was that the appointment of Judge John Guy and Judge Judith Webster to the Provincial Court of Manitoba was acceptable to the public of this province, and he chastises me in his speech by saying that I have taken personal pot shots at newly appointed members of our judiciary—quite the contrary, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

My comments at that time were, I believe, in keeping with the best interests of the people of this province and in keeping with the tradition of doing everything possible to maintain the respect for the judiciary in this province and uphold and increase respect for the vaulted positions which we put judges in, in this province, and it is extremely important not just that justice is done but that justice be seen to be done.

The fact is that this Minister could not wait to make those appointments. The appointments were necessary,

I do not dispute that, but the fact is he could not wait. He had made a commitment to the Canadian Bar Association. He said, "I will look at the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission before I make new appointments to the Provincial Court." He said that in March. He could not wait, he went ahead, he made those appointments. Quite frankly, he broke his promise to the Canadian Bar Association.

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is an extremely important thing to note in this Minister's relationship with the legal profession, with those who deliver legal services in this province, because he masquerades as someone who listens and consults effectively but the fact is, when push comes to shove, he has kept the critical decisions in the back rooms. He kept that decision in the back room. He could not wait for the Law Reform Commission report.

He appointed 15 Q.C.s in January of this year, an unheard of number. He just simply had to do it, he could not wait to set up a formal committee. No, this Minister had to appoint 15 Q.C.s in January of this year. Again, a commitment was made. He could not wait. He had to do it even though Q.C.s have nothing to do with the administration of justice. They have absolutely no impact on the administration of justice and the delivery of legal services. Yet, this Minister, Attorney General as he then was, felt he had to go forward. He just had to do it. No one is quite sure why. He has never answered why but the fact is this is the type of Minister we have. He has kept those critical decisions in the back rooms.

I believe the public will not accept and will see through his alleged commitments to opening up the system to the public. He said he wanted his tenure as Attorney General and now Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) to be marked by open access. The fact is it is a very thin veil over the true fact that this Minister keeps those key decisions amongst himself and that, I believe, will be the verdict of the public in due course, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Next, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) states that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), speaking of my Leader, would rather put the convenience of terrorists ahead of the safety of Manitobans and Canadians. He says that is the wrong kind of priority. He is speaking about his plan to deal with drinking and driving. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no question that drinking and driving is a serious problem. It is a problem which this Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) committed himself to dealing with almost a year ago. We waited until now to get a proposal. That proposal came forward and, quite frankly, parts of it—and I say parts of it because other parts of it I agree with wholeheartedly—are very ill thought out.

I suggest there is a serious concern about the constitutionality of the immediate suspension with drivers' licences for 90 days upon only the suspicion that one is drinking and driving. I do not think that suggestion in any way compromises my commitment and our Party's commitment, and in fact the commitment of the Second Opposition Party, to deal with drinking and driving. I think that our commitments are clear.

We have repeatedly asked for this Minister to come forward with a plan. He came forward, quite frankly, with an ill-thought-out and incompetent plan. The fact is that the 90-day suspension was an excuse for not dealing with the court backlog. What we need to do in this province is, we need to deal with the court backlog. You need to be able to say to someone who is charged, you will be in court, you will be at a trial within two months, three months at the outset.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest to you that taking away the constitutional rights is no excuse for not dealing with the court backlog, and I suggest that is what the problem with the Minister's plan was. However, having said that, I want to pass on and I am sure the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) would join with me, the Justice critic for the third Party, will join with me in thanking the Minister for sending us a copy of the brief on which he relied in making his constitutional judgment. I will review that carefully and I will assess my position. I am not so proud as to be beyond looking at the opinion that he relied on and assessing it.

I certainly do not claim to have all the answers and I believe it is responsible, with respect to myself and the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill), to look at this and assess the details of the proposal. I simply put on the record, as I did earlier, my concerns that this may in fact be an ill-thought-out program, and that in particular the suspension prior to a trial may work the opposite to what the Minister seeks to achieve. That is, if this is constitutionally challenged, it will take three or perhaps four years to work its way through the courts to the Supreme Court of Canada. That is the time it takes. It will cost immense amounts of money. The fact is that in the meantime the entire initiative will be held up.

The fact is, if the police went ahead when something that is being constitutionally challenged, if the police go ahead and lay those charges and revoke peoples' licences and those people lose their jobs and eventually it is found to be unconstitutional, the province may end up being in the position of paying those people damages, paying damages to suspected drinking drivers. I simply put that out as the worst-case scenario.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is very important to think through any provision which raises the issue of a constitutional challenge because of the expense involved, because of the enormous waste of time as we work our way through the courts, and simply because of the straight injustice if indeed Charter rights are being abrogated. I suspect if the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) thought he was abrogating Charter rights, he would think very seriously about the initiatives he has taken. I do not think he is seeing the danger.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I simply refer in closing on this issue to the two quotes from the Minister of Justice where he says "that there may also be an indication that they wish to come to the support of those whose privileges we would like to remove, those people who are suspected of impaired driving, or suspended driving," and again down later on this page in Hansard, he speaks of the dealing with "suspected impaired drivers." Well, that is precisely the point, suspicion in our country is not enough. It is not enough, I repeat,

to take away one's rights. You are innocent until proven guilty in this country. That is the law as I know it. That is a law that is hundreds of years old that has been cherished and has been protected through administration after administration, and a deviation from it and a taking away of it is the hallmark of a nation that has dropped into decay.

* (1500)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must protect that right vigilantly. As I said, I will look at the brief put forward by the Constitutional Law Branch and I will assess my position in light of that brief. I will undertake to respond as sensitively and with as much information as possible once that legislation comes forward, but I simply note for the record the concerns we have.

I point out to the Minister considerations which I do not think he has taken into account, and those are that this may end up backfiring. The police and the victims of this province will not thank a Minister who puts into place a program which is simply unworkable and which may, in fact, work the opposite.

The solution, in my view, at least part of it, was left out of his program, and that is to increase the sentence after a trial. In Ontario, the minimum sentence for a first offence is a year; here it is six months. I support the lengthening of that sentence. I am entirely in support of getting tough with those who choose to drink and drive.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edwards: The program I have put in place, I believe, is workable and also deals more harshly with those who are caught drinking and driving.

I want to mention one more thing on this issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an issue which has been totally ignored by this Minister. That is that we must impress upon the youth of this province the dangers of drinking and driving and the penalties associated with them. In my program for dealing with drinking and driving, there was specific provision for an educational aspect, and that is going into the junior highs because I believe in junior high school and perhaps even younger is where it needs to be made very clear that drinking and driving in this province is simply not acceptable behaviour. It is not, as it were, cool for those who are young to drink and drive. I think that is a myth that is out there in some of our schools, and I think we have to deal with it head-on. We have to take this into the schools and let these young people know.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): In the schools, eh?

Mr. Edwards: I see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) saying take it into the schools. Yes, take it into the schools, take it to the youth.

Mr. Manness: I have not been to school for 30 years.

Mr. Edwards: The Minister says that he has not been in the schools for 30 years. I suggest he go, I suggest

he go and learn about the schools. I suggest he goes and finds out what is really on the minds of youth because the fact is that youth—

Mr. Manness: Why do you not have three teenagers like me in it to understand . . .

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister says I should have three teenagers like him and know about youth. The fact is that his colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), has totally ignored the educational aspect of this issue, drinking and driving.

There is a serious need to go into the schools and make very, very clear the dangers of drinking and driving and make it graphic. Let us face it, other provinces have done things that we have not, taken graphic videos and done mock accidents in front of the school to surprise students and show them the gravity of an accident which involves drinking and driving and the wanton and reckless injury to personal life and to property that occurs because of drinking and driving.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the sensitivity, I think, that this side of the House has spoken for throughout the last Session and will in this Session again. I think it is that lack of sensitivity and it is that lack of ingenuity and any imagination on the other side of the House which makes us think that this Government has very few original ideas and even fewer initiatives with which it is willing to go forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I only want to call attention to one more quote from the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) in his response to the Speech to the Throne. He stated, and he is speaking at this time, I believe, about my colleague, the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), and he says that the Member for Fort Rouge was somehow remiss in asking for the Government to make a statement on an issue, to come forward with a statement on an issue. The Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) says, and let us just take his quote, "they are up to a little bit of politics." He reiterates the same concern that the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson) has stated and he says, "they are up to politics."

Well, I have two comments. First of all, it is the Government's job to lead. It is this Government's job to lead. We see them asking questions of us today in this House. Is there anything more ridiculous? Is there any greater indictment on a Government with absolutely no direction of its own that it turns to the Opposition for ideas and questions? It wonders where is it going, and it refuses to make comments when it feels it can get away without making a comment and leading.

Then, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I want to read this quote, he goes on to say, "The fact is there is a time for politics and there is a time to do what is right." The Minister suggests, there is politics and then there is doing the right thing. That is his suggestion.

Surely politics itself is about doing the right thing. This Minister has no idea that may be the case, that in fact politics is about doing the right thing and is about taking a stand on what you believe in. We are not in politics to do the wrong thing. We are in politics

to benefit the people of this province. We are in politics to do what we think is right and to work, if possible, cooperatively towards a common goal.

The fact is, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), he thinks there is politics and then there is what is right. Yes, Sir, he thinks that there is some distinction between the two. I suggest that is a very serious indictment on the true ambitions of this Minister of Justice and his true approach to his position, and a very vaulted and honourable position that it is.

I want to go on to deal with some of the issues in the Department of Labour, and I am very pleased to congratulate the new Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond). I look forward to developing a relationship with her as the critic for the Official Opposition, and I want to wish her all the best in her new portfolio. She represents a constituency which is very close to mine and I have had the opportunity to meet and discuss with her on many occasions. I am sure that we can work out an amicable relationship, and I look forward to doing just that in the coming Session.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to look at a particular promise which was made in the last Speech from the Throne by this Government in the labour field. The last Speech from the Throne stated and made a promise that cooperative projects with industry and labour for projects in the workplace regarding prevention and reduction of factors contributing to injury and disability would be taken. Well, the unfortunate reality was that this Government took the opposite extreme in the labour relationship. They in fact wreaked the same harm that had been wreaked by the previous administration on the labour relationship in this province.

I hope that this new Minister will look closely at her role which is, in many ways and in most ways, a neutral role, a role that attempts to strike the balance between labour and management because there is a tension that is natural in our workplace environment between labour and management. I suggest that the true role of a sensitive Minister of Labour is, yes, to take initiatives, to move forward with labour legislation. The role is also not to become seen as so obviously biased to one side of the relationship because a truly effective Minister of Labour will have the respect of both sides, and that has been a long time in this province since we had just that.

We have had a Minister and an administration in this province which has been very, very obviously biased and has lost all dialogue and all respect with the other side. The fact is that in the last Session we saw a continuation of that—just went to the other extreme. I cite the discontinuance of the funding for the Labour Education Centre as part of that. I also cite the fact that the joint federal-provincial legislation instituting jail terms and fines for employers failing to warn employees about workplace hazards, which is in place, was not being fully enforced, compliance was not being fully enforced by the past Minister. I think that is something which must be dealt with, and I think that we also need to see initiatives which will deal with the problems of the extremes in the labour relationship.

I saw, and it was interesting to see, that there is a new Labour Management Review Committee set up

with the Manitoba Government Employees' Association—I believe three representatives from both sides. We also have in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Labour Management Review Committee, which is a committee set up for province-wide interests, chaired by Mr. Cam MacLean at present, a man who I have great respect for. That committee, I believe, can serve a very vital role in, as it were, trouble shooting on contentious issues as they come up in the labour relationship in this province.

* (1510)

I encourage this Minister to take a very close look at the initial resolution which set up that Labour Management Review Committee and see if there is a way that we can put new life into that committee so that it can very effectively, as it has done in the past, deal with the issues which come up in the labour relationship. If you get the right people on that committee, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my feeling that you can very effectively troubleshoot on issues as they arise and deal with them so that the emotions are defused and both sides can be heard at the table and deal with it in a rational way. Obviously, the sides are not going to agree on everything, we know that. The fact is, the role of the Minister is to facilitate, as much as possible, discussion and negotiation on all issues facing the labour relationship in this province.

I think there is no greater issue facing this new Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) than the job situation in this province. It is indeed grave as we continue to see the loss of well-paid jobs and with that, no doubt, the flight of well-paid workers and their families, skilled workers, to other centres. We must deal with that, and the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) must deal with that, again I say, sensitively and with some imagination and ingenuity as we head into a new type of relationship, a continental economy and no doubt the Americanization of much of our economy in this country. I think the challenge is clear.

Under the new Free Trade Agreement, Manitoba is not, I would submit, in a particularly enviable position. I think we have seen the ramifications of that ever since this deal came into place. The fact is that it is in place, and the fact is that it is this Minister's job to react and not hide behind the rhetoric of her federal counterparts that this is going to be bliss for all people. The fact is it is not bliss for all people. The fact is Manitoba has and will continue to pay an extremely high price in this country due to the so-called rationalization of the economy. She must take her job as the Minister of Labour seriously in the areas of retraining and in the areas of the preservation of the manufacturing sector and the industrial sector and the sectors of this economy which provide those jobs that feed families, well-paid jobs which we have seen lost again and again and again throughout this province under the tenure of this provincial Government.

What we saw in this most recent Speech from the Throne was a promise to establish a Skills Training Advisory Committee. I simply note that at some point, surely at some point, this Government has to act. I see their setting up of the advisory committee as a

recognition that the Free Trade Agreement will and has had deleterious effects on this province, and I applaud the Government for recognizing the true effects of the Free Trade Agreement. The fact is that this advisory committee had better work fairly quickly because we are losing jobs in this province every day, and we have lost many. Combined with the poor relationship with the federal Government and the punishment which has been meted out on Manitoba—and I hope I am not correct, I really do—but I fear for the future of this province as this Government heads us further into the abyss of economic scale down in the coming months. I think we have started to see it, and I fear that we will continue to see it under this administration because they have failed to come to grips. They have failed to come to grips with the true problems and the true needs of the people of this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, also in this Throne Speech under the heading of the Department of Labour, there was a commitment to attempt to conclude arrangements with the federal Government to provide benefits to older workers who lose their jobs due to major permanent layoffs and are unable to secure new employment. Again, it is an interesting initiative. I think obviously it is laudable, but the fact is attempts and committees only go so far. This Government has a commitment to deal with the labour problems in this province and the increasing siphoning off to other centres of the highly paid skilled labour jobs which we so desperately need in this province.

I want to simply reiterate some of the plant closures which we have seen in this province since this Government's tenure and bring to the attention of the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), if she does not already know, the jobs that we have lost. We lost 89 jobs at the Ogilvie Plant. We lost 180 jobs at the Westcott. We lost 37 jobs at Marr's in Brandon. We have the announced closure of Toro of Canada of Steinbach, that is another 28 jobs. We have 45 jobs at Marks and Spencer.

We have serious problems that we are facing in this economy of ours, and I suggest and I reiterate that the federal Government has shown that it is in no way willing to cooperate with the Province of Manitoba to buttress what we have to offer in this economy. Rather they are looking to take and take and take, and they have done that, and they have done it repeatedly. It is with great sorrow that I conclude, and I think all of us conclude on this side of the House, that this Government simply does not have the ability to be strong in Ottawa. This Government simply does not have, as it were, their federal counterparts on the phone or anywhere. They do not meet with them. They cannot get them on the phone, and they certainly cannot produce results.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is extremely important in a have-not province to be tough and to stand up for the real needs and the principle of equalization in this country, because that is the principle that this country was built on. We are not equal in population, we are not equal in resources, and we are not equal in tax base. The fact is that this country was built on equality from coast to coast to coast. The fact is that the Liberal Governments always recognized that. They always

recognized that this was a Confederation. This Government fails, I believe, to have any vision of the country at large. I think that is shown by their flip-flop stance on Meech Lake. They do not know what they are doing. They are following the polls consistently since then, and prior to that as they go to Ottawa and they attempt to show Manitobans that they have something to say to Ottawa. The fact is, I think they get down there and a nudge and a wink and it is over and they are back and nothing happens.

So much for the recently elected federal representatives from this province. We certainly know that their efforts, far from being any more successful, are an absolute shame. I am sure they will be called to account by their voters. The fact is that we have entered the first year of a four-year term federally and I think it is fairly consistent with Conservative policy. They simply look back to the last election, see what they promised and forget about it—scratch, scratch, scratch.

We have seen consistently broken promises by the federal counterparts. I fear for the future of this province, a province which I and many others love dearly and have lived in for many, many years, and a province which I chose to come back to from the East, specifically because I believed in the quality of life that one could achieve in this province, and I continue to maintain that. It is very, very important for a provincial Government to stand up to the powers that be in the rest of the country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Three minutes.

Mr. Edwards: Three minutes. Time flies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I greatly regret that I will not have adequate time to make all of my comments on the Speech from the Throne, but I cannot leave without making some comments about the third Party.

The Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) and the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) spent most of their speech talking about us, and I am going to save three minutes to talk about them. The fact is we know who the enemy of the third Party is in this House. It is very clear. The fact is, it is us. It is the Official Opposition. They are scared to death about the Official Opposition. They spent all their time haranguing on and on and on because the fact is they are in bed. It is an unholy alliance with the Government of the Day.

Quite frankly, the speeches which were read could largely have been written and read by our honourable friends on the Government side. There is no shame that is too great for the third Party to bring to this House. I say that J. S. Woodsworth, I say that Tommy Douglas would be rolling in their graves about the unholy alliance which has developed in this province, an alliance not built on any principles, not one principle, because they stand up, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), and he says, they have deserted seniors. Yes, they have deserted the North.

* (1520)

The Leader of the third Party (Mr. Doer) stands up and says the same thing. He says, oh, this is terrible. This Government is absolutely decimating the economy and the North and deserting those who are underprivileged in our society, but they say, we are not going to go to the polls. We are not going to stand up for our principles, no. What are they going to do? They are going to follow. They are going to bow to the knee of opportunism of the worst kind. They have absolutely no principles, and I believe the credibility of the third Party has been irreparably impugned.

The fact is, when I went to the NDP doors in my constituency, and it is previously an NDP-held seat, there were seniors who said, Mr. Edwards, I have voted NDP all my life and I am going to vote NDP. I had respect for those people because I said, look, you have voted this way. They were generally kind to me. They just said, I am voting for the NDP. I had a lot of respect for those people, but the fact is when I go to the door next time, I am going to have absolutely no respect for those who continue to support the NDP because the fact is I do not believe anybody will.

The fact is when my constituents, who continue to support the NDP, say, I am supporting NDP, I am going to bring to their attention the fact that their Party and their Leader are now in bed with the archenemies. These people who for eons, for decades have been saying, would it not be terrible, it would be terrible, the province will be over when Sterling Lyon gets in, and when Mr. Filmon gets in. The fact is, who is propping up this Government? We know who is propping up this Government and the people of Manitoba know who is propping up this Government. I believe that the . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae).

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it because the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) exceeded his time allotment by a minute or two that he obviously did not wish to answer any of my questions that were raised earlier in his speech.

Two small points and they need not take any length of time at all, the Honourable Member was complaining that the complement of staff for the family mediation work to be done out of The Pas was insufficient. I would ask the Honourable Member if he read the report of the task force, which made recommendations as for the setting up of the Unified Family Court. If he read the complete report, he would find that was the number of staffpeople recommended for that location.

The other thing is with respect to the impaired driving countermeasures being introduced by my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger). The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) should be aware that I went to great pains

on Friday to make available to him and the Honourable Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) the legal opinions that lie behind our wish to move in the direction of certain changes with regard to drivers' licences and impoundments, and so on.

I find it somewhat surprising that the Honourable Member should rise today in his place to speak against these initiatives, not having read that information, as he indicated in his speech. I wonder if the Honourable Member would not like to read that information before coming out in favour of impaired drivers, as opposed to the rights and the safety and protection of lives in Manitoba?

Mr. Edwards: I do not want to contravene the Rules of the House but the fact is that I believe a good portion of my speech was lost on the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) and I will not say why. The fact is that I stated with respect to the impaired driving—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have a question?

Mr. Edwards: I am responding to the question, and I will respond very briefly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The fact is I stated I would not be taking a shotgun approach to this. I expressed my concerns at the time that the initiative came forth, and I am going to take the legal opinion that has been afforded me very seriously. If the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) reviews my comments, he will see that I did not categorically state that I would not be supporting this initiative. I said I had serious concerns. I said I would review his documentation extremely thoroughly. I will be coming forward to this House with what I believe is an educated opinion, which I believe is the responsible position for a critic to take.

With respect to the first question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister, as much as he pretends that he listens to the grass roots, does not listen to the grass roots. The fact is, if he went to northern Manitoba and if he listened to the people who practice in that area and who dealt with the system, he would realize, as I am sure the future will unfold, that the provision for mediation and conciliation services in the North is woefully inadequate, and I believe that will be proven in his tenure. I simply leave those comments as they stand. It is a prediction and I encourage the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) to do what he says he does and talk to the grass roots before he makes these decisions.

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): I would like to begin by firstly offering my personal congratulations to you on your election to the high office of Deputy Speaker of this Chamber. You and I go back some years together and have had a personal friendship that goes beyond politics, and it is certainly pleasing to me to see you sitting in that chair. I know that you will do this House proud and I think all Members of this House share in my sentiment in wishing you again best wishes in your capacity as Deputy Speaker.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Praznik: I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate several other Members of this House on changes in their respective positions within their Parties. Of course, to my two colleagues, the Honourable Gerie Hammond and the Honourable Harry Enns, I wish them all the best in their appointment to the ministry. Both individuals I have had the honour to work with over the past year as a Member of this Assembly and a Member of our caucus. I must say that both of them I found to be extremely capable individuals who will serve the province well, and I am certainly glad that they are in those positions in Cabinet. I know they will do well for the people of Manitoba, and I wish them both all the best and a long tenure in the ministry.

* (1530)

I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz), on his election as our caucus chair. I know he will do an able job in that position and I look forward to working with him.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) on her appointment as the Deputy Leader of her Party, as well as to her colleague, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), on his appointment as the third Party House Leader. Both of these individuals I have come to know and respect over the last year, and I wish them well in their positions.

I must admit that the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) did not take me by surprise in any way whatsoever when he indicated he would not be supporting the Throne Speech. I think it was fairly evident the Liberal Party is playing the role of a typical, usual Opposition Party, oppose everything the Government does, hope that you can convince the people that you have some new and imaginative alternative and someday will walk across to this side of the House. There is nothing surprising in that attitude or in the comments from the Member for St. James or any of the other Liberal speakers. It is very typical for an Official Opposition Party to do it. What is surprising is this is the Party that came onto the political scene a year ago and said they were going to be different, that they were going to offer new ideas, that they were going to have new proposals and they were going to offer some new image of politics to the people of Manitoba.

I think the last year has proven that if there is any hollow rhetoric in this House it comes from that side. When the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) made comments about the New Democratic Party and that Party abandoning its principles and criticizing them for acting responsible and sustaining a Government for this province, I think what that only demonstrated—the New Democrats and Conservatives certainly have a lot of ground in which we disagree. It showed a Party that was acting responsibly for the people of Manitoba, recognizing that we had a minority Government, indicating that the people did not want an election in that time and working within that framework to achieve not only a legislative agenda for the people, but also

use this opportunity to put forward some of their legislation to this House in the form of Private Members' Bills that would better the lives of Manitobans.

As a Member of this side, I certainly look forward to discussing and debating some of those Bills and, hopefully, being able to support some of them as they come forward where the legislation is good. That is called a cooperative, good working relationship. If there is any surprise in this Chamber, it is that the Conservative and New Democratic Parties have matured and are of a certain maturity that they are able to do that. That is the real surprising thing, that our two Parties who have fought each other long and hard for 20 years, given new electoral realities, are able to act responsibly to ensure there is Government, and good Government, in Manitoba. What is not surprising is that the Liberal Party has fallen into the typical mode of any other Opposition Party strictly here to criticize and stand ready should the people of Manitoba determine to put them in office. That is fine, but let us not fool the people of Manitoba that they have anything different, anything new and, heaven forbid, anything exciting to offer the people of this province.

I would like to also use this opportunity to thank the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of the province for appointing me to the Meech Lake Task Force. I have enjoyed that job and I am enjoying it presently as we work towards drafting a report, enjoyed it immensely.

It has given me an opportunity to work closely with two of my colleagues, the Member for Kirkfield Park (Mrs. Hammond) and the Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae), the Attorney-General and Minister of Labour respectively, as well as the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer), the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) and the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr). I think the spirit of cooperation that has existed in that Task Force has been tremendous and stands as a model that I wish our colleagues opposite in the Liberal Party would be able to emulate in the House, but there are no miracles, I imagine, in politics.

It has been exciting to listen to Manitobans on Meech Lake. It has certainly been an eye-opener to see the conviction of Manitobans to see a new constitutional development in this country that recognizes their role within Confederation, their interests as a province, while at the same time preserving the national unity of our great country that we all would like to see.

I look forward to our further discussions in that committee and producing a report that I sincerely believe all Members of this House and indeed the vast majority of Manitobans are going to be able to support and give to the Premier (Mr. Filmon), our Premier, to take forward as a constitutional debate progresses—and needless to say, I think it will—so that he may represent us at the table of First Ministers and come up with a constitutional Accord that all Canadians, hopefully, will be able to live with and be comfortable with.

I would like to spend the majority of my time on this debate concentrating on the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), because I have read that speech a number of times. I sat in this Chamber—

any my colleague indicates it should not take long. I would disagree, I think it will take a great deal of time because there are so many things that just do not make sense and need some discussion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have read that speech a number of times and I have looked at a variety of issues that she has raised on which her Party—or I should say her, I am not quite sure if all Members of the Liberal Party get a say in a lot of these issues, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But I have looked at a number of the issues that she has raised about how terrible our province is. She puts onto the negative side of the scale a list of issues and fails totally, as we would expect of any typical Opposition Leader, to put anything on the positive side.

So I would like to use this opportunity to review some of those issues and hopefully correct the balance a little bit and perhaps give some new insight to some of our colleagues in the Liberal Party as to some of the realities that Manitobans face and some of the great problems and the true, the more realistic means of dealing with them than just empty rhetoric.

In that speech, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) referred to the Throne Speech as a hollow shell of rhetoric. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think she certainly has indicated that she knows what that means by her own speech, or from her own speech.

In that speech, she criticized the Manitoba economy. It is the Government's fault that there has been a slight slowdown in certain sectors in the Manitoba economy, but yet the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) and the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) clearly forget that the Government of any province or any jurisdiction does not control every aspect of an economy, nor do they remember that a provincial economy is greatly affected by the nation in which we live, by the continent in which we live, indeed the world markets in which we live.

We benefit from many actions that happen in other parts of the world and we suffer by them as well, and that is not the responsibility of one set of Ministers or, heaven forbid, if the Members across the way were in Government, would be necessarily always their responsibility. I think that they have to be honest with the people of Manitoba and admit that firstly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one fact, and one only has to look at a number of the surveys that have been done on the Manitoba economy—I have one here, the National Housing Outlook, published by CMHC in the autumn of last year and they indicate very clearly that much of the weakness, and I quote, Mr. Deputy Speaker, “. . . much of the weakness in the Manitoba economy can be traced to the agricultural sector where production is expected to decline as a result of severe drought conditions.” In a province where agriculture is one of our No. 1 industries, when the wheat does not grow, though there is no wheat moving through the system, the dollars are not there in the agricultural sector to buy things, people who work in agribusiness, in the agrifood sector, do not necessarily have the raw product to process and there is a tremendous ripple effect.

One would almost get the sense that Members across the way would blame the drought conditions on the

Government. Well, if that is the case, then I think we should also commend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) on a tremendous drought relief program he held last week, some 2 1/2 inches of rain. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you are going to criticize us for drought, give us credit for rain.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) listed a number of plant closures in the province. Liberal Members opposite, in their speeches, have referred to this list as clear indication everything is in trouble. Well, let us just look at a few of those. Look at Canada Packers, look at their plant in St. Boniface which was closed some time ago, look at the plant they closed last year. Both of them are old plants. Here is a company that has made a great deal of money in Manitoba over quite a number of years. Where is their responsibility to reinvest and develop those plants? Where is it?

Is it our responsibility as legislators, as a Government of Manitoba, to pump in money into a company every time a company refuses to do it themselves? Do you think the consolidation of the meat industry, in the case of the large Canada Packers plant in St. Boniface, the consolidation of that industry in Ontario is something that any Party in Manitoba wants to see? But it is one of the realities in the beef industry, and you do not overcome that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by trying to preserve facilities that are outdated within the marketplace. I think Manitobans should be saying to Canada Packers, we buy a lot of your product. Are you going to produce some here, to process some here? We do not hear that kind of call coming from the other benches. We come to say they should have kept their old plants open.

* (1540)

The same is true with Ogilvie Oats, the only plant in North America still using stone millstones, a plant that was initially begun before Manitoba was a province. Molson's, the brewery industry—anyone who took 20 minutes and really looked at that industry would understand that the brewery industry faces a number of very critical problems. One is obviously the opening up of market. We sell a lot of Canadian beer in the U.S. We can expect they are going to sell a fair bit here—and they are. But your constituents and my constituents are drinking that American beer. Yet you would blame this Government for the consolidation in the brewing industry? Do you blame your constituent when you go to the door, that he may be drinking American beer instead of Canadian? No, they do not, so be fair. That is what I am saying to the Members opposite, because I know the public of Manitoba will ultimately be fair and understand those issues.

What about the positive side of the ledger? Where have we heard Members opposite at any time mention that positive side? Well, I will tell you. Today we had discussions about Corning bringing a pilot project to Manitoba in East Selkirk, developing a resource where we are unique and have a potential market niche in Manitoba. That is positive news. Instead, we hear some concern about how the negotiations are going. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) does not make all her negotiations public. Certainly

not. But she expects this side to? As the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has indicated, I do not think she made her discussions with the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) public as she was going about doing them. No one would expect her to. To defer expansion—another positive for the positive side. Northern Telecom, who celebrated some 20 years of operation in Manitoba, do the Members opposite know that corporation has just transferred 50 jobs from their plant in Quebec to Winnipeg? No, they never mention that. But they are then the positive side.

In my own constituency, Abitibi-Price, who employs some 500-plus people directly in their mill and another 400 people through contractors in their woods operation, almost a thousand families in northeastern Manitoba dependent on that business, Abitibi-Price will be investing in Manitoba over the next two years nearly \$26 million, \$18 million of it in a new woods room, \$5 million to put a new 50-inch roller into operation so they can produce paper for the Winnipeg Free Press who are installing new presses and some \$3 million in miscellaneous improvements. Those dollars are coming here within that corporate framework because Manitoba is a good place to do business. It is a good place to do business because it has a Government that recognizes it and is doing what it can within limited fiscal constraints or a limited fiscal framework in order to see real jobs in this province, not hundred-year millstones operating in perpetuity and not being upgraded.

While I am talking about Abitibi-Price, I noticed with interest the comment made by one Member of the Liberal Party, after the fires and the damage to the wood reserves in the northeastern part of the province, that perhaps they should now convert to the use of wastepaper, strictly a recycling plant. Again, we see a Party who takes something without doing their homework. When I speak to Abitibi-Price, that corporation is looking at recycling within their corporate structure. They now have a vice-president appointed for recycling who is looking at building a plant, but there is a piece of economics that the Members of the Liberal Party never looked at. There is not enough wastepaper in Manitoba to supply a plant, oh, a simple little miscalculation.

Abitibi-Price produces 175,000 tonnes of paper a year. One of its largest customers is the Winnipeg Free Press who buys 25,000 tonnes. Sixty percent of their paper goes south of the border. Again, when we came to the free trade debate, Members opposite said, oh, we do not need this agreement. Companies like Abitibi-Price, who employ 1,000 people in Manitoba, needed that agreement and supported free trade. Even if every newspaper, every Free Press and every Sun were collected and not used to start fireplaces or for other purposes, but if everyone of those papers were collected, we would have maybe 50,000 tonnes to recycle, a far cry from 175,000 tonnes—a good idea, no one denies that, but no facts, no research to back it up, none at all. That is what we get from the Members opposite.

If I may just characterize the kind of argument that we are getting from across the way on a daily basis

with respect to the economy—and it has always miffed me as a politician how any thinking person could make that kind of statement. Every time we see some changes in our economy because of technology, because of outdated plants, because of change in process, we hear it is terrible, it is the Government's fault because that plant is closing or those jobs are lost.

The analogy that I like to make—and I am going to make it here for the benefit of some of the Members across the way—if at the time that the steam engine and the railway were developed, the Honourable Members across the way, using their logic, would have said we should not have railways because the amount of goods that a train could carry may require, for the sake of argument, 100 wagons and with every one a teamster, well, if we had the railroad, we would put all those teamsters out of work and all the people who ran the livery stables and all the people who grew the feed for the horses. We would put them all out of work, so we should not do it.

When you bring in that train you now require some railway crew, you need the steel and iron to build the train, you need the steel and iron to build the rails, you need the coal mine to run the steam engine. You can move goods more cheaply so the cost of those goods is reduced, more people buy those goods, more people are needed in the factories to produce them. At the end of the day, you may have those teamsters out of work and you may have the livery stable men out of work but you have more working in the factories producing goods, more people working in the railways, and your society is wealthier and has progressed. Yet they continue to make those arguments about some of the plant closures, whether they be Canada Packers in St. Boniface or Ogilvie Oats and others, or the brewery industry.

In her reply to the Speech from the Throne and in moving a motion of non-confidence, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) referred to Alumax. We know there are negotiations going on at this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we know that there is an acid rain program, but the Leader of the Opposition makes it sound like the Province of Manitoba, that the taxpayer of Manitoba should jump in with a blank cheque to say to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, here is all the money you need, install this new equipment.

* (1550)

As one Member of this Legislature, I really have to ask if the people of Manitoba, if the taxpayers of Manitoba really want us always, time after time, to be putting their dollars into industry. I really have to ask that. There are times when it is important, yes, and sometimes, often because Government is over the barrel because Oppositions sit there and say we are going to lose some jobs, but you have to look at the numbers.

What amazes me with Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting—I would like to talk about them for a moment. Here is a company, part of which is owned or is a subsidiary of a company named Inspiration Resources Corporation. I would like to just read you from the first

paragraph of their report to their shareholders in, I believe, 1988, June 30, 1988. I will just read you the first line. It says: "Dear Stockholders: We are pleased to report the highest second quarter earnings ever for both Inspiration Resources Corporation and IRC International, our largest subsidiary. During the 1988 second quarter, IRC posted operating income of \$45.4 million, a 32 percent increase over 1987, second quarter operating income of \$34.4 million," so the parent is making money.

The parent has made a lot of money out of that plant over the years. What is their obligation to that plant, to that smelter? I believe they have an obligation to it. I believe that some of those dollars that they have earned in Manitoba should not be creamed off, and then they come to the Government and say, now, because you have an Opposition yelling over there, let us talk about how much you are going to put in. Every time they get up and yell about Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, I bet you their corporate president sits there and says, well, we can ask for a few more million. Hey, Sharon, keep yelling because you are getting me more money—tremendous negotiators across the way, depending whether you are a taxpayer or Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting.

That is the reality of their criticisms, not acid rain and jobs. It is the financial package and how much the taxpayers of Manitoba have to bear while their parent continues to make large dollars and not want to reinvest into this province.

I refer to Alumax for a moment, another classic example, I think, of criticisms that are not thought through. I would hope that the media of Manitoba and the public of Manitoba would ask these tough questions because I do not think the Members across the way have answers. It was very clear in the Alumax negotiations, from the material that was put forward, that company wanted hydro in Manitoba at 1.5 cents per kilowatt hour, instead of the regular industrial rate of 2.4 cents, another subsidy. I would bet you anything, if we had signed a deal on that basis, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) would have got up and said, "You have given away our power."

An Honourable Member: That is right, that is what she would have said.

Mr. Praznik: You have given it away, but we did not give it away so she had to get up and say, "Well, you should have got him here because I, quite frankly, do not know what to do, but I had better say something."

That is what it boils down to. Your Party across the way, the Liberal Opposition across the way, wanted the taxpayers of Manitoba to subsidize to the tune of some \$220 million to \$250 million a smelter in this province. Now, if that is what you want, say it. Go to the people of Manitoba on that basis. Say it, do not hide.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a couple of comments on Churchill, we all in this House share the desire. We would all like to see Churchill as an operative and prosperous port, and we all say that. Last year, in the debate on Churchill, in one chance I had to speak in

this House, I laid out some of the realities. Again, I do not think any Members across the way listened, and perhaps that is understandable that they do not listen, but albeit.

One of the realities that they have to deal with this year is a drastically reduced production, again the drought. You also have to look in the change of our customers for our products—more wheat being sold in the Pacific Rim, less in Europe. You also have to look at the economic realities of Prince Rupert and its ability to move grain at far less cost than not only Churchill but also Thunder Bay. I am going to make a prediction today. It may not be two years from now, it may not be five years from now, but within the decade we are going to see major trouble, major closures in Thunder Bay because that port will not be able to move grain as economically as Prince Rupert or West Coast ports. In fact, I understand that last year wheat moved at less cost to Europe from Prince Rupert than it did from Thunder Bay. You can yell and scream and use all the hollow rhetoric you want on the other side of the House, but that reality is still going to be there and, unless you are prepared to dip into the Treasury or put it onto the backs of the farmers, both of those ports are in trouble. So let us deal with the facts, not rhetoric.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) criticized the performance of this Government with respect to health care. I think there is no Member, no politician, in this country today who, if you sat down with that politician and talked about health care and they knew something about it, would disagree with the statement that across the nation, indeed across North America, our whole health care system is going through some very trying times. Cost of diagnostic equipment technology is increasing in leaps and bounds. The cost of that equipment goes up, our population is aging. All of those factors are there. All of them are putting great stress on health care systems worldwide, not a problem unique to Manitoba, not a problem at all. I am glad the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) has made a few comments because I have a few things to address to the Honourable Member as I proceed on health care.

In last year's Budget, this Legislature voted, without the votes of the Liberal Party, to spend \$1.5 billion on health care, one out of every three dollars, \$1,500 for every man, woman and child in this province, an increase of 9.1 percent; \$760 million for hospitals and community health centres; \$263 million for Medical Services; \$181 million for Personal Care Homes, \$45 million for Home Care—a \$10 million increase over the previous year; \$42 million for Mental Health Services; \$40 million for Pharmacare. That is a lot of money and it will probably never be enough to do everything. When you are spending \$1,500 for every man, woman and child on health care, and about \$1,000 for every man, woman and child in this province on education, and you have less than \$90 per man, woman and child on such infrastructure as highways, where is the give?

It is tough and it is difficult and maybe we as a society will have to redirect more money to health care but, for goodness sake, do not stand up with the rhetoric and yell and scream that it is a simple problem. It is

not. Be prepared to make the sacrifices in other areas, and I detect no willingness on that side to do it.

If I may for a moment on the capital program in health care, we have heard great criticism, but look, look at where those facilities are going. In last year's Budget, the capital cost of projects presently under construction and projected to be \$73 million in expenditure—those are projects already on the board and ready to go and completed last year—included the Morden Hospital; Health Sciences Centre, continuation of the emergency power upgrade; St. Boniface Hospital, replacement of the cardioangiography equipment, expansion of space for staff and training, computer hardware; Fred Douglas Lodge; Gimli Betel Home; Foyer Notre Dame; Erickson, a hospital and personal care home; Deer Lodge, and some money for contingencies. Then look at the \$95 million that we are expending now on other projects: 26-bed combined health facility and personal care home in Manitou; Pine Falls, the addition of 20 new personal care beds; Vita, Benito, Roblin, Neepawa, Virden, the Sharon Home in Winnipeg and the Taché Nursing Home, all recipients of some total \$95 million for new construction, all vital projects.

I am glad the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) has been so attentive to those comments, because I understand at one time he practised medicine in Pine Falls briefly.

I would like to quote an editorial from the Winnipeg River Review, Wednesday, February 1, 1989 entitled, "Hurray for Rural Manitoba." It quotes an article in the Free Press in which the Member for Kildonan made some statements on the priorities of the Government. It says in this article, "Former doctor of the Pine Falls General Hospital, Dr. Gulzar Cheema, who is now the Liberal Health critic, wondered how the Conservatives could justify putting 20 beds in a town of 1,000 people while city hospitals function in intolerably crowded circumstances. First of all, the town has far more than 1,000 people. Does Dr. Cheema so quickly forget the crowded circumstances."

* (1600)

An Honourable Member: Deny the people of Pine Falls proper health care, that is what he wants to do.

Mr. Praznik: I can tell you, with help like this, Dr. Cheema can come and campaign in Pine Falls against me any day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I continue, "Does Dr. Cheema so quickly forget? Does he realize how many of our seniors are transferred to care home facilities far from home, alone, and sometimes forgotten? So true rang the Honourable Don Orchard's remarks that in Winnipeg if one hospital or health facility closes you can walk or drive the several blocks to another. In rural Manitoba, Mr. Orchard says it is the one hospital in your town or no hospital. One has to admit that all are in need but Orchard states that the capital budget is balanced between city and rural, so why the big stink? How dare the NDP criticize a program they initiated? So Winnipeg politicians believe rural communities are non-existent. Surely we deserve an equal share of the funding."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, here is the editorial and I can tell you that the first day we are into a writ this editorial will be sent to every home in that area just to remind the electors of that area what the Liberal Party would do if they were in power, because it certainly would not be supportive of rural Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, how much time is remaining in my speech?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Member has five minutes.

Mr. Praznik: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Six minutes, I beg your pardon.

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in her address on the Speech from the Throne, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) talked about lotteries and the changes that our Minister of Culture, Minister responsible for Lotteries (Mrs. Mitchelson) was making. She referred to lotteries as a regressive tax on the poor. She also criticized the decision to spend some of those lottery dollars on health initiatives and some on conservation. So if the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) is not sending to this House empty rhetoric, hollow empty rhetoric, then I take it we can believe she opposes any lotteries in this province. So if she was in power, she would ban all lotteries and, if she did not, she would spend none on conservation or health care.

I can tell you, the people I meet in my constituency are demanding some of that money be spent on health initiatives. The Liberals cannot have it both ways. If you are out there calling it a regressive tax on the poor, then you would do away it. So let it be on the record of this House that a Liberal Government would do away totally with lotteries. You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, briefly on agriculture and farm policy, we hear the Liberal Party are going to be the great saviours of rural Manitoba. We know what they would do in health. I would like to quote an article from the Brandon Sun actually quoting the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), their critic. He indicated that Liberal agricultural policies are 20 years old and whenever agriculture was on the agenda of their two-day policy conference, only about an hour or two was devoted to developing specific programs for farmers. I tell you, for a Party with really no agricultural representation, they have a long way to catch up, they are not spending it, they do not know what they are doing in rural Manitoba, and heaven help rural Manitoba if they ever cross the floor. Our colleagues in the New Democratic Party know that. They know the lack of knowledge and interest and caring about rural Manitoba, and that is why they are acting responsibly in ensuring that this Government continues on, and that is why they would not want to see the other Members across the way in Government.

There is one last comment that I would make and it is the most telling comment about the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) because if you go through her speech it is the only glimpse you see of any foresight, but it is totally hypocritical to everything else that she

has said, and I quote, buried amongst all the criticisms of where we are not spending enough money, Mrs. Carstairs says this, "The Government has reallocated and redirected funds," but please pay attention to these words, "but it has not limited its own expenditures. Our province will see tough economic times ahead which will require appropriate management."

There is her only glimpse of truth, the only glimpse of the reality that is there that Government has to get control of their funding, and she says it under her breath. The media does not pick it up and yet she stands there and says that you have not spent enough here, you have not spent here. We all remember last year when the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) and myself brought forward the cost, the billion dollars in additional expenditure that the Liberal Party promises would cost this province. Yet here their own Leader, under her breath in a little glimpse of reality, talks about restraint.

So my question to the Liberal Party and one they have to answer to the people of Manitoba is, what would they cut, where would they spend, what would they not give an increase to, what would they cut? It is right here, just a little bit of truth in an otherwise speech, a hollow shell of rhetoric. Those realities, that hypocrisy, that lack of understanding, and I am sure all Members in both Parties on this part of the House can see that every day the people of Manitoba will see that, and they will learn that the Liberal Party really offers no new suggestions, no new policies and is very, very shallow in its understanding of issues.

I look forward to participating in the debates in this House in the months ahead, and I know that ultimately the people of Manitoba will recognize just how hollow the Liberal Party across the way is. Thank you.

Mr. John Plozman (Dauphin): I appreciate once again the opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech Debate for this year. I have had the opportunity now to speak for a number of years on the Throne Speech. Once again, I must say this Throne Speech is one of the ones that I do not look forward to speaking to in terms of its content, as much as I have in the past some six years.

I can tell you that I have enjoyed the new dynamics in the House since the last election, which has just been a little over a year now. We see a revived Liberal Party. Last year they came in here very timid and said they were going to be gentlemen and ladies, if you pardon the term, that they were not going to raise this kind of raucous environment in here that existed for years before between those bad Tories and New Democrats. They were going to be acting much more civilized. I have seen that they have now adopted the normal decorum of the Legislature, as they see it is probably more effective to take apart the Government informally as well as formally, and to be more aggressive in the Legislature.

It is interesting to see. I look at it as the Liberals and Tories squabbling over who is going to have power here. It is like the family trying to determine who is the head of the household here. The Tories and Liberals are all part of the one big happy family having a little

squabble. In this case, what is so interesting about it is that they cannot control who is going to have the power, and that is what is frustrating both of them on both sides.

* (1610)

Yes, as a matter of fact, the Members have seen that there is a third Party. It is in fact the New Democratic Party who really controls who is going to exercise the reins of Government. We have some temporary custodians here in office. They are very temporary as the honourable former Premier, Sterling Lyon, who was not a person that I admired a great deal, but he was certainly one I respected. He used to always talk about these temporary custodians in office. Actually, if you stay around long enough, it comes true. In this case, I think it is these people, the Members of the Government do in fact feel quite temporary and insecure, and I see them squirming in their seats every day. I frankly enjoy it, because it is something that they never really know when the day is going to come, and it is going to come. The day is coming and the clock is ticking, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I am content though to allow the Tories to sit in those chairs for a short time yet. I believe the people of Manitoba want that. I have to say though that I am not surprised by the lacklustre performance of this Party over the last year, 12 months, 13 months. As a matter of fact, I think it was entirely predictable that there would be a rather lacklustre performance because I saw what they were in Opposition, as they sat in these chairs on this side of the House for a number of years and berated us in Government.

I looked back over the Statistics Canada information for Manitoba over the last number of years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the quorum falls well below its usual high standard in here and the family squabbles even more. I would like to point out that over the last number of months, the economy in Manitoba has deteriorated rather dramatically.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Health.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I am tentatively listening to all of the reasons why my honourable friend, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plozman), is going to support the Throne Speech, but the adult day care centre as represented by the Liberal Party is preventing me from doing that with their raucous behaviour. I wonder if you might bring them under control.

Mr. Plozman: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it that was not a point of order. I also take it that you will deduct that time from my speech time.

I want the Member for Pembina and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to not be quite so smug about being propped up. As a matter of fact, I can tell him right now that I am not going to support this Throne Speech, so he should get that clearly in his mind and he should sleep a little less easy tonight. Now I did not say what I was going to do exactly, but I can tell that

Member that I will not be voting for this Throne Speech, so he should not assume that.

Now I want to indicate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that eight of the 11 indicators from Statistics Canada that we have reviewed demonstrate that this Government has failed in Manitoba, that they have taken this province backwards instead of forwards in the last year in the economic indicators. We want to see that improve over the next while, and we are going to attempt to work with this Government to ensure that happens over the next while, but let them not pat themselves on the back about their tremendous record in their first 12 months in Government.

As a matter of fact, the economic growth over the past year in 1988 was only .9 percent in the province, ranking Manitoba ninth out of 10 provinces in terms of economic growth in 1988. Job creation was only .3 percent, which ranked again Manitoba ninth out of 10. The unemployment rate for 1988 was up over 1987. It was the first time that the unemployment rate in Manitoba was higher than it was for the Canadian average, which is very, very serious in terms of a trend for this province.

Manitoba's population actually declined in 1988, which again reminds us once more of the Lyon years, 1977 to 1981, when the population in Manitoba indeed because of Ministers like the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Minister of Health and others who were involved with that Lyon Government at the time, people actually left the province in record numbers.

Mr. Cowan: I remember that.

Mr. Plohman: The Member for Churchill very clearly remembers those days. I was not at that time in Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I recall it well as a teacher in Dauphin, and all of us discussed the terrible, terrible Government that we were dealing with and how long and dark those years were under the Lyon Government. Now we see the people leaving again. I think that is more than a coincidence.

We see retail sales. In retail sales in 1988, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Manitoba ranking tenth out of 10 under this Government; housing starts, tenth out of 10, a drop of 29.8 percent in 1988 versus the Canadian decline of only 12.5 percent.

We have seen a drop in the value of building permits, ranking Manitoba ninth out of 10, and the farm cash receipts, Manitoba ranked seventh out of 10. So the drop has been rather significant in all areas of the economy under this Tory Government which is, as I said earlier, entirely predictable when you are dealing with a Tory Government.

However, they have tried to temper their performance with some fancy language in the Throne Speech that would appeal to some of the people in Manitoba. As a matter of fact, they were somewhat successful, but I want to tell you that public opinion is not decided on the basis of these statistics. Public opinion at this time is such that they believe that a minority Government situation should be given an opportunity to work, and in fact one year is not enough time to make it work.

I think it is irresponsible for the Liberal Party to sit here and say, well, they are somehow going to be able to replace this bunch over here and do a better job than they are doing. We do not, frankly, believe that we could feel comfortable with a Leader of the Party, as has been said in this House many times before, who considers herself No. 1, who considers Sharon Carstairs as the most important issue facing the province as stated by her, as opposed to the people of Manitoba and doing what is best in Manitoba's best interest.

I only have to look as far as her support of a Quebecer for Prime Minister in the future for Liberal Leader in this country, and I have to wonder at her priorities. Is that in any way in Manitoba's best interest after what we have seen by Quebecers in the Liberal years and in the Tory years, in terms of their representation of Manitoba, their support for Manitoba's interest? Can that in any way be construed as representing Manitoba's best interests?

I say to her colleagues, where are they? Why do they not speak up and disown themselves, disassociate themselves from those statements by their Leader that she will support? Because that is not being done in Manitoba's best interest. I think the people of Manitoba do not feel very comfortable about that either as they become more and more aware that is the case.

So Manitoba does need an activist Government, and we will seek to make this Government more activist. While this Government's Throne Speech seeks on numerous occasions to take credit for getting the financial house of the province in order, they fail to point out the real reasons why we have a comparatively good financial picture in Manitoba at this particular time insofar as the management of the Government.

The Deputy Leader of the Liberal Government has said, well, tenth out of 10. Yes, in economic areas indicators, I talked about financial management, and the Member does not seem to be aware of the difference. The fact is, in terms of the financial picture of the Government, they failed to note that there was no massive mess to clean up, as they stated. You see. That is what they said to the people, that is what the Liberals said to the people, but they both were wrong.

Sure there are always some areas for improvement. We had the Conservative consultants that they hired, the Kelloggs, Ernst and Whinney, and Stevenson. They were put together to come forward with ideas for trimming the deficit and so on, but the fact is they could not find many areas. There are always little areas to improve it. There was no mess to clean up. That is the bottom line. That is why there have not been massive cuts in expenditures. They have not been able to find it. They thought there was all kinds of a mess in social assistance. They could not find it. They found two or three cases out of hundreds where they thought maybe there might be a bit of a problem.

* (1620)

MPIC was clearly set on a path of healthy financial management by the previous Government. As a matter of fact, it has demonstrated in only one year, a very short history, which of course we did not have the benefit

of in the last election in 1988, in April, of course. We were just putting those measures into place. Quite frankly, it is shown quite clearly that MPIC has been well-managed, again some areas to improve but we set the corporation on a proper financial course and now we see the results. It is making a profit. It is still managing in a way that yields the best rates for the people of Manitoba, probably better than any other province, any other public insurance corporation or private.

MTS was on its way to an ambitious service implementation plan, improvement plan for rural areas, that they found on their desks when they walked in a year ago, ready to go. They have made some changes. There are still some improvements to it. Major service improvements for rural areas, a plan put in place by the former provincial Government that was developed by our Government and one that they simply stretched out to make it take longer to do rather than the one we were going to do.

The fact is the Tories and Liberals thought these things were in a terrible mess and in fact they were not. The Government at that time was embarking on an ambitious water and soil management program that has now been theoretically followed up. We have not seen too many results yet, but they are talking about sustainable development and soil and water management.

We had undertaken major initiatives for economic development on a regional basis. We were in the process of selling Manfor up at The Pas because it was a good time to sell it, while it was making a profit and was being turned around. It was certainly an asset that a private company would want to buy. We will talk about that a little bit more later, of how they fumbled and fumbled that issue.

We were on our way to obtaining an aluminum smelter, Alumax, which again we will talk about in a little while. We were in the process of developing our high-grade potash reserves. We were in the process of establishing an oriented strandboard project up at Swan River which has been lost, and I will talk about that more. We had in place a program to clean up Lake Dauphin, to expand the use of Churchill. We had negotiated—the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) should remember that one year has passed very fast. So does six. He will not have that opportunity.

We negotiated a water and sewer infrastructure agreement with the federal Government that was not finally signed and has just been languishing over the last year and a-half with this Government at the helm. The list goes on in terms of the kinds of things that we were doing in this province that were building this province for the people in all areas. Many of these have been carried on by this Government in some form, but many of them have been fumbled by this bunch of Tories across the way.

Ironically, much of the reason for their problems in this is in an area that we would have thought that they would have been stronger in. That is an area that involves the relationship with the federal Government. They tried to tell the people of Manitoba that in fact

they would be strong on this area, that would be one of their strengths. In fact, since they were both Tories, somehow they would be able to negotiate and get results for the Province of Manitoba. They blamed us on many occasions. They chastised us, they berated us for our strong stand in defence of Manitoba, for standing up to the federal Government. They said that we were unfriendly. They said we were uncooperative and that attitude was responsible for Manitoba losing out in areas it should have been able to find movement forward. That is what they said. I believe that they have matured a lot in the last year. They have seen things they did not know were there. However, I think that would not stop them from saying those kinds of things in the future.

You see, all Filmon had to do, all the Premier of this province once he became Premier, Filmon would have to do would be to pick up that phone and the voice would be there at the other end and so would the job. They would respond when the Premier picked up that phone. That caring and sensitive Quebec Prime Minister would jump to the pump, to borrow a phrase from Domo, for these people in Manitoba, finally gotten rid of those nasty New Democrats who did not know how to get along with them. Now they would have the Tories, the true blue Tories, and they would deliver for them. As a matter of fact these Tories in Manitoba found out how insignificant they are. They are truly insignificant. They are as insignificant as the federal representatives from this province in the Tory Party, truly insignificant.

Look at Epp, Charlie Epp or—Jake Epp. I am sorry, Charlie—Charlie Mayer and Brian White, anybody heard of him—Dauphin-Swan River. Our new Dobbie? We have Holtmann, some people call him Holtmann, and we have Clark, and what is his name from Selkirk. From those, we hear no support for Manitoba's best interests. Do we ever see those people? Do we ever see that powerful Jake Epp standing up on behalf of Manitoba when it comes to Manitoba getting the wrong end of the stick? No, he is afraid to rock the boat. Maybe they are going to take him out and put somebody else in from somewhere, who knows where.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Plohan: Do they ever take on those nasty powers from Ottawa? No, not a thing. You never see Jake Epp, Brian White, Charlie Mayer stand up for Manitoba and say, we are not going to put up with this. We are not going to put up with these CN layoffs that are devastating our small communities. We are not going to put up with the closure of Churchill, to preside over the death of Churchill while we are in Government. We are going to stake our jobs on it; we are not going to put up with that.

They do not say anything like that, they make excuses. They are apologists, they are apologists over and over again. I think these Members here in this Government, in the Filmon Government, realize that now but they are powerless to do anything about it. They are powerless to have any impact themselves and they have given up even trying. They are afraid to make statements on behalf of Manitoba. They continue to be apologists because they are concerned that the people will not

be able to see the difference between provincial and federal Tories if they squabble.

Mayer is a Manitoban. He is the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board. He has a tremendous opportunity to ensure justice for Churchill, and he quietly presides while Churchill goes down the drain, goes down the tube—the Minister responsible for the death of Churchill. That is an issue that is far more important than CFB in Portage. Really, CFB in Portage is important but it does not even come close to the loss of Churchill for this country.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

Let us think about it. Canada's only northern Arctic seaport, 2,000 miles closer to many Soviet and European markets, strategically placed to demonstrate Canada's sovereignty over the North, over the Arctic. With icebreakers, modern technology, that port could be open many, many months of the year with the investment, instead of putting the money into nuclear submarines, which we thankfully can see that the Government has come to some sanity, we hope, in terms of Conservatives cancelling them. Icebreakers could demonstrate that Canada is able to operate in the North, in the Arctic. Sure, it would cost a little bit to operate an extended season but it would demonstrate to the Americans and to the Soviet Union that the Arctic is truly part of Canada and we can do business there and we can trade there and operate up there. They have not taken that kind of vision of Canada. That is lacking in this Government, is sorely lacking.

* (1630)

It is the key to the economic health of the northern communities along the bayline. It is the key to much of northern Manitoba so, when I say it is far more important, I in no way belittle the issue at Portage la Prairie in terms of its importance for that community, but I do say that Churchill is extremely important for the future of this country.

We have miserably weak federal and provincial Tories. While a Quebec Minister, Benoit Bouchard, makes statements that are erroneous, that are wrong, that are misleading about Churchill, we see nothing but silence from these provincial Tories, both representing us at the federal level and at the provincial level.

Benoit Bouchard spouts ignorance about our port, mumbling non-reasons. The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) says, "A great man." Well, that is how he stands up for Manitoba, this Minister of Transport from Quebec, mumbling non-reasons for the closure of Churchill, garbage about the Arctic passage which is not relevant in the ice-free period. There is no ice there, mumbling garbage about the Arctic passage and the rail line, if that is a limiting factor at this time. Sure, in the longer term it is, but right now they can get the grain there, CN can get the grain there. That is not a reason for not having a season at Churchill. Yet those were the kinds of things that he was quoted as saying in the newspaper.

The Liberals meanwhile stay quiet on this issue. The Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) stays quiet on it.

He stays quiet on it, he does not say anything about the need to provide some direction to the Wheat Board, to the Crown corporations, to use them as an instrument of regional economic development, to use them for the betterment of regions of our country, Ports Canada, CN and, yes, the Wheat Board, that sacred Wheat Board which must have no political direction, the Liberals and the Conservatives say, but when it comes to the crunch there are no other alternatives. That is what we have come to with Churchill.

They should see past that policy that is narrow and that hurts portions of Canada at various times. Is it too much to ask that the Wheat Board be directed to ship 3 percent of the export grain through the Port of Churchill so it remains, and then build from that in the future, as I said earlier, to a modern port with some vision of the North for Canada, so that they can demonstrate sovereignty, but just during these times of difficulty to keep 3 percent of the grain shipped through that port?

They say you cannot provide political direction. The Liberals are supporting that provincially, probably federally. They are supporting that policy. They differ from us; they would undercut us. That is the thing here that we have, the Liberals and the Conservatives together on this.

An Honourable Member: Side by side.

Mr. Plohman: Part of the family.

It is the New Democratic Party who is standing up and saying, look, enough is enough. There is no future for Churchill unless we get that commitment for 3 percent of the grain, and that is what we want. It seems like the bottom line for the Tories and Liberals is that the only thing that should govern the operations of the Crown corporations is the bottom line, whether they make a profit.

CN jobs go, rail lines goes, VIA Rail goes, post offices go, so Churchill goes and they sit back and say, well, we cannot do anything about it because we do not believe we should provide any direction.

You know, the problem with it, the irony of it is that the farmers actually save money by shipping through Churchill, contrary to what the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) says about the costs. Yes, there are capital costs and infrastructure costs, but in terms of the shipping cost it is actually cheaper to ship through Churchill from the catchment area.

The Tory bunch of apologists sit idly by and they dilute our arguments and accept the arguments of the opponents, and the Liberals join with them, while the federal Government pulls back on agriculture, in drought aid, dragging their feet on the payments, asking the provinces to pay some of their responsibility, crop insurance, massive cutbacks in crop insurance through this Budget, massive cuts in sales and excise tax rebates by the federal Government to farmers.

How can they justify that at this present time? This federal Government, who in the last federal election and before, said they were going to support the farmers,

now pull back on support in their time of need. I cannot understand the kind of thinking that goes on with that kind of Government. The removal of oats from the Wheat Board, supported by this Minister and this Government here, and the way that decision was made, they do not even come out and criticize that. Even though 70 percent of the people in western Canada believe that the decision was made in a wrong way, without proper consultation, they defend that. I heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) defend that decision. I watched him on television defend it, not only the principle of the decision, but the way that it was done. He did not single out that as an issue at all because he is protecting the federal Party.

So we saw nothing on Alumax from this Government. We saw a loss of that project because the federal Government and the province could not talk. They did not even get a proposal in to the federal Government so that there could be some result. We know that. Jake Epp said there was no proposal, and I do not know if he knows what he is talking about, and they can talk about that. It is probable that there was no proposal that went forward from this province. They are not talking. They said they get along so good, they are big buddies, they cannot even talk together on projects that are so important to this province.

An Honourable Member: The phone is off the hook.

Mr. Plohman: We saw what happened at Manfor, the sale of Manfor. We said that was a good thing, we were negotiating with Repap. What they did in order to achieve the sale in a short period of time, they gave away the whole cutting area for hardwoods in the Parklands, this whole area that would have meant that we could have had an oriented strandboard project in Swan River, a waferboard project with an identified market. I do not think the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) should stoop to statements like, are you investing in it, or some ignorance like that. The fact is, I am very concerned about what was happening in the Parklands area of this province. I wanted those jobs there, 400 to 450 jobs, that have been lost by this Government because they threw that in, in order to get the sale at The Pas.

The people of the Parklands feel very much violated by that very hasty decision which has cost us, in the Parklands, hundreds of jobs. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) sat in the committee and said at least seven times, there was no market for the product. The document that we released, that my Leader released in this House, that was a briefing to the Manitoba federal Conservative Caucus, showed and said that the plant's production, and I quote: ". . . will be sold to identified markets in the north central and western U.S., where few Canadian plants are expected to be active." Seventy-four percent of the plant's production will be sold to identified markets, not speculative markets, not that, identified markets—74 percent. They were there and this Minister of Finance said there were no markets.

Now I have to tell you, I can only look at that one way, that he did not tell us the facts. He did not tell us the facts or else he did not know them. I have to say that I believe he knew the facts or else he is totally

irresponsible and should resign, should be removed from his position.

Then he talked about 250 jobs, and then he went up to 300 jobs during the course of the discussion on the sale. We found out that state-of-the-art chipping at this particular time produces only 10 jobs to run it. With its sophisticated controls and high degree of automation, only two men are required to operate the production line. Two others are on the ground to handle maintenance and assist with railcar and truck traffic. The entire mill staff consists of 10 people, including foresters, management and office staff—10 people, and they talk about 300 jobs now in Swan River.

* (1640)

An Honourable Member: High-tech jobs.

Mr. Plohman: Yes, high-tech jobs. You can see. You know what these jobs are? These are more of the bush jobs, getting the wood out. The people are there already doing those jobs. They will pick up a little bit of extra work on here but there are no new jobs. He said new jobs, 300 new jobs. When I say the facts, the Member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach) says, fearmongering. That is how he responds, how intelligently he responds.—(Interjection)—I am stating the facts and the facts bother that Member because he knows there are no guarantees. As a matter of fact, I could not find in that agreement anywhere that was tabled in this House any reference to this chipping at Swan River. Why are those people at Swan River upset? Why do they feel uneasy? Because those jobs are nothing compared to what they would have had under an oriented strandboard factory that was there, and they lost it. They gave away all kinds of future developments in the Parklands area because of their anxiousness to sell Manfor.

The water and sewer agreement that we had lined up and that was ready to be signed, the only problem was that Jake Epp had identified the funding. He said at first he would get it from the Western Diversification Fund. Then he said he could not. Then the MPs for Manitoba, the Conservative MPs, the caucus got into the act. They said, oh yes, you should be able to get that money from the Western Diversification Fund. They agreed with what we were saying all along, that diversification comes from good water and sewer infrastructure in communities. Now it seems that maybe it is on again, but it has been an off again-on again. Over a year has gone by and those communities still do not know at Portage, Brandon, Dauphin, Morden and Selkirk whether they are going to have this federal contribution towards these major projects that are essential for the economic health and development of their communities, and it lags on.

There is nothing for Lake Dauphin. We had the MP for Dauphin-Swan River at the last provincial election say there was \$30 million on the table in April of '88. He said there were \$30 million, federal dollars, and we did not even want to take it. We just let it sit there and we are losing it. That is what he said, the Member for Dauphin-Swan River. Now, of course, no money has come forward and here we are over a year later. He

is losing a lot of credibility in the Dauphin-Swan River area. I feel very bad about that.

They stand by while the feds continue the federal Liberal and Conservative policies of cutting our health funding. That is a federal policy that was started under Trudeau where they were cutting back on the federal shares of post-secondary education and health care in this province, in this country. They cut back and the percentage now is getting down to 35 percent, is it not, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) over there, or is it less than that now, federal contributions to our health care system? It used to be the deal was 50-50. That was the responsibility for both levels of Government, and they have been pulling back. The Liberals did that. Now the Conservatives are doing it, they are hastening it. Again, we see hardly a whisper, hardly a murmur from these Conservatives across the way. Silence is deafening across the way.

Then we see decisions like the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey). Could the Speaker tell me how much time I have left, please?

Mr. Speaker: Three minutes.

Mr. Plohman: Three minutes. Well, the times flies, I will tell you. I want to tell you that we have decisions made by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) with regard to Meadow Portage where he refused to listen to the people there. He did not consult with them. What he did instead is split the community in two, cause a convulsion in that community. He did it, he said, because 23 people signed a petition because a consultant did a report. I want to tell you that a Grade 5 "C" student could have done that report better than this one was done. Apparently, he paid \$5,000 for it. I think there are going to have to be some answers for that kind of a report. He did not listen to the people and he caused so much pain and havoc in that community. He will not even go out and talk to them and hear them and listen to them and have them express their concerns. I think that is a terrible decision.

We see decisions made by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) with regard to the public health facility in Dauphin, cancelling that facility, cancelling the nursing home beds expansion in Dauphin, just as his forefathers did -(Interjection)- Well, he was part of that. It was his buddies, the former Premier of this province, Sterling Lyon, when he cut the hospital from Dauphin. Now he does the same thing. History repeats itself when we get this Minister, this Member for Pembina doing the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a number of decisions in education, a lack of funding for the poorer school divisions. They have to close schools in Pine River and in Rorketon, in Duck Mountain School Division because there is funding only based on per-student basis, not on the basis of the cost for those poorer divisions. I ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) to ensure that he rights that problem that is hurting our rural areas and our poorer school divisions.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this Government listen to the Opposition when they bring forward solutions to

these problems, that they respond to the New Democrats when they bring forward responsible suggestions for our health care system, for our crisis centres, for our day cares and our child care centres, and for economic development in our rural areas. We want to be responsible elected officials and that is why we are making this decision. I say to the Liberals and the Conservatives—and they should not feel smug, this Government—we make this decision because we believe that it is responsible and in the interests of the people of Manitoba not to cause another expensive election at this time. We believe that a minority Government situation deserves an opportunity to work.

That is what we intend to do for a short time yet, but the days are numbered, and I want this Government to know that and to respond accordingly.

Thank you.

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): I want to share with the rest of the Members in the House in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your first term in the Legislative Assembly and look forward to this next term.

I would also like to congratulate my colleague from Burrows (Mr. Chornopyski) in his appointment election as the new Deputy Speaker, and look forward to seeing him in the Chair on increasingly frequent intervals.

I would like to congratulate all Members on surviving the first Session, and I look forward to this next Session.

It certainly is a more comfortable feeling, I must admit, for those of us on this side of the House. We feel a little more secure in our positions and certainly have had a better opportunity to have researched our various critic areas.

I would like to take one moment to thank some behind-the-scenes people. I am referring, I am thinking of the caucus staffpeople. I am sure that the Members on the other two sides of the House have very wonderful caucus staff but we have four people—Mary Ellen, Dorothy, Sonia and Aline—who are outstanding and, without them, we would have a very difficult time, I think, in functioning.

This weekend as I sat overlooking the Lake of the Woods and reflected on the first bit of Session - (Interjection)-

An Honourable Member: Shoal Lake.

Mrs. Yeo: Yes, Shoal Lake, and watched the sludge float by, I reflected upon some of the things that had happened in the first week or so. I must admit I found myself thinking about our position and my distinct feeling that I cannot support this Throne Speech. I think that will be evident in the next few moments, not because I or anybody else on this side of the House has a desire for an election or a desire to bring down the Government. We certainly realize that there are Members on this side of the House who could do a much better job, but we have no desire for the people of Manitoba today to have an election.

* (1650)

My reason for not supporting this Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is through principle. I cannot see much in the Throne Speech that I feel comfortable with. I hope you will indulge me a moment—and my apologies to Ogden Nash—but I did write a bit of a limerick, because I was finding myself smiling over some of the things that had occurred, and it goes this way:

“There once was a man named Gary, whose management skills were nary. He led the PCs and wooed the NDs. What a very strange pair to marry.”

Oh, there are two more verses.

“It is obvious a coalition, an alliance without inhibition, twixt Gary and Gary, all principles buried, and softens past years’ ammunition.

“Manitobans are watching and chuckling, this gander and his tall, dark duckling. The twins they are called, and all are appalled. Philosophy’s gone, it is just cluckling.”

An Honourable Member: Good work, Iva.

An Honourable Member: Publish it.

Mrs. Yeo: Before I refer directly to the undereducation aspects mentioned in the Throne Speech, the apparent lack of initiative, the rather wishy-washiness of that particular part of the proposals, the lack of directions, I want to again thank the people of Sturgeon Creek, the constituency that I am delighted to be able to represent as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. I want to thank them for their calls of concern, their few calls of direction for either me or my Leader or the Party that I represent. I think we are living in an era of genuine sensitivity. I think people really do take more of a concern about what is going on with the Government. They are saying to me they are concerned with the lack of governing that they are getting, the lack of direction.

One individual said to me, it is like in the old days when we used to buy \$40 worth of groceries. We would go into the shopping centre, we would come out with our \$40 worth of groceries and we would load up the total trunk of our car. Now we walk out with \$40 worth of groceries in one sack. With increasing and increasing taxes, they are only getting one sackful of services for the amount of taxes.

Oh, we have had people calling and saying, I need more in the way of home care services. I have shared this with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and the people are still phoning and saying, but I am not getting the kind of services that I once got or that I feel I need. What it is going to cost the taxpayer is a great deal more if this individual or these individuals end up requiring hospitalization, because as we all know a hospital bed is far more expensive than is a home care worker. Some of the people are saying that the red tape is getting longer and longer. They sometimes wonder, is bureaucracy set up merely to stop people from seeking assistance.

I share the people’s sense of frustration because in the past I have made a few phone calls to the

department of which I am critic. I must admit I sometimes fail to follow the lines of communication that have been directed towards me that I must follow, and sometimes I will say, well, I will just phone the department. Other people in the community can do that. I have had people on the other end of the line now who, I guess, recognize my voice, because I do not always identify myself, and I can tell. My intuitive ear tells me, oh, oh, I am not going to get the answers, and I do not. I have to follow a certain direction, a certain line of communication, and I wonder to myself, is that really an open Government. I look at the direction that our Government is moving towards mainstream in education, a position that was established by the previous Government and a position that the Liberals basically agree with.

Yes, we live in a very public world. I look around this Assembly and I think we are made up of different age groups, of different walks of life, of different professions, of different trades, of different labour unions, others, even a few women, all too few. We are different racial and religious backgrounds and I think it is good that we are a mix. I think each of do learn from each other. I have learned from every single individual that I have met all my life.

I have also witnessed a classroom with only one severely handicapped student in it, and one month later I have witnessed one of the top teachers in a certain division almost torn apart trying to make this situation work without adequate supports. I think, how can we think of closing Prince Charles School without tremendous preparation beforehand for the students who are going to go out into the community? How can we send them to other schools or out into the work force without some sort of resources in place to accept them?

I have been to Lord Roberts School, I have been to Kirkfield Park School, and I understand that they are thinking about doing away with some of these locations as well.

Very recently, I was at the Manitoba Developmental Centre in Portage la Prairie. It is my understanding that a few years ago there were some 1,200 clients centred in that particular location. Today there is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 550. I think the mainstreaming aspect is tremendous but it is not a carte blanche thing where all handicapped students should be pushed in with the mainstream, because they are going to be totally swallowed up or totally trampled on.

There are people at the Manitoba Developmental Centre who have worked with those handicapped individuals. Some of them have had 25, 30, 35 years of service and, in my opinion, those people have been sent from heaven. It is a very, very difficult kind of work to do day in and day out and they seem very much to enjoy it. They respect the clients that they look after. They try with as many of them as possible to give them a feeling of productivity.

As I walked through, it was a Friday. I do not remember the exact date but one of the clients stood up and came over and took my hand and said, “Happy

Mother's Day.' It was three days before Mother's Day. He looked happy, he looked a lot happier than some of the people do who sit here in this Assembly day after day.

I look at the Throne Speech and I think that we had hopes of dealing with a reasoned and reasonable Government. When I listened to the last Throne Speech in July of '88—it certainly seems like a long time ago—I heard of the establishment of a task force to study illiteracy. I thought to myself at the time, my goodness, here we are, another task force to study a subject that has been studied to death. I am waiting.

I have read several things the Minister has said, that we will be hearing about this task force. The other thing I read in his speech—I was not able to be here unfortunately—but they are going to come underbudget, \$60,000 underbudget. I think, is that not tremendous, particularly when you have a \$300,000 budget to begin with, so it is only going to cost the people of Manitoba \$240,000 to have had that study on illiteracy.

* (1700)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Are you saying it was not needed?

Mrs. Yeo: I think when you look at what the outgoing—I have already put it on the record that the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) says, "Are you saying it was not needed?" I have said, why not use the statistics, the information, that the federal Government has said. Why not go to the Manitoba Teachers' Society? The fact the federal Government does not share information with them may have made it necessary for them to have had to call their own task force on illiteracy. Judy Balabas, the outgoing president of the Manitoba Teachers' Society, said just the other day non-readers do not magically appear in Grades 7 and 8. She said they have been there for years.

Crisis intervention and resources at the early years' level will be considerably less costly to society and more successful for the student as a child and as an adult. I think there are things that we can do. I have heard over and over and over again, parents, teachers, the general public say how can we be turning out students who graduate from high school and they are classified illiterate? How can we allow this to happen? There must be something wrong with some of our language arts curriculum, and I think we could be addressing that. We could be looking at that. I have been hearing that for years.

I have travelled a fair bit. I have gone to some of the rural areas, because I really felt that was an area that I wanted to learn more about. I have heard about some students who have to travel 50 miles to school in the morning and 50 miles back home again at night, and I think there is a real problem there. I have also heard about one particular small community where there are 30 students moving from Grade 9 to Grade 10. Of those 30 students, only 11 of them are opting to stay in their small community. The rest want to go to the nearest centre which is a larger town. I cannot help

but ask myself what is going to happen to these small schools, these small centre schools? When are we doing to look at that?

I listen to people in the rural areas, one gentleman who said he never hoped to be a rich man, but he and his wife have spent over \$100,000 to send their two children to university.

I did hear the Minister just last week, and I think I have got it here somewhere saying that the universities are going to take classes to the rural areas for one year, I think, in just certain areas. So I know, and I am grateful that they are actually looking at that situation.

I think about the concern. This Government said in the Throne Speech, the environment is a big problem. We must be addressing the problems with the environment. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) is nodding his head. I am wondering whether he and the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) have discussed environmental education, and the very real need to increase the aspects of environmental education to start at the tender age. I am thinking, this Government that is so concerned with the environment, and I look at the styrofoam cups and which side of the House they are centred from mostly. Are there other kinds of cups that we could be using, I am wondering.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): They are environmentally safe now.

Mrs. Yeo: They are?

Mr. Enns: Yes.

Mrs. Yeo: When I look directly at the Throne Speech and under the area of education, I was really pleased. In the last Throne Speech, education did not even warrant two-thirds of a page. In this Throne Speech, it has grown. It has grown to one page basically full of studies. My Government is continuing its reform in all levels of education. A White Paper will be circulated. It is going to make the education system more accessible and more flexible.

Many people in the field of education agree that there should be some sort of broad study. If that is what the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) or that is what the Throne Speech is indicating, I will wait and see. There are definite weaknesses and everybody in all levels of education agrees with that. Vern Kulyk (phonetic) the outgoing president of MAST, said in a very dynamic way and with a great plea as he was leaving, he advocated a Royal Commission on Education. If this is the sort of idea that the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) has in mind, maybe it is not a bad idea.

I have asked a lot of questions. I have asked the Minister, of the students who enter school in kindergarten, how many of them actually leave with a high school diploma? There are no stats. You cannot get the answers. I have had people say to me, it is very difficult to follow students because students are so transient and they move from division to division and province to province and there is no way to study them. There is no way to follow them, there is no definite

sort of number that will keep track of them, so it is kind of hard to find those statistics.

Last year, a very weak list of recommendations as a result of the High School Review was published. Will this be part of the White Paper? Is this going to be part of the new committee that has been now set up to study the high school situation for the third time—the third time? In 1986, the High School Review Committee was struck. Lots of the high schools have been saying we are going to wait for the results of the High School Review before we change our set-up in the high schools, before we move our direction, because the High School Review was going to tell us.

Almost a year later we got the responses. I think it is 68 of them, numbered 1 to 69, but there is no number 55. I do not know where it got lost in the book, but there is no number 55. At any rate, then the Minister decided instead of doing anything about it, we do not have too much action or move too quickly because we have to consult some more, so we will consult the same people who gave us direction in the first place and get their response. Now he is saying, let us set up another committee to look at the results of the two sets of responses. Then I can see us down the line saying, well, now we will have another study done to study the study that has been studying the study.

I mentioned the poorly organized and very costly task force on illiteracy and am hoping that perhaps some innovative suggestions will come forward there. Has the Minister, who is chirping from his seat, listed the problems that he wants to address and ultimately correct? I wish that I could feel confident for the Winnipeggers and the Manitobans because there are a lot of them who are waiting with great expectation for some concrete action, and so far the only action is to establish another committee.

“Accessibility for rural children, for special needs children, for highly motivated, academically talented students,” accessibility for whom—flexibility, movement from division to division, addressing the varieties of programs? I am not really sure what is meant by these, so it is rather hard to say, oh, this is wonderful when you really do not know what he means by these statements.

* (1710)

“There will be renewed emphasis on strengthening the links between community colleges, the communities they serve, the real opportunities that exist in the economies of all regions of the province.” The term “renewed emphasis” kind of frightened me. I thought in the first 14 months that the Minister has been in place, that the community colleges links have grown weaker. Is that why there has to be renewed links? If the lack of increase in the number of day care spaces in the colleges, especially in the rural settings, despite the fact that there is a shortfall of about 200 day care workers and it is really appalling in the rural areas, if that lack of increase is any example of the kind of direction, the kind of emphasis that is being placed, then I have great concerns.

“In addition, my Government will continue to expand education and training programs in rural and northern

communities through the use of state-of-the-art distance technologies.” Now this is humorous, really humorous. At the same moment that these marvellous words were being uttered, the province was denying the Manitoba Computer-Assisted Learning Consortium out at the University of Manitoba the opportunity to continue operating. Here is a Canadian content program that would have the ability to enhance the Distance Education technologies in our province and, in fact, in our country. Instead of encouraging Canadian content because we are all hearing more Canadian content needed, instead of giving them the shot in the arm they need to keep on going for a little while longer so they can become self-operational, they are being cut off at the knees.

My business sense tells me if a group three years ago has made \$25,000 profit, two years ago makes \$50,000 profit, and last year it makes a \$100,000 profit, that is going in the right direction, I think. You would think that perhaps the Government could assist them to continue. They have some marvellous programs that can be used for Distance Education, but no one talks about it. There is concern and there is rhetoric in the Throne Speech but is there action? Once again, not only is there not action for this consortium which, by the way, offers programming in both official languages, but we are going to have to look to again our American-dominated area to pick up programming from across the border. Of course, with free trade that may be easier.

State-of-the-art distance technologies, what about the Bachelor of Social Work program in Thompson? Is that going to continue? What about the many LPNs, licensed practical nurses in Dauphin, in Thompson, in The Pas, in Flin Flon, who want to have local access to the R.N. programs? Or what about the R.N.s who want to be able to access a B.N. program? Is that going to be looked at? The Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses has stated by the year 2000 that all registered nurses must, in fact, have as minimal entry their Bachelor of Nursing. Is this Government looking ahead because that is only 10 years down the pike? It is not very far. Some of these people, at one or two courses a year, are going to take a fair bit of time before they manage to obtain their B.N.

My Government remains committed to a collaborative process for resolving the complex issues of education finance. A consultation paper, that wonderful word, on proposed funding measures will be issued by the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) in this Session—consultation paper. That suggests to me this is all that will occur as a result of this recommendation, more consultation, more opportunity for political appointees.

With the current thought to more equal access, to greater equality, some people in the province are suggesting that the province actually fund education 100 percent. There are concerns this would eliminate the problems that one division may have that has no businesses in their area, no shopping malls, no factories of any kind where there is an ability to raise taxes in that area alongside another division that may have all kinds of businesses and factories. If the province took it all over, then they would divide the pie but we all know which Party favours businesses most. We are

concerned. There are some people who are concerned that the particular Party that is favouring businesses will decrease the funds available for education at a time when education funding needs more and more dollars attached to it.

"A Skills Training Advisory Committee will bring together representatives from business and labour." All I could think of when I read that, Mr. Speaker, was again more political appointees. I say that because we have actually witnessed that happen.

I think the part of the Throne Speech that makes the one mention of the universities is the area that distresses me perhaps the most, "My Minister will also provide additional support for the growing capabilities of the Faculty of Management at the University of Manitoba." The only mention of our universities is this one particular faculty. I think the Minister perhaps needs reminding there are four universities in our province, except that he does not actually need reminding because he did mention them in his response the other day.

He referred to the fact that our province is blessed with four fairly important universities, and I quote: "Well, I look at our universities, Mr. Speaker, as being a great deal more than fairly important; they are our centres of high learning," at the same time that the University of Brandon would really like to have a Faculty of Management and in fact they have the support of the faculty of Brandon, they have the support of the surrounding community. They have the support of Brandon itself, businesses, the same sort of thing that the Throne Speech is talking about, this Faculty of Management that the University of Manitoba have. Has the Minister listened to all sides of the Faculty of Management story when it said in the Throne Speech that the faculty supports this? I know there was a vote taken. I know that with the faculty, but I am wondering were all the faculty present when this vote was taken?

Mr. Derkach: 28 to 1.

Mrs. Yeo: The Minister says 28 to 1 and I ask the Minister, does he know how many faculty members there are in the Faculty of Management? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that no, he does not know.

I think this is a proverbial can of worms, and I think it is being opened with this strong statement of support to one of 100 or so more needy faculties in our Manitoba universities.

I am also concerned with one other area that is fairly close to me and that is the Winnipeg General Hospital, Health Sciences School of Nursing. There are two of us in this House who happen to be graduates of that particular School of Nursing. I have not heard the other graduate thumping the table very loudly, but I hope indeed that she will on behalf of the Health Sciences Centre Winnipeg General Hospital School of Nursing. My mother graduated from that school in 1930, I graduated in 1960, and the other Member in the House is a neophyte and graduated some years after that.

There is a tremendous history with that particular school of nursing. I think, if you were to look in North

America, that it has the greatest tradition of any—and I can say this without any reservation—hospital-based school of nursing. It is in danger, great danger of being closed. I do not think the Members of the alumni are horribly fearful about the doors closing as much as the way in which they close. They want to save some of the tradition, the long tradition that is a very big part of that particular facility.

* (1720)

So I would urge the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to have a good look at the situation there and if there is closure involved they consult because, as a matter of fact, the Minister of Education has said in his opening presentation he wants to involve the players when he makes this decision. So I hope he will involve the players who will be hurt or benefit from this particular move.

He also talked about the problems with child abuse. I would support the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) very definitely that we have to take a new stand, that we have to move. I think an all-Party position on the difficulties, where there is potential to occur in the classroom, should certainly be considered.

The other area that I was pleased to see that he had mentioned was in the area with regard to AIDS education. I wonder, when he made the statement that AIDS education is being delivered to all schools in the province, I am wondering if it is being delivered to the K to 6 schools as well as to the 7 to 12. I hope indeed that this is true that there is a curriculum base for the earlier years as well, because I think our young people today are pretty sharp. I think there has to be obviously an updating and increase in the education with regard to this very dread disease.

I think when we looked at the results that were done federally and we found out that our students in Manitoba were the poorest educated as far as their understanding of AIDS was concerned, this should be a definite priority with this particular Government.

I am not going to mention any other faculty at the university other than the Faculty of Agriculture, because the Minister has referred to the fact that we can be proud of our Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba. I can tell you we can be proud of it, but we are also going to lose some of the buildings and that Faculty of Agriculture building is in the poorest shape of all the buildings out at the University of Manitoba. I am sure that the Minister and some of his colleagues tramped through the steam tunnels out at the university and are aware that, should something happen to those steam tunnels, there are several buildings out there that are not going to survive. In fact, we are going to be faced with millions and millions of dollars of expense if we cannot find somewhere some monies to address the needs of the infrastructures at our University of Manitoba. I walked through the Faculty of Agriculture building, and I was afraid that the side was going to fall off at one point because the wind was blowing outside. You could see the papers on the desk fluttering as the wind blew through the cracks in the walls.

I was rather surprised that the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) decided that the area of training—and that is a dreadful, dreadful word, Mr. Speaker. You train a seal or you train a dog, but you do not train a human being. The area of training is moved into the portfolio that is now obviously far, far too large, and an \$800 million or so budget has something else tacked on to it, whereas the previous training now is left with a Minister who has something in the neighbourhood of \$7 million, I think, to guard over and to direct. I wonder about the logic in that area. The area of training, I will leave to my colleague from St. Vital (Mr. Rose). I do not know whether he is as upset with the term “training” as I am, but it is —(Interjection)—

I look forward to working with the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), with some of his initiatives. I would hope that there will be a time when the NDP Education critic (Mr. Storie), the Minister of Education, and I can sit down together and perhaps come up with some shared philosophies and shared positions. I thank the House for their indulgence.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): I guess I can say quite honestly that I have not heard this much excitement in the House for the last couple of hours, and I want to thank my colleagues specifically for their support and encouragement.

Before I get really into the heart of my speech, I would like to congratulate you for a tough year, a year that you have come through and done an excellent job at trying to keep some decorum in this House. I think that all Parties do agree that you have worked in the best interest of all Members of the Legislature over the past year and wish you much success in the coming year.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the new Deputy Speaker (Mr. Chornopyski). We have had a long association, long before I was elected to the Manitoba Legislature, or the Deputy Speaker was elected to the Legislature. I do know that he is a very fine gentleman and will do much service to the position of Deputy Speaker.

I would like to welcome all Members back to the House and say how pleased I am to see that we are all healthy and full of life. I noticed that some of us have a few more grey hairs than we had last year at this time. I want to say to all Members, I wish them a very successful and eventful Session.

Also, I would like to congratulate the two new Ministers who were brought into Cabinet this year: the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) and the Member for Kirkfield Park (Mrs. Hammond). I do know that they are going to contribute much and be a real asset to our Cabinet and our Government. I would like to wish well all of those critics who have new critic responsibilities and roles, and those too wish them well, the ones who are continuing on with their old critic responsibilities. It should prove to be a very successful, eventful year.

Before I go on to talking about my responsibilities as Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation and

Lotteries, I do want to say a few things about my constituency of River East and indicate to the people in River East that I certainly have not forgotten them. In fact, the things that I ran in the last election campaign on and, as I went door to door in River East constituency, I heard time after time after time that people were tired of paying more taxes.

Well, I want to commend our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) for the fine job he has done over the past year in keeping personal income taxes frozen. We have not increased them, Mr. Speaker, and we do not plan to in this Session or this Budget of the Legislature. I do know that as I went door to door, people did indicate that they did not want to have to dig into their pockets deeper to pay any more personal income tax. We have managed to accomplish that, a feat I must say in the tough situation that we are in as a province and a country today.

* (1730)

Also, Mr. Speaker, the people of River East had specific concerns about health care. Myself, being a registered nurse and a graduate of the Health Sciences Centre, as the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo), a few years later, but not late enough to remember how hard we worked as service to that facility and to that hospital. I know that things have changed over the last number of years, even more so probably since I stopped working as a nurse three years ago. Times are tough. I know that nurses are having a hard time right now with the shortage of staff and the increased workload because we are in fact developing new ways and means of keeping people alive longer.

There is more, I suppose, mental pressure than the days gone by when we just worked really hard to try to maintain and keep those people alive, but there are so many more support systems now available. I know that things are tougher. We need more highly qualified and highly skilled nurses to perform the duties that they are expected to perform now. I know the nurses who work in my local community hospital, the Concordia Hospital, are feeling the same things as they are feeling in the major institutions in our city and our province.

I have not forgotten my commitment to Concordia Hospital, my commitment to work very hard towards expanding the size of Concordia Hospital. I do know that when it was originally built it was the NDP Government that cut back the size that Concordia Hospital was originally intended to be and it, as a result, has ended up being the smallest community hospital in the City of Winnipeg. It serves one of the very largest communities and a growing community in our city and our province. I have not forgotten my commitment to work hard on behalf of my colleagues at Concordia Hospital and the people in the northeast quadrant of the City of Winnipeg to try to enhance and improve the services at Concordia Hospital.

On that note, I want to just assure my constituents in River East that they will always be first and foremost when it comes to my representing them and trying to look after the major issues and concerns that do face my constituents. We as a Government are going to

work hard towards addressing the major issues and concerns of all the people in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a busy year for all of us and I think some of us who were new to Government and new to Cabinet responsibilities have found it to be a very long year—

An Honourable Member: Ah, but a rewarding year
. . . .

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, very rewarding in many aspects, and we have accomplished much. The indication of what was said in the Throne Speech for this second Session truly indicates that we have done much and that we are going to have an even better year this year.

Mr. Speaker, just an indication of what has happened in the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation over the last year, and I think that, as you will note throughout the Throne Speech, there are several references to my department and a clear indication that I have been working very hard with my colleagues in Government to assure that Culture, Heritage and Recreation has a voice throughout all departments, and that we as a department are working together with all other departments to try to improve and enhance the services to all Manitobans.

I want to indicate some new initiatives that we have undertaken in this first short year. The Throne Speech did announce improved library services to rural and northern Manitoba beginning with the establishment of a Public Library Advisory Board. That board has been appointed and is in place and its prime responsibility is going to be looking at long-range planning for library development throughout our province.

I do want to indicate that when we took over as Government the City of Winnipeg with its library funding was about mid across Canada in terms of funding per capita, but I will tell you we were a dismal 10th in rural library development and funding across the country. I am not proud of that. The appointment of the Library Advisory Board to look at long-range planning and funding for rural and remote Manitoba is the first step in the direction to rectify that problem.

I know that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in her comments said it was just another council and another advisory board and just another study, but I do want to indicate that we have not had a Library Advisory Board in the Province of Manitoba since 1969. I think it is long overdue. I think it is time that we had people there who have an interest in the community and want to improve the service to our communities throughout Manitoba. I do know that with the calibre of the people that have been appointed to that board, we are going to see some positive steps over the next year in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, also we announced in the Throne Speech and are getting under way an Arts Policy Review, something that has been long overdue. It was 10 years under the former Lyon Administration when the last Arts Policy Review was done, and this is another area where the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs)

criticized during here response to the Throne Speech, indicating that it is just another study.

I do want to indicate that during the election campaign her Party, as well as the Second Opposition Party and our Party, all agreed we needed an Arts Policy Review. It was long overdue and it should be undertaken. Now she is saying, here we are just doing another study. I question how she feels that we can just walk right in there and develop a direction for arts over the next 10 years when there has been no study done, and the needs in the arts community have changed considerably since that last study was done 10 years ago.

We are now in the process of putting a policy review in place so that we can look to direction for arts throughout the province over the next decade. So I am pleased that we were able to announce that initiative, and it will be taking place very quickly. We will be having some answers and some results as to what direction we should be heading as a Government, as a result of this new initiative.

Mr. Speaker, another major area within my department we have looked at over the last year and have taken an initiative on and have provided some increased funding, as a matter of fact, is to recreation throughout our province. It is very clear in my mind after just a year in Government and travelling throughout the province that the communities throughout our province are diminishing in size.

People are moving into the larger centres. They are not staying in the small towns and communities. Although we do need economic initiatives to keep people in rural Manitoba, we also do need some form of leisure time activity for those professionals who we are trying to attract out to rural Manitoba, and keep in rural Manitoba once they get there. Mr. Speaker, they want the same opportunities for their children in rural Manitoba as we want and have in the City of Winnipeg.

If you do not have a community that can provide piano lessons for children, sports facilities for children, photography classes, programs for seniors in rural Manitoba that take in leisure time activity—those are all the hours that are not spent working, that is the basic definition of recreation. If we do not have some type of programs or projects available for people in rural Manitoba, to attract them and to keep them there, we are going to see the influx of people from our rural areas into our major centres in years to come.

We want to develop rural Manitoba. We want to ensure that they have equal opportunity with citizens in the City of Winnipeg. So we have provided in this year's new initiatives \$900,000 through Lotteries for recreation to rural and northern Manitoba to ensure that we are going to be able to attract and keep people in those areas. I think it is a positive initiative. It is something that has been long overdue and it is something that we, as a Government, have committed and will be able to follow through on.

* (1740)

That money is going to be used in consultation and conjunction with the volunteers out in rural Manitoba

and the municipal Governments, the local Governments. There is going to be a consultation process and we are not going to jump quickly into just spending that money for the sake of spending it. We are going to ensure that there is some coordination of activities in rural Manitoba, along with the local Government from the volunteers, who really are the experts in knowing and determining what we need in rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, also for the first time this year, Manitoba Day was a day that really did look at and promote pride in Manitoba. We had several different activities going on throughout the Legislature, throughout rural Manitoba, through the education system, through our schools, and we also did designate this building as a heritage building so that it will be preserved forever for future generations to see just what a marvelous Legislative Building we have in our province.

We plan next year to increase the awareness of Manitoba Day so that all Manitobans can share and feel that same pride in our province that we have come to know here in the Legislature. I cannot stress how much I feel more a part of this Manitoba community since I have been elected to the Legislature and since I have had the opportunity to know the process and the history of our province, and I want the opportunity for all Manitobans to be able to experience that. We are going to make every effort in the coming years to ensure that Manitobans do know and understand where we have come from in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered all aspects of Culture, Heritage and Recreation except multiculturalism right at this point. I would just like to briefly spend a few minutes indicating our Government's commitment. It was in the Throne Speech and throughout the Throne Speech, a clear indication that I have been working closely with my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), my colleague the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) to provide new and enhanced services for the multicultural community to take down some of the barriers that presently exist.

We have a new initiative in the Department of Health that is going to allow some of the barriers to be removed with a better understanding of multicultural health, the language problems, the barriers that are there for those new Canadians who do come to our country and do not understand the process, the medical process, the health process. I know that the Department of Health is working on a major new initiative and we are going to work very closely together to ensure that those in the multicultural community have those barriers removed.

Also a major new initiative in the Department of Education is accreditation for those new Canadians who come over here and are not able to find jobs or obtain jobs because they cannot become completely accredited here. They do not have the opportunity to work at the jobs and the professions that they were taught and trained to do in their own countries. So we are going to be working very closely over the next year to ensure that there is an accreditation program for those new Canadians so that they will be able to provide and produce in the areas that they have been trained in.

Mr. Speaker, we have hired a multicultural coordinator who has a great understanding of the multicultural community. She is indeed a fine woman and she is going to bring to our Government and our department a sense of coordination and a sense of understanding, and help to develop over the next year a multicultural policy that will lead to a multicultural Act that will enhance the ability of the multicultural community to be a complete part of Manitoba.

I do want to indicate too that, first and foremost, we all have to take pride in the fact that we are Manitobans. It does not matter what our background is or how long we have been here in this province, whether we are second-, third-, or fourth-generation Canadians, whether we are first-generation Canadians, or whether we are brand new Canadians who have just come to this country.

Mr. Speaker, everyone is here for different reasons and for different purposes but we, first and foremost, do have to be Manitobans and Canadians and take pride in our province and be very pleased with what we have, the freedom that we do have in this country to be able to participate at every political level, to speak freely and not to be afraid of Governments as such because no one in this country has to be afraid of any Government, whether it be Conservative, Liberal, or NDP. We can still speak freely, we can say what we feel and we can all be a part of the political process.

I want to assure you that we, as a Government, want to first and foremost attempt to understand the various different cultures. People who have come from countries that are quite different from ours, who had come with fear of Governments, we want to assure them that there is nothing to fear with any Government in this country. They can speak openly and freely, and they can live normal lives without any worry about what they say or what they do. We want to make it easier, as we grow, to learn and understand more about each other's cultures. Then we will all be able to work more closely and more harmoniously together without discrimination. So we are going to be working very hard, as a Government, to ensure there is a multicultural policy leading to a multicultural Act this year.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to go on to the major initiatives that this Government has taken over the last year in the announcing of the casino at the Fort Garry Hotel and the needs assessment, the Lotteries Needs Assessment.

Mr. Edwards: A lot of public input on that one.

Mrs. Mitchelson: The Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) says a lot of public input on that one. The casino at the Convention Centre was a dismal disaster, it was an eyesore. It did not portray the City of Winnipeg in a very positive light. We, as a Government, decided that was not the kind of casino that we wanted to run in the City of Winnipeg. We decided to amalgamate all of the casinos.

I know the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) seem to have different points of view on whether—the Member

for Springfield, in his comments the other day, indicated that he wanted to see gambling in rural Manitoba. The Leader of the Opposition is not sure whether she wants gambling in rural Manitoba or in the City of Winnipeg, or whether she wants it at all or whether she wants both. On one hand, she has said on many occasions we are depriving the people in rural Manitoba from having casinos, and on the other hand she is saying casinos are a tax on the poor.

* (1750)

Is she saying it is all right to have a tax on the poor in rural Manitoba but it is not all right to have it in the City of Winnipeg? She is speaking out of both sides of her mouth, Mr. Speaker. She does not really know where she is coming from. She says casinos or gambling is a tax on the poor. Governments cannot go backwards. We cannot get rid of casinos. What would she do if she were Government? Would she abolish gambling in the City of Winnipeg? She really does not know. She has absolutely no answer for what she would do in Government, but you know she has been on both sides of the issue.

Just let me go back to her very scientific survey she did in the local papers. She indicated quite clearly it was not scientific because the Liberal Party did not have any money to do a scientific poll. Nonetheless, they passed out surveys at the Liberal convention last spring. She got some 3,000 or so responses back. I have the numbers here, 1,838 coupons were opposed to the casino and 955 coupons were in favour of the casino. Well, she plopped them all on the Premier's desk and they eventually ended up on my desk, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you what we did.

We went through all of those coupons. I will tell you out of those who were opposed to the casino—the 1,838—100 of them had markings on them. The rest of them just had a plain yes or no. A hundred of them had markings on that said they were opposed to the casino. But let me tell you something, out of those 100, 49 of those 100 had a clear signature on them so we could tell who sent them in and 51 of them were ineligible. So out of 1,838 coupons we have a clear indication that 49 people were opposed to the casino. On the other side of the coin, there were 955 coupons in favour of the casino. Out of the 955 coupons in favour of the casino, 65 had very clear signatures with names and addresses and 15 were ineligible. The scientific part of the survey clearly indicates to me that 49 people were opposed to the casino and 65 were in favour of the casino. I will tell you that the survey that the Liberal Party did clearly indicates that the majority of Manitobans are in favour of a casino. (Interjection)-

The Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak) talks about public hearings. I know the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) has indicated that our Premier (Mr. Filmon) in the past said that the NDP should have public hearings when they were opening up a casino and, yes, Mr. Speaker, if we were expanding a casino in the Province of Manitoba we would certainly hold public hearings, but there is no expansion of casino hours in the Province of Manitoba. The number of hours that are going to run at a full-time casino at the Fort Garry

Hotel, or a year-round casino, are the same number of hours that the casinos ran throughout the Province of Manitoba in the past. So, quite clearly, we are not increasing gambling hours in the Province of Manitoba and, if we were, we would certainly ask the public of Manitoba to have some input.

As far as the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) talking about casino revenues going to health care before the needs assessment was announced, quite clearly any market survey that has been done throughout the province indicates that the people of Manitoba want to see lotteries revenues go to health care—clear, simple fact. We have indicated, because we wanted to close the casino at the Convention Centre and we wanted to move quickly to make that happen to improve the image of our casinos in the City of Winnipeg, that we moved it to the Fort Garry Hotel and we allocated all casino revenues to health care. It is a decision that has been made, it is a decision that has been lauded by the people of Manitoba and they will benefit, Mr. Speaker, from the results.

I want to go on briefly—I see my time is running out—to changes in the lottery funding system in the Province of Manitoba. The changes in the lottery funding system are going to provide a better accountability system and they are going to be fairer and more flexible for the people of Manitoba and, quite clearly, the old umbrella system and the lottery funding system was not working in the province. It is quite clearly evident by the number of letters we have received from the people of Manitoba indicating that they fell through the cracks and they were not able to get lotteries funding in the past. In the future, there will be fairer access to lotteries revenues throughout the Province of Manitoba. We have not made a change at all in the philosophy of how the funds are spent. We are just going to have a more accountable system in place to see that money spent.

The Members opposite have criticized indicating that it is not going to be more accountable. I will tell you that also we are making it more political because Cabinet is going to be making the decisions on where the lotteries funds go. I will tell you that Cabinet always made the decisions on where the lotteries funding would go. All that happened was that the Lotteries Foundation signed an agreement with the umbrella groups, but it was always a Cabinet decision on who was going to be getting the money.

So there is absolutely nothing different except that there is going to be more accountability. Why should the Lotteries Foundation be signing an agreement with the Manitoba Sports Federation? It is the Minister of Sport (Mr. Ernst) who is ultimately responsible for how those dollars are spent who should be signing an agreement with the Manitoba Sports Federation.

An Honourable Member: And defending it in the meantime.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, and I know that the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) has defended Tom Saunders from the Sports Federation, who has clearly indicated there is going to be more instability or insecurity. I have

to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Selkirk could take the side of Mr. Tom Saunders, who says there is going to be less stability when the agreement that was signed with the Lotteries Foundation only gave the Sports Federation 90 days of stability. With the agreements that are going to be signed with the Ministers responsible for departments, they will have a whole year of security with a long-range plan, so they will know in future years how much money they are going to be getting. So there will be more stability, not less, as a result of the changes in the lottery distribution system.

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): Sounds pretty unlikely.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I know the Member for Transcona says that it is pretty unlikely. I will tell you that in his uninformed way he has made statements in this House. I think when he gets right down to attempting to understand and know where the money is coming from and where the money is going, he will be pleasantly surprised to see that the money is there and it is available and it is going to go to all the worthwhile causes throughout the Province of Manitoba. The money for conservation and for recreation and for medical research that is so badly needed is going to be there and it is going to enhance our community.

An Honourable Member: They are bringing out the worst in you, Bonnie.

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, no. The Community Investment Fund, Mr. Speaker, which is a new part of the lotteries distribution system is going to ensure that areas outside the City of Winnipeg and those within the City of

Winnipeg have equal opportunity to access funds, something that has not happened in the past. The expanded Community Investment Fund is going to be made up of equal representation from rural Manitoba and from within the City of Winnipeg, so that those communities that felt they were not receiving an adequate share of funding through the umbrella system that existed before will have the opportunity now to receive equal access and they will have equal representation on that committee.

The money that is going to recreation in rural Manitoba is also going to address that inequity, people who in rural Manitoba felt before that the umbrella system was not working for them. The Sports Federation and the Arts Council were not—and it is quite clearly indicated in the Needs Assessment Report. We are not addressing the needs of rural Manitoba or remote Manitoba. So those issues will be addressed and those groups will receive additional funding as a result of the changes.

I do want to talk briefly about medical research and the extra \$800,000 that is going to be going to health research in the Province of Manitoba as a result of our commitment, as a Government, to ensure that quality research is done here in the Province of Manitoba, jobs are created, and we can keep the experts—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs. Mitchelson: How much time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hour being 6 p.m., in accordance with the Rules, I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8 p.m., at which time the Honourable Minister will have seven minutes remaining.