



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

41 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XLII No. 4 - 1:30 p.m., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1992



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, December 1, 1992

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Routine Proceedings, I have a statement for the House.

I must inform the House that Elijah Harper, the honourable member for Rupertsland, has resigned his seat in the House effective November 30, 1992. I am therefore tabling his resignation and my letter to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council advising of the vacancy thus created in the membership of the House.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Donna Hardman, Ellen Enns, Michael Kalmakoff and others requesting the government of Manitoba pass the necessary legislation/regulations which will restrict stubble burning in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Marie-Jeanne Buccini, Alice Szarkiewicz, Maureen Monk and others urging the government of Manitoba to pass the regulations which will restrict stubble burning in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. George Hickey (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Chief Louis Stevenson, Lloyd Stevens, Leslie Daniels and others requesting the government of Manitoba show a strong commitment to aboriginal self-government by considering reversing its position on the AJI by supporting the recommendations within its jurisdiction implementing a separate and parallel justice system.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of F. Pyryhora, I. Pyryhora, T. Weiss and others urging the government of Manitoba pass the necessary

legislation/regulations which will restrict stubble burning in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Monica Linklater, Sylvia Spence, Eileen Moody and others requesting the government of Manitoba consider reviewing the state of Highway 391 with a view towards improving the condition and safety of the road.

* (1335)

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Urban Affairs.

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the report of the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund Board, the Annual Report, 1991.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon, from the F.W. Gilbert School, thirty Grade 5 students. They are under the direction of Ms. Merle Stepaniuk. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik).

Also, from the Linwood Elementary School, we have thirty-five Grade 5 students. They are under the direction of Mr. Ed Hume. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Poverty Rate Provincial Increase

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have been saying for some time now that the government is out of touch and this Premier is out of touch. Unfortunately, today the poverty

figures have been released for the province of Manitoba and for Canada. Unfortunately, the poverty numbers indicate the tragedy that is taking place in our communities, where Manitoba now has the second highest poverty rate of any province in Canada, and the child poverty rate remains the highest of anywhere in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier stated two weeks ago, in a speech he made to his own faithful, that all Manitobans are better off under Conservative government. Given the fact that the number of people in poverty between 1988 when this Premier took office and 1990 has grown by 10,000 Manitobans, can the Premier please explain to us and to all Manitobans, if they are better off, why there are 10,000 more people unfortunately in poverty today?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, certainly we as a government, as I believe all people in elected office ought to be, are concerned about the trends for continued poverty in our society, and we as a government have taken some very determined action since these figures, which relate to 1990, have indeed been collected.

I am sure that the member opposite knows that we continued to increase our social allowance rates at, for instance, 3.6 percent last year, which was the second highest rate of increase in the country, and this year again at the rate of inflation. We added income assistance for disabled at \$60 per month, which is rising to \$70 per month as of next month, and a monthly supplement to replace the provincial tax credit. It is also one of the reasons why we are placing great emphasis on economic priorities to get the economy rolling again.

Mr. Speaker, we take no solace in these figures. In fact, we are very, very concerned. I would say that I would hope the member opposite would recognize that this is not a partisan issue. If it were so, it would have been settled and it would have been addressed during the time when the member opposite's administration was in government, because the figure that is published in this report for 1990 is lower than it was in 1982, '83, '84, '85 and '86 and at the same level that it was in '87.

That is not good news, but we are doing things that are within our power, and we would hope that the members opposite would continue to work with us to try and improve the lot of those who indeed

have to live in poverty in this province and right across the country.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier to look at the trends and look at the numbers. The amount of people that decreased in the poverty list between '82 and '88 was a 40,000 decrease in the number of people living below the poverty line in the previous government, and now we see a 10,000-person increase in people living in poverty in the province of Manitoba. The Premier on the one hand said this is not a partisan issue, and then he proceeds to produce partisan numbers. Well, we can respond to those partisan answers of the Premier if he so desires.

Mr. Speaker, the government said that they remain committed to strengthening and supporting Manitoba families, caring for those less fortunate and protecting Manitoba's vulnerable and disadvantaged citizens. That is in the Speech from the Throne. Why do we see an increase of 10,000 people under his first two years in government, and how many more are going to be living in poverty with the actions and economic policies of this government, because we see a decrease of 25,000 jobs in our province and decreased opportunities for our people?

* (1340)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the figure is 17.8 percent of people living below the poverty line. In 1982 it was 20.5 percent in Manitoba; in 1983 it was 18.6 percent; in 1984 it was 18.4 percent; in 1985 it was 18 percent; in 1986 it was 18.6 percent again and so on. So those are the figures we are talking about, and I am saying that that is unacceptable. I am saying that this government has increased the rates, the welfare rates, that we pay at rates that are greater than what is being increased in most provinces in the country. In fact, last year only one province had a higher rate of increase, plus we added the particular additional payments for disabled people who were at a particular level last year and are rising again as of January.

We are working as well on the economic side because we know that ultimately, as the report indicates, that the ultimate solution to this, of course, is to ensure that we restore the economy to economic health, because that is the long-term

solution that we have to address in this issue. That is why the throne speech deals with the economy as the central focus, because it is jobs, it is a healthy economy that is the long-term solution to improving the lot of these people.

Poverty Rate Provincial Increase

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Premier is right. It was 20 percent in 1982, and it went down to 16.6 percent in '88, a decrease of 40,000 people. From 1988 to 1990, it went up to 17.8 percent, an increase of 10,000 people in the poverty rate. That is exactly the point. You know, you do not have to listen to these statistics. The Premier could go 200 yards across from his office, across the street, to really see what is going on in this province, and we have been saying that this Premier and this government are totally out of touch with what is going on in terms of the realities of people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of months, this government chose to offload millions of dollars on social assistance payments to municipalities or the larger municipality of Winnipeg and other municipalities that were paying provincial rates, which will result in either a decrease in provisions like food for children or increased taxation. Now the Premier had promised no increase in taxation, so I would ask the Premier what is the impact of the cutback on benefits, such as food for children, on the poverty rates of Manitoba. I would ask the Premier to stand up and answer this question, because he did not answer it last spring when we asked him the very same question.

Hon. Harold Gillieshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the number of recipients on social allowances is a small component or a partial component of the people living in poverty that this study reflects, and I think that what happens with statistics like this is that you draw a national poverty line based on the cost of living in some of the urban centres like Toronto and Vancouver, yet the cost of living in Winnipeg, for instance, is lower than 11 other major urban centres across this country. I would also point out that we have the third lowest incidence of citizens on social

allowances per capita in the country, and our rates are about the sixth highest in the country. So Manitoba is relatively positioned with the social allowances that other provinces pay at this time.

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Autopac Rate Increase

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the minister responsible for Autopac (Mr. Cummings). The Conservative-appointed Public Utilities Board has now approved the request of the Conservative-appointed board of MPIC for the highest real increase of Autopac rates in the history of this province. Non-merit private passenger vehicles approval is 13.5 percent which is 10 times the rate of inflation. The average increase of 9.7 percent is about seven times the rate of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, how can this minister who led the charge a few years ago, how can this minister sit there complacently and justify these unconscionable increases?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I reject the member's reference to the quality and the standard of the work being done by the PUB. We deliberately made sure that the Public Utilities Board was given the opportunity to look at the rate structure and make sure that it was properly reflecting the costs and the real cost of coverage that the corporation was taking on.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the recommendations of the Public Utilities Board, it very clearly demonstrates to us why it was the proper thing to do in referring these types of rates to the Public Utilities Board, because it clearly references the fact that we need to make sure of what is required, that the level of coverage in this province is correct and adequate and make sure that no increases are brought forward that do not reflect the actual costs of the claims that have been incurred.

* (1345)

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, my next question is, talking about costs, why did the government interfere in the MPIC request to limit

agency fees? How can you interfere on behalf of the brokers, but not on behalf of the consumers of Manitoba?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the corporation is undergoing a major review of the Autopac agents compensation package as we bring forward Autopac 2000. That is the fair and practical manner in which they have brought forward their presentation to the agents, so that as they review that compensation package and as they change the entire method of which we do business with the public and with the agents, those changes will be incorporated.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, my final question is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh). I would ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs if she at least will act on behalf of the consumers of Manitoba who are now being asked to pay outrageously high increases in Autopac rates, given the fact that there are so many Manitobans who have not got a job—they are losing their jobs—and given the fact that incomes are declining in this province. Will this minister at least stand up on behalf of the consumers?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, that demonstrates the lack of acumen on that side of the House. They are asking that we now run the corporation into the ground in order that we not reflect the real cost of insurance.

Poverty Rate Provincial Increase

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask some questions on behalf of those people who cannot afford an automobile, the genuine poor of the province of Manitoba.

On December 13, 1991, the Premier, in his speech to this House, said that he was willing to work co-operatively with all levels of government on any programs designed to eradicate poverty with respect to the children of our province, any programs whatsoever.

Can the First Minister of the province tell us, if that was his genuine desire less than a year ago, why was child poverty, which for two years in a row is

worst in this province of any other province in this nation, including Newfoundland, not even mentioned in his Speech from the Throne?

* (1350)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the figures which the Leader of the third party is referring to as being for two years in a row date back to 1990, before the speech that I gave that she references. As I said earlier, this government took action during the past year and raised welfare rates in this province at a rate of 3.6 percent last year, which was greater than any province but one in the country and, in addition to that, brought in additional income assistance for disabled, \$60 a month, which is rising to \$70 a month in January. In addition to that, we used a monthly supplement to replace the provincial tax credit, but we know that this is not enough, and we have said—[interjection]

Mr. Speaker, the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), if her Leader allows her, will be able to ask a question later. I am sure that we on this side would be happy to respond to her question. All she has to do is convince her Leader that it is her opportunity to speak.

We on this side have indicated that we must continue to search for ways to improve the economy so that we do not just have people relying on government social programs for support, and that is in the report that was released that she is quoting from the newspaper article on, the report by the National Council of Welfare that the long-term goal has to be work on the economy.

That is what the throne speech is all about, is improving the economy so that people do not need only to be dependent on welfare, social allowances and provincial government for their subsistence, that they must have the opportunity to go and improve their own circumstances, and only through a healthier economy will we be able to accomplish that.

Social Assistance Food Allowance

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Premier likes projections. Well, I think that he should take a look

at the projection of the National Council on Welfare. The projection of the National Council on Welfare is that the figures on poverty will be worse for '91 and worse again in 1992 than they were in 1990. At the same time, this government has made it an unfortunate circumstance that food budgets will be cut for those 93 percent more people on welfare in the city of Winnipeg.

How can this Premier justify less money for food for the children already suffering and living below the poverty line?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): As I indicated, our provincial government increased welfare rates by some 3.6 percent, which was the second highest in the country last year, and again by the rate of inflation this year. In addition to that, the member may be aware of the national program, the federal program, entitled: Brighter Futures, which is to add support to the children. [interjection]

Mr. Speaker, the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) is on his campaign box, and perhaps he would like to give the answer to his Leader because he does not seem to want to listen to my answers.

Social Assistance Food Allowance

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the government's offloading to the City of Winnipeg amounts to some \$5.6 million in money that should have gone to support the 93 percent additional plus those already on social assistance. That money is used for food.

How does the Premier of this province think that single parent moms, who suffer from the greatest poverty levels in this nation and in this province, are supposed to feed their kids?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchellson (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): I would really like to respond and ask the Leader of the Second Opposition party to get her facts straight.

There is not one single mom who will receive any less under the new system that has been put in place than before. All single mothers in the province of Manitoba are on provincial welfare, not on city welfare, and they will receive a 3.6 percent increase in funding as a result of this government's decision.

Bill 70 Impact on the City of Winnipeg

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, there is no limit to the hypocrisy of the Filmon government who in their throne speech criticized the federal government for offloading expenses to the Province of Manitoba and at the same time have offloaded millions of dollars to the City of Winnipeg. Regrettably, the Minister of Family Services denied on April 13 that this would happen.

Now that the minister has announced the regulations to Bill 70, will this minister admit that is the effect of Bill 70, offloading millions of dollars of expenses to the City of Winnipeg?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): The intent of Bill 70 is to standardize the intake procedures and the rates across this province. We have many municipal corporations where the rate was below the provincial rate. We had two municipal jurisdictions where the rate was higher. Bill 70 will allow for one rate across the province, and municipal corporations at their own expense have the ability to give higher rates if they wish.

I would like to point out the many other enhancements that we have added to the social allowances program in addition to the 3.6 percent. Recently we announced the ability for certain recipients to keep their health card as they make their way from social assistance into the work force, I think a very progressive way of allowing people to leave social allowances and get into the work force, something that my honourable friend has failed to comment on.

We have also increased the supplement for the disabled. This was a new initiative last year. We have been able to increase that by \$10 a month this year. These are just two of the many reforms that we have brought in in the last two years.

Mr. Martindale: Mr. Speaker, why has this minister offloaded expenses and forced the City of Winnipeg to pick up millions of dollars of expenses, since we know that Manitoba has the second highest rate of poverty in Canada? We have the second highest rate of poverty for families and the highest rate of child poverty.

How can this minister offload millions of dollars of expenses to the City of Winnipeg which may force more people to become dependent on food banks and soup kitchens and force families deeper into poverty, deprivation and hopelessness?

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, the number of people living in difficult circumstances in Manitoba and in other provinces across Canada is a concern of all governments. We have seen with the recession an increased number of people added to the social allowance rolls right across this country.

Again I would point out that we have the third lowest incidence of citizens accessing social allowances across the country. We also have the sixth highest social allowance rates across the country. If the member is suggesting that Manitoba should have the highest rate, that is not in keeping with the cost of living across this country. Manitoba is placed relative to the cost of living, well positioned at sixth place with other provinces across this country.

At the same time, we have also addressed many other issues that the member has raised in the last two years. We have increased the liquid assets exemption, something that has been discussed by poverty groups and something we were able to act on last year. As well, we have dealt with the head of the household issue, something that was a long-standing issue that had not been dealt with through the '70s or the '80s, but something that we have been able to deal with in recent months. Those are again two more of the reforms that we have brought in in the last two years.

Mr. Martindale: Why has this Minister of Family Services, by offloading \$5.6 million of expenses, forced the City of Winnipeg to choose between cutting rates, especially for people in families, many of their rates were higher, especially for infants, or to increase property taxes when everyone knows that property taxes are a regressive form of taxation?

Why is this minister forcing the City of Winnipeg into that kind of choice?

Mr. Gilleshammer: I can tell you that this government has had difficult choices on raising taxes, and we have made those difficult decisions over the last five budgets. I think that the City of Winnipeg, all municipal corporations, have to make

those same decisions. These are tough times to be governing in, tough decisions to make. I am sure the City of Winnipeg will give it due consideration and make the appropriate decision.

Again, I would point out that besides increasing the rates by 3.6 percent we have also dealt with a tremendous volume increase. Last year we put an additional \$40 million into our social allowances budget which we expended, and we overexpended that by another \$40 million.

The rates would seem to be appropriate when you compare them with other provinces across Canada. I think the reforms that we have brought in have been very well received by the groups that lobbied for additional rate increases and enhancements, that lobby government regularly on that. We have brought in at least a half a dozen, if not eight of these enhancements, over and above the general rate increase.

* (1400)

Grain Transportation Proposal Tabling Request

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the Crow benefit has historically been put in place to provide a level playing field for producers to ship their grain to export markets, but there are enemies to this proposal, some of them right here in this Legislature. The latest effort to dismantle this historic benefit was made in an alarming proposal by the federal government at the Agriculture ministers' meeting in Toronto on November 16 and 17.

I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he received a copy of a draft proposal on grain transportation reform and, if so, will the minister table that proposal in this Legislature so that we all can see what is being proposed by the federal government on this important issue?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the question the member raises is an issue of grave importance to the grain industry of western Canada and we all know the GATT process is moving along. We all hope there is a resolution, and there is no question that it will create disciplines on the kinds of support we put in place for our farm community. It will have a major impact, on

particularly the WGTA as it is presently paid to the producers.

Certainly we also have issues like the pooling of the costs on the Great Lakes, as to who is paying for them. We know that the Alberta Wheat Pool and the Alberta government and the Canadian Wheat Board are certainly putting pressure on changing that, and if it is changed without our involvement in the process, it will have negative impact on us.

A proposal was brought to the Ministers of Agriculture across the country called the Whithers proposal, commissioned by the federal government, which we received at a meeting not too long ago in Toronto. From that we had a fair bit of discussion and put together a framework for further reform, which I have taken back to the stakeholders in this province. I met two days after I got back with about 40 different people representing 30 different farm organizations to lay out those proposals and have asked for a response from them. I am receiving those responses from those stakeholders and we will decide how to respond when we get all those responses in.

Government Support

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): This minister continues to use GATT as an excuse for change, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that we have a copy of that draft and he should have tabled it in this House with the opposition in this House as well. If he is going to consult, consult with the opposition in this Legislature. I have a copy to table.

Does the minister support the proposal that would see the lifting of protection on the branchlines according to that proposal and a tripling of the grain transportation rates on rail over the next four years? Does the minister support those proposals in that draft that was proposed to the ministers?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, in my first response, we have asked our stakeholders, many and varied across Manitoba, to give a response, and we are awaiting all those responses to come in. There are about 20 or 30 issues in that paper, one of which the member has raised and certainly if there is branchline abandonment there is significant impact on the province. There is no question about it.

We have grave concern about what that impact will be, so we are in due process of analysis and the

discussion will continue. We will continue to consult with the stakeholders in the province of Manitoba. The member has a copy; I would welcome his comments on the draft proposal.

Consultations

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about due process. Then will he support the government of Saskatchewan's position that they will not negotiate these kinds of draconian changes until there has been extensive consultation with the producers throughout this province as was asked for by the producers at transportation talks and meetings last year?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated in both my answers previously, we are involved in extensive consultations in an ongoing way and many groups have thanked us for that opportunity. We do not take a knee-jerk reaction this way or that way. We are in continuous consultation. That process will not stop. We will not take a knee-jerk reaction like that member would like us to take.

Health Care System Community-Based Services

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. When the minister released the Action Plan for Health Reform last May, we said it was better late than never. We supported that plan in principle. We in this party wanted the health care reform to succeed and therefore we wanted the minister to succeed. The progress has been very slow and we have many more questions for the minister. In fact, we gave the minister an advance copy of a question last week when we released the report to the media.

My first question is: Will the minister provide more details on the new community-based services that will replace the beds which are going to be closed at St. Boniface as well as Health Sciences Centre?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my honourable friend's continued support for the process of change in the health care system of Manitoba, because I

think my honourable friend recognizes that that type of change that we have proposed is essential to be undertaken if we are going to preserve medicare for the provision of health care services to Manitobans and Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend makes the case that progress to date has been quite slow. I simply say that that is a matter of perspective, because in fact I have been buffeted at recent occasions that the process is moving much too quickly by some of those involved in the shift of services from our teaching hospitals to the community. So I take my honourable friend's observation seriously, but I would suggest to him that the process of change is on target as we had announced May 14 in the tabling of our action plan document.

The announcement 10 days ago of the 246 beds and the identification of those beds at our two teaching hospitals involve a process of retirement from service over the next four months approximately, with replacement services being enhanced in three community hospitals and the concurrent provision of community-based services which my honourable friend I will share with him as they are in place and as the beds are retired from service.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, the health care reform has to succeed, because in this province and in this country we have no choice than to have the health care reform. The question is that to have that success, we have to have an alternate way of services.

Can the minister tell this House exactly what new services are going to be put in place to make sure those patients who are displaced will be provided care in the community?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, depending on the type of service being provided, the new services range from a reinforcement of our Continuing Care program, a reinforcement of mental health service provision in the community through enhancement to the crisis stabilization unit which is proposed for early next year, an increase in the number of mobile crisis team individuals in service to provide early intervention at the place of residence rather than admission to an acute psychiatric facility.

Those types of services, although new to the system, are not new in concept and build upon a success that we know is available from a community-based services basis, the redirection of some million dollars from our departmental expenditures in mental health services three years ago to invest in community-based supports which we know work and will serve the system well as, for instance, it changes to more community-based, orientated services.

Obstetric Services

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns from the parents as well as the physicians and the other health care providers is that when you are transferring services from the teaching hospital to a given community hospital what back-up services for neonatal, for anaesthesiology, for emergency transfers will be put in place to make sure, for people who need these services in their teaching hospital, they will be provided? Finally, who will be paying for those transfers?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I presume my honourable friend is referring primarily to the issue of obstetrics. I think there has been a substantial amount of quite open discussion around the safety of obstetrics, both within our teaching hospital environment and in the three community hospitals, the Victoria, Grace and Misericordia.

Mr. Speaker, I can say it no more eloquently than the administration of Misericordia Hospital, who shared statistics on their experience over the last five years of a very safe birthing environment for women in their hospital facility, an environment that they believe, within existing resources, they can substantially add to, creating a win-win situation across the system.

The second piece of information that I know my honourable friend will want and I will share with him is the review of the LDRP program at Victoria Hospital, where for about a quarter of a million dollars less in spending in obstetrics, they have increased the number of deliveries by 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the important point to remember here with Victoria General Hospital is that 20 percent increase was chosen by women to be there

because they liked the environment, the safety and the benefits of having that program and their birthing at Victoria Hospital.

* (1410)

Lockport, Manitoba Tourism Promotion

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson).

It now appears that the Lockport bridge will be closed for most of 1993, and this would effectively and unfortunately destroy the tourism industry in that region.

My question to the minister is: What action is he prepared to take to promote the tourism industry in the Lockport region?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the member that we are still proceeding with negotiations with the federal government in terms of seeing whether we can get a plan in place. The problem that we have faced as a province is that Public Works Canada has not apprised us of all the information that we require and certainly that the merchants' association requires out there.

We have ongoing meetings that are taking place as of today and some more following this week, and we will try and resolve the issue.

Lockport, Manitoba Tourism Promotion

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question was to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism.

What is he prepared to do to help the tourism industry in Lockport when the bridge closes?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, obviously the honourable member did not listen to the answer from the Minister of Highways as it relates to the prospect of the bridge closing.

In terms of particular programs that are available to the individuals and businesses in the Lockport area, we have a current agreement with the federal government, a Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement that has various programs available in

terms of marketing, product development and so on. Certainly the businesses of that area have access to that program, as do businesses throughout Manitoba. We will work with them to encourage that they use those programs to promote Lower Fort Garry and other tourism attractions in that area, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dewar: The government has already failed Selkirk very, very miserably, Mr. Speaker.

Lockport, Manitoba Bridge Closure

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Will this minister then demand, in cabinet, that his colleague the Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger) meet soon with the Minister of Public Works to resolve this issue?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, not to belittle the concern that the member has for his constituents, but if he had really checked this out, two of my colleagues, along with representatives from the merchants' association, flew to Ottawa and met with the Minister of Public Works, Elmer MacKay, as well as with the Manitoba representative, the minister Jake Epp, and this is ongoing.

Mr. Speaker, further to that, I thought that the member might have gotten up and sort of given accolades to my department for doing the bridge job in his town of Selkirk, which basically was appreciated much by the people out there, and we had the opening there.

As we did with Selkirk, we will try and do with Lockport as well.

Education System Program Reduction Criteria

Ms. Avils Gray (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

The throne speech said that education and training are the keys to unlock a world of opportunities and a future of economic growth and prosperity. Yesterday on a TV news program, the Premier was justifying the proposed cuts to the Education department with the argument that he had not cut anything in Education for five years. Mr. Speaker, one can only assume that this is the serious discussion that goes around the cabinet table in determining the priorities for cuts.

My question is straightforward. What is the criteria the cabinet is using to determine which programs and services will be cut?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the—[interjection] I wonder if the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) could hold his enthusiasm for his leadership campaign and not try and answer the questions of the member for Crescentwood.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to answer the questions. The members opposite do not show a great deal of respect for their colleague and her question. It is a legitimate question, and I would like to answer it.

The fact of the matter is that my response was that this government has not cut in Education, that despite all of the statements to the contrary by members opposite we have consistently given increases to Education that are well beyond increases in inflation even, that we have consistently shown that Education is a priority in our administration, and that when we look at serious financial issues as we do with lowering transfers from Ottawa with expectations that our revenues may not grow at all in this coming year, we have to look at all departments and ask them to consider carefully their priorities.

Nobody has suggested at this point that any figures that have been put out in a speculative story are accurate, and trying to answer a question based on inaccurate speculation is not the way to try and develop policy. So the point that I was making and the point that I will make is that until we come forward with a total and complete analysis and review of all government departments, it is very foolish to speculate about cuts which are not necessarily what the policy of this government will be.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Nonpolitical Statements

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

December 1 is World AIDS Day. Mr. Speaker, this year the World Health Organization has declared the theme for the World Day, A Community

Commitment, to stress the need for community action in response to HIV infection and AIDS.

It was only 10 years ago when HIV infected about nine to 11 million people worldwide. Mr. Speaker, by the year 2000 at least 30 to 40 million persons will be infected with HIV infection. It is a very, very serious threat to the health of all the nations. Canada has done its fair share, and it is one of the four countries in the world which has given a lot of encouragement in terms of financial aid as well as the community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all the members to get involved and do whatever they can to make sure that this really becomes a community involvement and make sure that the people who have this disease and their families and their friends and their health care providers are given their due respect to make sure that we can achieve the real commitment, and also that will justify the team for the WHO. Thank you.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): May I have leave to make a non-political statement? [agreed]

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to acknowledge on behalf of our caucus that today is World AIDS Day and ask all members to join in publicly declaring our resolve to increase public awareness about HIV and AIDS and to strengthen our commitment to fight against this devastating epidemic.

The red ribbon I am wearing today, Mr. Speaker, is an acknowledgment of today's special occasion, and it demonstrates a commitment to work with caregivers, community organizations and people with AIDS. We know about the worldwide figures. Here in Manitoba, 350 people to date have been identified as HIV positive, 37 in this year alone, and four of those are women, with some further research suggesting the numbers may actually be much higher than that.

* (1420)

Mr. Speaker, HIV and AIDS continue on an increasing basis to affect people of all ages from all walks of life and to have profound implications for individuals, their families and friends, communities and the full range of health and human services.

Mr. Speaker, community commitment, the theme of World AIDS Day, is alive and well here in Manitoba. Many health care professionals, volunteers, non-profit organizations are going all out in the fight against AIDS. Many individuals with HIV

and AIDS have turned their despair into action and hope. I think of an old classmate and friend, Rick Koebel, who devoted the last years of his life to public education and awareness on the matter of HIV and AIDS here in the province of Manitoba, who wrote in his statement for his memorial service: My friends kept me going during many moments when I was ready to throw down the gauntlet. Together we taught a lot of people that AIDS is a learning experience as opposed to being a tragedy. Hopefully the world is a better place to live in because of our endeavours.

Mr. Speaker, the world is a better place because of people like Rick Koebel. It is our job today and every day to rededicate ourselves to the fight against AIDS, to support individual and community spirit that is determined to eradicate our world of this devastating and deadly disease. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave for a nonpolitical statement. [agreed]

Mr. Speaker, as all of us endorse World AIDS Day of December 1, I think it is particularly relevant for us in North America and indeed in the European community, where we have, I think, significant opportunities to involve the community in understanding the disease, in understanding how the infection is spread and in understanding how to mitigate against risk of contracting the virus. That has been very important to us in North America and I think indeed in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to reflect on how we can assist those people in Third World countries and in other parts of the world, where they do not have the same opportunity of television, public media and awareness campaigns that have been, I think, of reasonable success in North America in raising awareness and in raising individual opportunity to protect each individual, through their own action, against potential infection from AIDS.

I reflect upon the story of one religious leader in, I believe, Bombay, India, who has a megaphone and loudly hails, in a disadvantaged district of Bombay, to inform people in the sex trades there of the dangers of unprotected sex in his lonely crusade in that country against the spread of this very deadly disease.

I cannot help but reflect how that individual would be well served with the kind of electronic

communications and the modern technologies that we use in North America, coupled with significant researchers like Dr. Allan Ronald and others who are world renowned in their knowledge base that they share freely with us in North America of this disease and how it is spread.

I think, as we approach this World AIDS Day, it would not hurt for all of us to consider on how we might become small partners in that information and education campaign in continents outside of North America, where this disease has significant repercussions for entire populations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Third Day of Debate)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) for an Address to the honourable the Administrator in answer to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed motion of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) in an amendment thereto as follows, and the proposed motion of the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in further amendment thereto as follows.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): I would like to express my welcome to the new members of the House, the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) and the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister), and to you also, Mr. Speaker, for managing successfully the affairs of this Assembly.

I would like to focus on the economy in total. The Speech from the Throne had stated in the first page that the winds of change are sweeping the globe. This was true two years ago. Today the world economy has already changed.

As early as 1986, Peter Drucker, a well-known author in business management and writer, had stated that the world economy has already changed in its foundation and in its structure, a change which in all likelihood is irreversible.

The most fundamental change that had taken place in the world economy is the emergence of what is known as the transnational financial economy of monetary flows, credit flows, exchange rate fluctuations, capital investment directions as

influenced by economic variables and as influenced by political events as well as government policies and government practices.

If there is one fundamental action in economic theory in the western world to which we have been educated, it is whether the economy is classified as Keynesian, monetarist or supply side. They all have one commonality, in general they agree at least on one thing. The basic macro-economic assumption is that it is the nation state economy that is controlling the economic events, and therefore they use the individual national economy of the nation state as the basis for economic analysis and for policy formulation. This is followed by the United States, generally the western world and the United Kingdom.

However, such macro-economic axiom of the primacy of the national economy is not accepted by all economists. For example, Japan and Germany rejected this assumption. Instead, they based their analysis of events on the primacy of the world or global economy to which the national economies are merely responding to. Therefore, the Japanese and the Germans, in their assumption, in the workings of their governments have anticipated the patterns that are taking place in the global scale, and they accordingly shape their own domestic policy, economic, monetarist fiscal policy in order to bolster the international competitiveness of their national economy.

We have seen the outcome. While the United Kingdom has gone down the drain in the economic development and economic prosperity—and so has the United States, despite the fact that the U.S. dollar is the primary medium of exchange in the world trade—the United States now is in a position of government deficit and balance of payment deficit and world trade surplus deficit.

On the contrary, those who rejected this basic axiom, Japan and Germany, have enjoyed unprecedented prosperity, and their monetary unit has increased in their international exchange value. The yen has climbed, the deutsche mark has climbed in their international exchange value. The stability of their currency, the prosperity of their economy, the trade surplus that they enjoy are indications that the macro-economic theory of the western world is no longer operating to our advantage.

What is the lesson for this in terms of our country Canada and in terms of this province Manitoba when we deal with the outside external aspects of the economic world? It simply means that any business, any economic unit, any organization which wants to prosper under this changed condition must now accept the primacy of the world economy and that our domestic policy will succeed only if we try to advance our international competitiveness or at least not impair such international competitiveness in terms of the outside world.

* (1430)

Before we can understand the workings of our economy, we must review some of the basic concepts and basic notions in international economics. For example, what do we mean by exchange rate? What do we mean by foreign exchange markets? What do we mean by portfolio investments? What do we mean by direct foreign investments? What do we mean by floating exchange rate system? Unless we have some kind of a general overview of all the workings of these concepts and these variables, we will not understand why we are sinking down in our international competitiveness in the world economy.

The exchange rate simply means the price of one country's currency in terms of a currency of another country. It is the number of units of one currency that is exchangeable with one unit of another currency per unit of time. Thus, if we need \$1.25 of our Canadian money to buy a U.S. dollar, that is the exchange value of the Canadian dollar. The trouble with this concept is that it has its own inverse value. It means that you only need about 80 cents to buy the Canadian dollar.

The foreign exchange market is the market in which the various international currencies are exchanged, where the households, individuals, firms, banks buy and sell their foreign currencies in connection with transactions involving the exchange of one type of assets, and by assets here we mean the intangible assets like stocks, bonds, bank accounts, in exchange for other types of assets. This is the international exchange market.

Where the owner of such intangible assets has no control in the operation of the foreign company wherein the holder assets like bonds and stocks and accounts, that is known as portfolio investments. On the other hand, direct foreign investment is the

mechanism by which the owner of such assets will have direct control over the operation of the company which owned the assets that they own, such as for example by setting up foreign subsidiaries. If a Canadian company, for example, established a subsidiary company in another country, that is a form of direct foreign investment.

Since the Bretton Woods conference, we have deviated from the fixed exchange rate system. The world is practically now operating on what is known as the floating exchange rate system, where the exchange value of one currency is permitted by the government to fluctuate freely according to the forces of demand and supply in the international market. However, there is a modification to the extent that central banks of nation states sometimes intervene in the working of the supply-and-demand forces in the international market and so we sometimes have what is known as the managed float system.

Now, money is not a commodity. We do not eat money. We do not use money per se, because money has symbolic value. How come there is demand for money? There is supply of money, supply of foreign currency. Our Canadian desire, for example, to acquire and purchase American goods or, in general, any foreign goods and our desire to travel abroad means that we are making out payments and the Canadian international transaction statement will show that as out-payments of our reserves. On the other hand, when we export commodities to the United States, or when United States citizens come to this country as tourists, what we are getting is an inflow of U.S. accounts, and this is the supply of our international foreign currency in the form of the U.S. dollar. Thus the demand for and supply of currencies are simply the right demand from our desire for foreign goods and foreign services.

Now, if our exchange position in the exchange rates system improves, there is an appreciation; they call it an appreciation of the exchange value of the U.S. dollar. That means the value of a unit of Canadian money is increasing. On the other hand, if the value of a unit of Canadian money is decreasing, they call it the depreciation of the Canadian dollar.

Of course, government policy has some effect on the fluctuating movements of these international exchanges of values. If we pursue monetary policy in this country, which is expansionary in nature,

what we are doing is we are increasing the supply of money. The effect of an expansionary monetary policy is to increase the supply of money, but with the increasing supply of money the effect on interest rates is that interest rates will decline, and with the decline of interest rates there will be a depreciation, a lowering of the value of our foreign exchange.

On the contrary, on the other hand, if we pursue monetary contraction policy, then the money supply will decrease. When the money supply decreases, it will be very difficult to get loans, and so interest rates will go up. When the interest rates go up and increases, the foreign exchange rate will also increase and appreciate. This is the effect of monetary policy.

Contrast that with the effect of fiscal policy. When our fiscal policy is expansionary in nature, that means the demand for money is increasing. With the increasing for the demand of money, the interest will also rise and increase. When the interest rate goes up, then the exchange foreign value of the money appreciates and increases.

On the other hand, any contractionary fiscal policy means that the demand for money is declining, is going down, and with the decline for the demand of money, the effect on the interest rate is also a decline, a decrease of interest rate, and of course a decrease in interest rate will bring about a depreciation of our foreign exchange.

Now, what is the relationship between interest rate and the exchange rate, and the relationship of the exchange rate with our international competitiveness? For example, let me see, if the Bank of Canada, as it has been doing, wants to control inflation, and that has been the primary policy of the federal government in the past couple of years, and they decide that they will increase interest rates in Canada, what will happen? It means that the Canadian dollar will appreciate in value in the exchange rate. In fact, that is the primary reason why they are trying to increase the interest rate. They want to bolster the international exchange rate of the Canadian dollar.

What happened to Canadian exports with an increase in the value of the exchange rate? Well, of course, Canadian exports will decline, because it will cost more for the Americans to get the Canadian dollars that they need in order to buy Canadian goods. Canadian import of U.S. goods will

correspondingly increase because then it will be cheaper for domestic residents to buy U.S. goods.

* (1440)

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

Of course, the relative level of prices which defines the inflation rate is related to the level of the exchange rate. For example, if inflation is higher in Canada than in the outside world, then prices go up, the effect on the price of goods and services goes up. Canadian goods become more expensive relative to the price of foreign goods, let us say, U.S. goods. If that is the case, what will be the effect on the exchange rate? Americans will buy fewer Canadian goods, and the Canadian competitive position will, of course, decline.

On the other hand, if the inflation rate in the United States is higher than the average inflation rate outside of the United States, let us say, higher than the inflation rate in Canada, then American goods become more expensive, both for U.S. and foreign markets. Canadians will therefore buy less of U.S. goods, and we will sell more Canadian goods to the United States, because the demand for the U.S. dollar will then decline, and the American competitive position accordingly will also decline.

Thus we see that where price levels are high, the monetary supply increases. With the increase in monetary supply, the interest rate goes down, the exchange rate goes down and the international competitiveness of the country goes down. On the other hand, when inflation is low, prices are lower, going down, the supply of money is going down, the interest rate goes up, the exchange rate appreciates, and our international competitive position improves.

However, with all these relationships, there is a time lag involved which makes the price and the wage changes move slower than the movement of the exchange rate itself. In other words, in the short run, prices are sticky; they are slow in moving. Hence, only the exchange rate will immediately respond, and this is known as volatility, and it will depreciate excessively in the form which economists call overshooting. However, where the money supply increases, in the long run the price level also increases and the exchange rate will depreciate.

Where a country's inflation rate is above the world's general average inflation rate, that nation's

currency depreciates the exchange rate continuously, as we have seen in the case of high inflation countries like Brazil, where the cruzeiros have very limited international value. Of course, political variables affect the country's exchange rate level. For example, if there is a genuine fear of, let us say, Quebec separating from Canada, many Canadians will convert their Canadian funds to U.S. funds, and this will cause the exchange value of the Canadian dollar to depreciate.

So with the overall picture of what is going on in this transnational financial symbolic economy of money flow, credit flow, investment flow, we can imagine economic events taking place, favourable or unfavourable, productivity levels of a country going up or down, changes in the demand going up or down, changes in government monetary and fiscal policy. All of these events are affecting the price level, the inflation rate, as well as the interest rate.

The changes in the price level and the changes in the interest rate in turn are bolstered by political factors, by psychological factors of consumers and their expectations about the movements of international events, and will affect the demand and supply of foreign currencies. The demand and supply of foreign currencies in turn will affect whether the exchange rate will go up or down, and whether the exchange rate will go up or down will in turn determine whether our international competitive position will improve or will deteriorate. That is the general picture in this transnational economy of symbolic financial economy of money flow, credit flow, capital investment flow in the world states.

Now, if it is the case that it is the transnational economy that is now dominant and is shaping and is driving the economy, and it is not the real economy of trade flow of goods and services, we have to understand that these international transactions are much more voluminous in terms of the amounts involved, compared to just the volume of trade in real goods and services. For example, the foreign exchange markets involve at least an amount 25 times more than what is involved in the world trade of goods and services.

According to Drucker, the well-known management and business author, these changes are more or less irreversible and have taken place. There is an uncoupling, a separation of the global economy of primary non-oil product items, of goods,

forest products, metals and minerals from the industrial economy of the world. The two are separating ways and they are no longer related.

Second, within the world industrial economy, the manufacturing production sector has uncoupled itself and has split from the manufacturing employment sector, and to be internationally competitive, any country must now continually shrink its blue-collar manufacturing employment sector because of the fact of the changes and shifts in productive processes. For example, it means that our manufacturing process is now a less labour intensive and more knowledge-based, information intensive process.

Let me give you an example. To manufacture a computer chip, the one that is the heart and brain of the computer, you know where it came from? It came from the common lowly material called sand—from the sand. Because of technological processes, we can extract silicon from the sand and from silicon we can create the silicon chips. The silicon chip in its production requires a 70 percent component of knowledge out of research, information, technological and scientific knowledge—70 percent. The materials involved there is about 2 percent.

* (1450)

The material grows product from the physical matter itself. The labour component is only about 12 percent. That is how the manufacturing process now has changed. It is now a society of information, knowledge, technology, and therefore many of our industrial, blue-collar workers are no longer needed in the productive process as much as we needed them several decades ago. The same changes have taken place in the changes in the world economy.

There is another third uncoupling or separation taking place. The real economy of tangible and visible goods and the intangible, invisible services are now being separated from this transnational financial symbolic economy of money, credit, exchanges, and they are no longer concurrently working in the same direction.

Why is this so? Because we have changed our international exchange rate system from what is known as the Bretton Woods agreement system of fixed monetary parity rates into what is known as the floating exchange rate system that is now prevalent all across the globe.

Now, what do we mean by this shift in the exchange rate system? In the olden days, under the Bretton Woods agreement, they nominated the U.S. dollar as the international monetary currency of world trade. Every country had a fixed ratio attached to the value of the dollar. For example, the British pound was fixed at \$2.80. This was backed by the gold reserve in the world. The value of the gold reserve, regardless of supply and demand, had been fixed at the time at \$35 per troy ounce. Therefore, everybody knew exactly where they were in this exchange of assets, intangibles, values, credits, money. At any time, you can always demand and convert the dollar if you want to, but this has already changed.

Nowadays, they allow the fluctuations in the foreign exchange rate to freely flow according to the international forces of supply and demand, but they did not do so completely, because the central banks of many national states are intervening in that natural process in the free market in the international monetary world. They are trying to influence the direction of the forces, such as the intervention of the Central Bank of Canada in order to protect and bolster the international exchange rate value of the Canadian dollar. So what we have seen here are actually these kinds of changes.

Let me illustrate why technology has contributed to this changed condition of the world economy, and we are part of the world. We cannot just isolate ourselves and say we want to control our own economy, we want to do this. We cannot be a closed system. We cannot do that.

We live in a globalized economy. It means an economy of transnational corporations, multinational corporations, straddling more than one country. They use production methods source in one country or set of countries. They market the product in another set of countries. They effectively link all these categories in the form of nation states, regional economic blocs, such as the European Economic Community, and we are now forming a North American bloc very soon after the emergence of the EEC in Europe. We want to counterbalance that. [interjection] I am trying to be objective here, so that we can understand the real situation taking place in the economy.

According to Piizer, the demand can take the form of quantity-oriented type of demand for more and more of what consumers want, what they already

have. For example, in 1960, 90 percent of American homes had at least one TV. Now that increased in 1980 to at least 98 percent. At this point, the nature of the demand itself has changed from a quantity-oriented type of demand to a quality-oriented type of demand. Instead of having just one TV, black and white, we now want colour TV. We now want stereo TV. We now want the wide-screen TV. That is the kind of demand that people are now wanting. [interjection] Well, you can find so many homes nowadays with at least three TVs, in every room.

The changing nature of the productive process also changes the kinds of products that are available in the market. It used to be that when you wanted vinyl records, they were still good. Who buys nowadays the turntable record player? Nobody, because with the invention of the compact disk, that has actually replaced and superseded the old record player, and the demand for CD players now has practically dominated the entire market.

An Honourable Member: What is a CD player?

Mr. Santos: Compact disc.

There are many other examples. Because of our technological knowledge and technological processes we have invented, for example, synthetic rubber. That means that the demand for natural rubber is no longer there. It has been replaced. Synthetic fibres like nylon and all kinds of manufactured fibers—the demand for natural cotton is no longer there. The invention of vinyl has replaced our desire and demand for leather and, with the invention of hard plastics, the demand, of course, for steel and tin and all natural minerals has gone down. That is the reason why copper is no longer as much in demand worldwide. What happened to our workers in Thompson, and what happened to the economy in Thompson? Of course, all of these are affected by international events outside of our small sphere of our economy.

It used to be that we used copper wires in order to put up telephone lines. Nowadays they use what is known as fibre optic cables.

A mere 100 pounds of fibre optic cables used as telephone lines will carry as much information and messages as one tonne of copper wire, and they are relatively very cheap to manufacture and to install compared to the copper wire. Hence, the demand for copper has gone down.

You can see now the collapse of the world demand for natural metals and natural minerals. So even a country like Canada, rich in forest natural products, rich in minerals, rich in resources, has found itself in trouble because of this collapse in the price of the non-oil forest products and other mineral products.

* (1500)

Now, in the form of all these changes, what do we need to do? What can we do? In order to prosper, we need primarily to bear in mind our international competitive position. We have to strengthen that international competitive position or at least not impair such international competitive positions.

How do we do that? Well, we know that this is now a knowledge-based society. It is an information-based society. It is a technology-based world economy.

What are some of the primary, traditional, neoclassical factors of production? People, material, land, labour, capital.

What is the most important resource that we can contribute in there if the physical resources coming from the land are no longer valuable? [interjection] Do you know what is the most important resource? People. Therefore, we have to have this human resource developed at a very high level of literacy with technical, scientific, computer-oriented skills, as well as human sentiments and concern for the welfare of human beings. There should be a balancing in there of technical skills and concern for human welfare.

Sometimes our organized unions are fighting to protect their jobs in the manufacturing industry, but because of this uncoupling, of employment going down and the number of blue-collar workers diminishing despite the fact that manufacturing goods are increasing because of the robotization of the productive process, what is to be done? This is a very controversial and contentious issue, and ideology can enter into this. The most difficult choice that any government can make is of course to allow its industrial working force to be taken over by robots and computerized devices and throw them out of work.

Now, if a person, a worker, loses his job to a machine, is that good or bad? Of course, it is bad for the worker, but if there is a national training and retraining program that takes care of the worker, that

is not bad because after the worker is retrained, there will be two kinds of jobs, the job that is being produced by the robot and the job, probably a service job that is the growing sector of the employment industry which the worker will also enjoy. So we have two kinds of jobs, and we will produce twice as much, and we will enjoy the prosperity that we are trying to enjoy.

Therefore, the modern economy should redefine success. Success means flexibility. Flexibility can come about only if we have the right kind of worker who has the basic skills in writing, in calculating, in speaking, in listening, in decision making, as well as in technical skills, computer skills, in scientific and technical-oriented skills.

Therefore our educational policy, as you see, is related to our international competitiveness. If we allow our schools to go down and deteriorate, we allow our human resources to deteriorate with it. We allow our economy to deteriorate, and we lose our international competitive position. We need to more than educate and graduate people in our educational institutions, in our schools, in our colleges, in our universities. Indeed, the call of the hour is for people to continue to go back to school at least one day a week for the rest of their working lives, so that they will be up-to-date—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Gerry McAlpine (Sturgeon Creek): It is a pleasure to stand before this House today and to offer my reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Acting Speaker, since being elected, I have spoken on every throne speech and every budget speech. It is interesting, as I look back over the past years, how overwhelmed we felt as new members at the thought of speaking for 40 minutes. Now it is just a short time ago we have begun to feel that 40 minutes is not enough.

On this occasion, Mr. Acting Speaker, I want to take a different direction in addressing this Chamber and my constituents, and the reason is not because anything is changed, but because of what I have been hearing Manitobans think of these difficult times and what they think government should be doing. This really hit home to me when I saw a video of a lecturer and educator, Joel Barker, whose comments made a lasting impression because what

he was saying can apply to every one of us, to every Manitoban as we set out to build a stronger Manitoba. I share much of what I remember of this lesson throughout my speech today.

Although I do want to take the high road, I may stray from time to time just to make a point. I do believe the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) said it very well in his remarks last evening so I will leave it at that level.

I would like to begin by welcoming the members back to this new session, and I would also like to extend my best wishes to the Pages who are joining us this year. I hope this introduction to the legislative process is a good learning experience for you.

I would also like to offer my congratulations to the two new members, the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) and the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), and I congratulate both of you on your successful campaigns.

I would like to add my congratulations to my colleagues on their accomplishments in their respective constituencies since the last session, and to you it is reassuring to see Mr. Speaker once again occupy the Chair. May this session be a rewarding one for you and to you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

I would also like to offer my best wishes to our Lieutenant-Governor who was missed during the throne speech. I would wish him a quick recovery and good health for many more years to come.

Too often we do not appreciate the importance of good health until we suddenly do not have it anymore. Health care is a pre-eminent issue for this government. We understand the importance of good health. It is a fundamental value that unites us as Manitobans. The health care system of choice is one that creates a balance between prevention, community-based and institutional services.

Because our government believes a strong sense of community is a valuable resource in the delivery of health care services in Manitoba, our government is placing more emphasis on community-based care. What is being achieved through this change is a redirection of the responsibility where ultimately those who are able to do so can accept more responsibility, thus a saving of tax dollars without sacrificing patient care. This is an area of interest to both myself and my constituents.

The availability of health care in the community is of extreme importance to the people of Sturgeon Creek. As the member from a constituency in which approximately 37 percent of the population are 55 years of age and over, the necessity of available health care is well known to me. A vital part of this care is the existence of personal care homes. These facilities enable our elderly to remain in their communities and among their peers and among their families.

The Sturgeon Creek area is indicative of the changing demographics of Manitoba. It is imperative, as our population ages, to provide adequate support to our seniors. Our government's decision to direct revenue toward the establishing of more personal care home beds illustrates our intention to provide this support. Manitoba senior citizens deserve to live with dignity, surrounded by friends and loved ones. By increasing the number of personal care home beds available and lessening the number of seniors confined to hospital beds, our government is effectively addressing this issue.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we owe it to ourselves and to the future generations of Manitobans to take care of our aged. I was proud to represent the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) this fall at the sod turning for the construction at the new municipal hospital, a long-awaited initiative which is just another example of this minister's commitment to health care in Manitoba. I am deeply committed to our government's action plan which will make positive inroads to a national health care delivery system.

* (1510)

Mr. Acting Speaker, fortunately over the summer recess, I was able to spend a lot of time in my constituency talking to the people. In speaking to my constituents at one of my coffee parties last fall, I was able to determine the concerns of the seniors in this area. I was proud to be able to, in this instance, assist these constituents in obtaining a new sidewalk and approach in front of their seniors residence at 22 Strauss Drive. My constituents had previously been forced to navigate an often dangerous path along the roadside as well as an approach which was not easily wheelchair accessible.

These hazards were undermining our efforts to maintain and preserve the well-being of this senior population. I am pleased to announce that the sidewalk was built this summer, and I would like to

thank the minister and his Department of Housing for his support in addressing the concerns of the residents of this seniors home. They have really appreciated what we have been able to do for them.

I would like also to pay tribute at this time, Mr. Acting Speaker, to another valuable asset to the Sturgeon Creek constituency, and that is the Canadian Forces base of Winnipeg. The air forces's connection with the city goes back to 1922 when a station of the old Air Board was opened here to serve as a winter base for detachments which operated in northern Manitoba during the rest of the year. RCAF Station Winnipeg officially opened in April 1925 and was one of the first air force bases in Canada.

During World War II, RCAF Station Winnipeg became a major air force base as part of the British Commonwealth air training plan which trained more than 130,000 pilots, observers and wireless operators across various locations in Canada. Winnipeg also became a major wartime centre for supply and repair depots, and ferry inspection units.

After the war, RCAF Station Winnipeg saw an increase in training activities. Over 5,000 aircrew from foreign countries graduated there from No. 2 Air Observer School and Central Navigation School. CFB Winnipeg was officially formed in November 1966, following the unification of the Canadian Forces Base. Base consolidation resulted in the combining of the former RCAF Station Winnipeg, and the Fort Osborne army barracks.

From such humble beginnings in 1966 grew a base which is now one of the country's largest, employing over 3,700 people. Of these approximately 1,000 are local civilians. The importance of such a large employer in the constituency of Sturgeon Creek cannot be overstated.

It was with pride that I accepted a recent invitation to tour the base and to speak with some of their personnel. As a result of my extremely positive meeting with base commander personnel, particularly base commander Colonel Bert Proulx, Lieutenant Colonel Rick St. Germain, Lieutenant Colonel Birt Meindel, Major Jim McMullin, Major Denny Carpenter and Captain Dan Lachance, I learned of the value of this facility to all Manitobans.

The role of CFB Winnipeg is to provide support to regular and reserve units. In addition, they operate the five military training schools that are based in

Winnipeg: The Central Flying School, Canadian Forces Air Navigation School, Canadian Forces Schools of Aerospace Studies and Meteorology, the language training centre and three Canadian Forces flying training schools at Portage la Prairie.

These schools provide training to many Manitobans. In fact, the role of Canadian Forces Air Navigation School is to train all navigators for the Canadian Forces on the brand new, Canadian built CT 142 Dash 8, of which there are six here in Winnipeg.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

CFB Winnipeg has been an integral part of the city for over 45 years and has become a very important element in the economy of this city. CFB Winnipeg injects more than \$210 million annually in the economy of the city and is currently the fourth largest employer in Winnipeg, and that is excluding all three levels of government of course.

As well, the base is very much involved in the local community. They support various charitable events and are involved in many humanitarian relief projects. We are all very proud of the contribution that CFB Winnipeg is making to the constituency of Sturgeon Creek, to the city of Winnipeg and to the province of Manitoba.

We congratulate them on leading the way in technological advances for aviation schools throughout the world. I would like to offer my personal thanks to Colonel Proulx and the staff of CFB Winnipeg for their graciousness in allowing me to tour their fine facilities, to learn more about the base and the personnel, and a special thanks to an outstanding gentleman, who, as fate would have it, shares my name, Major Gerry MacAlpine. The only difference is that his name is spelt M-a-c. Major MacAlpine is also a part of the command along with base commander Colonel Proulx.

I am extremely pleased to count CFB Winnipeg as one of the many fine organizations in the Sturgeon Creek constituency.

There are many other organizations that fall in this category, but I would like to draw the Chamber's attention to yet another facility located in the Sturgeon Creek area of which I will speak. It is a longstanding facility that has affected the lives of many families in the area, the Sturgeon Creek United Church, which was recently the site of a tragic occurrence. It all happened within an hour of

the end of the Sunday worship service. The sanctuary was completely gutted by fire.

Estimated damage has been placed at over \$1 million. Though the building was destroyed by fire, this church lives on, and it continues to worship in the Sturgeon Creek area. The courage demonstrated by these members in the face of adversity should be noted and applauded.

The history of the Sturgeon Creek United Church is as impressive as the courage of its congregation. I pay tribute to one of its members who assisted me with some of the church's history. Phyllis Bentham, a long-time member, told the history that in the late 1800s, the settlers living near the banks of Sturgeon Creek were without a home for their worship service. As rough-hewn homes began to take the place of buffalo tents and the community continued to grow, they began to search for a permanent home for their services.

It is believed, Mr. Speaker, that the small wooden church that first came to rest south of Portage in 1906 had been floated down the Assiniboine River to reach its destination. As the community of Sturgeon Creek changed and the church was relocated, the need for a larger facility was felt by the congregation.

After 26 years of fundraising, a church was finally built which could accommodate the 250-member-strong congregation. In 1963, a new sanctuary was built which was large enough to hold 450 members and offered a beautiful new home for worship. An addition completed later united the two church buildings into one large facility, and the church of 1949 was used as a Christian education building. Tragically, it was the sanctuary built in 1963 that was destroyed in the recent fire.

* (1520)

However, once again as throughout history, a building committee has been formed by the Sturgeon Creek United Church membership, this time to rebuild the church. This task is particularly important to the congregation, as the church will celebrate its centennial next June. A committee has already been formed to co-ordinate the celebration of 100 years of worship in the Sturgeon Creek Church. I wish the 100-year celebration committee well and success in arranging this event.

Although efforts have already begun to rebuild this historic church, the congregation was left homeless after the fire. The membership was

definitely in need of a temporary home for its services. I was proud to have been able to participate in assisting in finding a temporary place to worship for the membership of some 600 families. They were able to worship by the Sunday following that of the fire.

Though a new home for the congregation is at least a year away, they have been fortunate to find a willing partner to assist in continuing worship service. The St. James-Assiniboia School Division came forward with a very generous offer to the congregation because of the emergency situation of the Sturgeon Creek United Church membership following the fire. They have been most co-operative in helping the congregation to continue their services. The division has offered the use of Spring Valley Junior High School to the membership.

The school gymnasium has been turned into a beautiful sanctuary complete with donated items from churches all over the city. I would like at this time to commend both the congregation of the Sturgeon Creek United Church and the St. James-Assiniboia School Division for the caring and courageous manner in which they have faced this tragedy. The kindness and support of churches as far away as Lethbridge, Alberta, should also be recognized. They are a credit to the people of Manitoba, and on behalf of the membership of Sturgeon Creek United Church, I would like to, along with the many thanks already given, offer my thanks to the administration and trustees of the St. James-Assiniboia School Division.

While I mention the St. James-Assiniboia School Division, I would like to commend the division for being such caring citizens on this matter and also to the larger community, their constituents. There is much that can be said of the accomplishments of the St. James-Assiniboia School Division. This is a division that I have had the pleasure of working with closely, and I can attest that the education of our young people is the primary concern of this school division. Toward this end, the St. James-Assiniboia School Division trustees have formulated planning guidelines which echo the priorities of our government, such priorities as education reform that this division is already practising. They demonstrate leadership at its fullest which you will agree with after hearing my remarks.

The St. James-Assiniboia School Division has placed strong emphasis on total quality education

and total quality leadership. Therefore, it is no accident or stroke of luck that this division prides itself in having more students with gold medal awards and other top awards earned by its students than any other division in Manitoba. Whether they be academic, vocational or athletic, these students rise to the top time after time.

These include gold in such areas as a high quality of student learning experience; instructional excellence; co-operative learning; the teaching of thinking skills; student learning styles and other components promoting a high quality of education.

The division believes that planning which focuses on student self-esteem, student self-discipline and responsibility, student problem solving and goal-setting skills should be emphasized. Not only is the school division concerned with the quality of education it provides, it is also actively increasing its role in the community. At last count, the division had developed partnerships with 172 businesses and organizations across the city in order to offer their students opportunity to work on-the-job while attending school.

The St. James-Assiniboia School Division trustees recognize the importance of career education to the community as well as to the students. Though the commitment of the division remains strong, it has had to face difficult times over the past decade. They have had to manage the effects of school population decline unprecedented elsewhere in Manitoba. As a result, our division has had to deal with the closures of 14 schools in approximately the last decade.

The impact of this decline is currently being felt in the community at large. In large measure, this situation is attributable to the location of the urban development line, which has restricted housing development in the St. James-Assiniboia area while permitting development in other areas.

The residents of Sturgeon Creek who want newer housing or whose lives have changed with families growing up and leaving home have to leave the area to get suitable housing. This has had a drastic impact on retaining young families in the area, consequently, no other metropolitan area school division has experienced such drastic decline in student population.

Though the division has sought to soften the impact of declining enrollment, it is clear that there is an urgent need for new urban development,

particularly in this area. There is a high degree of support among my constituents for such residential development. Therefore, I will continue to work together with my constituents toward the continued growth and vitality of our community and our school. This can be best accomplished by attracting new businesses and new families to our community.

The Sturgeon Creek community has much to offer. It is my duty and that of my government to maintain the quality of education and the quality of life currently enjoyed by my constituents. Our government is deeply committed to the growth and prosperity of Manitoba's economy. This growth will in turn provide the urban development necessary to the well-being of our communities and our programs in education.

I am certainly aware, Mr. Speaker, that without the support of my constituents I would not enjoy the success that I have had to date. It is therefore very important to me to be informed of the issues that affect them and to address these concerns.

As I travel throughout my constituency and am able to meet and talk with people, one comment is frequently raised. People continue to let me know that they do not want more taxes. I am told time and time again that our government is heading in the right direction in holding the line on taxes. I commend our government on this position. It is clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba are confident that our government is working with their best interests in mind. The complete and encompassing throne speech spoke to the people of Manitoba and it covered the concerns that my constituents have raised with me.

Our government is firmly committed to the growth of Manitoba's economy. This is quite unlike the members across the way, who have no vision of the role of business in strengthening our economy. Their vision is a vision of short-term jobs with long-term pain. Their vision is to tax people and businesses so that government can do for the people what they can do for themselves. When will they learn that if you expect governments to do everything, it is going to cost more money? All that equates to is more taxes, 10 times out of 10.

I believe it is incumbent upon me to inform my constituents and to remind my fellow members across the way, as they seem to have forgotten, of the pain of which I speak.

In 1981, when the NDP came into government, it cost \$90 million per year in interest to service the government debt. In 1988, when our government came into office, it cost \$550 million to pay the interest on this debt. Why? Because the NDP in less than eight years and with revenues at 16 percent, went out and created make-work jobs that barely lasted for one full shift, and all that Manitobans were left with was the debt.

Business development and economic issues are going to play a key role in Manitoba's future. I am pleased with the motion in the throne speech which addresses excessive regulations and paperwork. These burdens must be reduced in order for our business community to remain competitive. Our province is fortunate to have diversified industries, and we must work together to maintain and expand these industries and protect jobs for Manitobans. By keeping taxes down and keeping spending under control, we are helping to create a climate that is competitive for investment and expansion of business. By reducing the red tape surrounding the establishment of businesses in Manitoba, a positive step has been taken to ensure that Manitoba's future is a bright one.

* (1530)

Mr. Speaker, the role of government in the economy is one that is often explored deeply and with great consideration, but we as individuals also have responsibility. We as individuals are the only ones who, if we want to control our futures, must act. The way we must act is to take responsibility for ourselves. We cannot blame the ills of destinies on government alone, which we have been hearing far too much these days as we listen to the opposition and the media. We as individuals have the freedoms in this province and in this country that are not found anywhere else in this world.

Our God-given talents are immeasurable. The limitations placed on our talents hold us back. Too often I hear the negative side of life when I listen to our opposition members and the headlines of the media. Is that what you like, I ask you. Do you like living in a negative world? You must, because that is all that comes out of your mouths. Too often, what comes out of your mouths are only words.

It would appear that the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) was correct when he referred to the members across the way as dinosaurs because they are living in the past. They do not seem to be

able to look ahead as successful and forward thinkers should but, then again, we are not looking at successful and forward thinkers. As they would say in Wayne's World, "Not."

Here is a quote that you should heed, and may I suggest to the honourable members across the way, pay attention to our future, your future, because that is where you are going to spend the rest of your lives. Mind you, I do believe that your future is to stay in opposition and ours is to stay in government. I say this for you who believe in government doing everything for the people—the people who are saying no more taxes, the people who are saying, let us have less government.

More government just costs more money, and instead of having people work for themselves, they end up working more for the government by paying more taxes. That discourages people. It discourages businesses. The effects are that people are hearing this negativism, think only about the present and only dream of the future. When we dream about the future too often, and I refer to the opposition members across the way, we think that our goals are unattainable, which is not only unfortunate, it is devastating.

Positive thoughts are so important in building a future, not only to individuals but to businesses and nations, corporations. Each and every one of us want to make a difference in this world, Mr. Speaker. I observed a tape with the words offered by a scholar recently that had a profound impression on me. He told of economies around the world. In 1973 OPEC was taking control of oil. Watergate was just beginning, and inflation was out of control. Many believed it was worthless to think of the future.

Positive attitudes are important, especially now through tough times. Think, dream about the future. This is our most forceful motivator for change. When I look across the floor and listen to those members, I believe that they have lost complete sight of the future. When they criticize the throne speech, I would ask them this question that I heard someone ask. I believe the media could take a lesson from this as well. The question went this way: Is a nation's positive image of its future a consequence of its success, or is the nation's success a consequence of its future?

I want to share with you a series of stories that I had the privilege of hearing and which had a

profound impact on me. I hope it will do the same for my colleagues and for all Manitobans.

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

A Dutch scholar by the name of Pollock who studied nations and corporations on the degree of positivity with which they wrote about their future and how they lived up to their expectations. He found the answer at the Parthenon in Athens in studying the work of the architect. The Parthenon was purely the work of the vision of the architect.

So too did the Greeks envision their culture. How did all this happen? The Greeks believed in dreams, and they transformed those dreams into something much more positive—vision. Vision is the result of dreams in action. Pollock found that significant vision preceded success. In example after example the same pattern emerged. Success was achieved by the significant vision of leaders who communicated that vision to the people.

First, a compelling vision of the future was offered by the leaders, and that image was shared with their community, and they agreed to accept it. In acting in concert, they made the vision a reality. It was true in Greece 2,500 years ago, and it was the same for Rome and Spain, Venice, England, France and in the U.S.A. It is even true here in Canada, in Manitoba. It was the same for great leaders like our own Duff Roblin, for Don Campbell and leaders before them. Even today, we can see the power of vision sweeping across the world and here in Manitoba with our Premier (Mr. Filmon) and this government.

What is particularly interesting about Pollock's research is that these nations that were studied did not have the right resources or any other strategic advantage against the odds as they began their climb to greatness. What they did have was a profound vision of their future. This was not the only key ingredient but was the first and most important.

Nations and people with vision are powerful. Nations and people without are at risk. This can even apply to children if we take this into a lower denominator. A researcher named Singer found that children were profoundly affected by their visions. The most successful students are those with vision; those hearing only about difficulty could care less about the future and live only for today. What does that tell us about doom and gloom from the opposition and the media? It was also found that high IQs and family backgrounds were not the

key indicators in determining successful people or nations. Do you know what the key differentiator was? It was vision. What the successful students had in common was that they all had a profound and positive vision of their future.

Another scholar and researcher, Joel Arthur Barker, took Singer's research to Harlem where he studied students in Grades 5 and 6. He talked about Eugene M. Lang, who in 1981 spoke to some school students. Mr. Lang gave the commencement speech to the students in this particular elementary school, the one from which he had graduated. He had graduated from this school in 1933 and had aspired to be a wealthy self-made man. Lang had a lot of concern in 1981 for the problems that these students faced. As he addressed them, he quickly realized that he would have little meaning in his address if he could not offer these students something tangible. What did he offer them? He offered them, as well as their families, some hope.

What he offered them was vision. This offering changed the lives of each of these students forever. He told them of dreams of other well-known successful people that they could identify with. He told them that everyone must have a dream. He told them of the importance of having a dream, and that the key to their future was education.

He spoke of their future years, going through junior high school, high school and college. When he spoke about college, it occurred to him that this goal was hardly attainable by the majority of these students. So he offered each of the Grade Sixers a full scholarship to college upon completion of their high school graduation. He worked with students, teachers and support staff to instill in the minds of these students a vision that each of these students could attain a college education.

* (1540)

Of the previous students at this school, almost none of them had gone on to college after graduation from the elementary school before. Of those 52 students that Eugene Lang addressed, 48 graduated from high school, and of those 48, 40 went on to college. This supports, in just another way, what researchers have told us, that people's and nations' success can be measured by their visions. What does that tell us about high school dropouts?

When we examine the future of our province, our people and our children, and we listen to what they are saying, we hear dreams, dreams that shape their confidence, visions that shape their own futures, and collectively, the futures of our province. For nations, for children, you can see the same pattern in the power of vision.

Another place in history where vision played an important role in survival and success was in Auschwitz, Germany, during the Second World War, when millions of people were being executed and tortured. I trust the honourable member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) knows of and has studied that of which I speak. This accounting in Auschwitz was done by a Victor Frankle, a Jewish psychiatrist. He told of his being rounded up with other Jewish residents and put in concentration camps and prisons. Victor Frankle said that when he was rounded up, he set three goals for himself. The first was to survive, the second was to use his medical skills wherever he could, and lastly, to try to learn something. Well, Frankle succeeded on all three counts. He went back to Vienna after the war and wrote a book of those who survived. There was something significant in their future, something they still wanted to do—vision.

We can only survive the present by living toward a positive future. That is our salvation, like the crossing of a turbulent river where our future lies beyond the far shore. Can we apply that to us as a government? Yes, I believe we can. I believe that not only can it be applied to our government, but that it can also apply to this throne speech. This throne speech has vision.

Firstly, to be considered a vision, it must be developed by leadership, which it has. Visions are not discovered by the masses. The visions of the leadership must be supported by the team, and the team must agree to support them, which we will do when we vote next Monday. In order to be successful, a vision must be comprehensive and detailed for everyone to interpret and act upon. With this throne speech, that will follow.

A vision must be positive and inspiring, encouraging us to reach beyond our grasp. Values are essential in establishing our vision. Values are established by our experiences of the past. Now the past is behind us, and the future is what counts the most for this government. As I speak today, not only do I speak to the members in this Chamber, I

speaking also to the people of Sturgeon Creek. As I have always said to my constituents, yes, we are going through hard times, we are probably going through the toughest times governments have seen in many years. However, we will pull through if we all work together. As little as the contribution we as individuals can make may seem, it is possible to achieve. Let us not wait for governments to do it. Let us not wait for corporations to do it. Let us take what we as individuals can accomplish on our own.

This reminds me of a story I saw recently that I would like to share with you. It is a story told by a Lorne Isley, a scientist and poet, and it is worth sharing with this Chamber and my constituents.

He told of his experience this one time, observing a young man on a beach throwing a starfish into the ocean. He asked the young man, what are you doing? The young man told him that the sun was hot and the tide was going out, and if I do not throw this starfish back into the water, it will die. The man replied, young man, do you not realize that there are miles and miles of beach out there with starfish all along it? What do you hope to achieve? What difference do you expect to make? The young man looked down, picked up a starfish and ran down to the water and threw the starfish into the water beyond the breakers. When he ran back up the beach he said, well, it will make a difference to that one.

The response shocked the elderly man and for days the vision haunted him. We can learn from this story just as it made an impression on me. As insignificant as it may seem, regardless of what we ever do to improve life, we can make a difference. That vision is among all of us. We all have the ability to make a difference. We only have to find our own starfish to make that difference and when we do we all become aware of our gifts. The future of this province and this country will be within the power of all of us. No recession, no hard times need control us. We will make this province and this country a better place to live. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Ms. Avis Gray (Crescentwood): Mr. Acting Speaker, government is a trust and the officers of government are trustees. Both are created for the benefit of the people. Since the beginning of democracy in the new world, this has been the traditional view of government. It is unfortunate that over the last decade that trust in governments and government officials has crumbled, and I am not

referring to this government in particular, but I am talking about governments in general. We have certainly seen cynicism in regards to politics and politicians.

This cynicism probably reached a crescendo on November 26, in our country of Canada when Canadians overwhelmingly voted against a government idea, a government-marketing job. The people felt that they were being sold a bill of goods by all three political parties, a slick packaging job that just did not work.

I have certainly heard at the doors of people in Crescentwood during the by-election this summer that cynicism and that frustration. I heard it again in the civic elections following. Frustration probably masked a lot of that cynicism.

I remember a story of our federal leader, Mr. Chretien, telling about a colleague of his who was a Member of Parliament. He told the story one day in caucus about his young son who was in school in the classroom and at recess a number of his friends were teasing him about his father's occupation. They were taunting him and saying, your dad's a politician.

I think that speaks volumes in terms of what the people in Canada and here in Manitoba feel about politics and politicians. We have to start changing that attitude, I believe, as politicians and see a reversal of that particular attitude.

When I was growing up in rural Manitoba in the late '50s and early '60s there were a number of esteemed professions in rural Manitoba that I remember, and one of those certainly was that of the local politician, whether that individual was the reeve or the mayor of a community or was a Member of the Legislative Assembly. It was certainly considered to be a very revered position.

The other positions that tended to be revered in those days as well was the local agriculture representative or the local home economist. I remember very well thinking and growing up meeting those people and meeting politicians as well, and they were considered to be very much esteemed positions.

* (1550)

I think it is important to note, and I think we have to move away from the idea of politicians as a revered profession. We have to have a happy medium between that reverence and the fact that

politicians are on the bottom of the rung in terms of the profession, and there has to be that happy medium between that reverence and that disdain.

I think that women have brought a change to the political scene as well, Mr. Acting Speaker. I think we do bring a different perspective to the Legislature. I think oftentimes we bring one of conciliation and mediation and negotiation.

My Leader, the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), reminded me that in fact it is partly because women have come from a different perspective. Our traditional roles have been different, so that is why we oftentimes do bring that different perspective. Because, of course, we have always been the mothers, not the fathers; we are oftentimes the teachers, not the principals; we are oftentimes the bookkeepers, not the accountants; and we have been the farmers' wives and not the farmers. So we do come from a different perspective.

I believe that we do bring a different perspective to this Legislature; no matter what political stripe, we do bring that perspective. I think that it is important that we continue to see more women who are elected to the Manitoba Legislature from all parties. I was certainly pleased to see the increase in the number of women who were elected in the 1990 election, and I hope to see more of that in the 1994 election.

I would like to take this time to also talk about a special woman, certainly in regard to Manitoba politics and, I would suggest, politics in western Canada, and that is our Leader, Sharon Carstairs, who certainly made inroads into the political arena in her last nine years here in Manitoba.

Here is an individual, here is a woman who certainly is a very principled individual, who had very much integrity and honesty. In fact, she was probably too principled and too honest in some respects. She will admit herself, will sometimes admit that that was oftentimes a weakness in the arena of politics, that her honesty sometimes got her into trouble with the electorate and her principledness sometimes got her into trouble, but she does not have any regrets about her principles and would not change, I believe, a thing that she has done.

There is no question that we will miss Sharon in our caucus, the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs). There is no question that the member for River Heights, our Leader, has certainly brought

many, many new ideas, a new way of doing things to politics here in Manitoba and in western Canada. I think she certainly revived Liberalism to some extent in western Canada and made it certainly an acceptable political party here in the west, and I think that is very, very important.

We will only know how much we miss her once she is gone because that is oftentimes when you recognize the great contributions that an individual has made to a political forum.

I am sure all members in the House would agree, political stripes aside, that in fact she has made a wonderful contribution here in Manitoba.

Let me say that I am pleased to be here once again in the Legislative Assembly, this time representing the people of Crescentwood and, of course, to promote the Liberal view of how we feel our province should be governed.

I certainly welcome my colleague the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) whom I met on a previous occasion at a hotel association curling bonspiel, and I welcome him here to the Legislature and look forward to many debates.

Thank you as well to the members of the House, new members and some not so new, who have welcomed me here on my return. The wishes were very sincere and very much appreciated.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I would also like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to thank you for your usual grace and charm as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Your welcome has been very warm, and I look forward to your leadership as Speaker throughout the session. My colleagues in the caucus have assured me that the skill with which you have managed the Speaker's role in the past continues on and that your belief in fairness, justice and a deep respect for all members of this House prevails as you carry out your role as Speaker of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank a number of individuals who are civil servants and who, at their request, shall remain nameless. When I was last here in the Legislative Assembly as the member for Ellice, after the 1990 election I went back to a position within the Department of Health. I had the opportunity to work with a number of individuals in the Manitoba Winnipeg Region Department of Health and Family Services.

I used to say to them that if I ever did come back to the Legislature, I thought it was important to recognize the value that civil servants do have in providing services to the people of Manitoba. I say seriously that they do prefer to remain nameless. They do not want to see their names recorded in Hansard, but they will read this and they do know who they are. They certainly provided me with a lot of support and assistance during my two years in the Department of Health.

I sometimes think that it would be a good opportunity for all honourable members of the House to have worked in the Civil Service at some point to actually gain an appreciation of the difficulties that one can encompass in the Civil Service, the hard work that is necessary and the fact that they actually are there to provide a service to the people of Manitoba. Their only goal and their main goal is to provide a quality service, and they are a very dedicated group of individuals.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the voters of Crescentwood for their confidence in me in the by-election this summer. It was certainly an exciting by-election, and there were six worthy candidates. I am grateful that the voters had confidence in me and my abilities to represent the Crescentwood interests.

Crescentwood as the name of a constituency is actually somewhat of a misnomer. There is a unique community of Crescentwood according to the city of Winnipeg boundaries which has existed since the early years of this century, and those boundaries are Grosvenor, Cambridge, Wellington boundaries. The Boundaries Commission that was looking at redistribution of the particular constituencies in their wisdom decided to divide this small unique community into two and place part of it in the constituency of Crescentwood and part of it in the constituency of River Heights.

The constituency of Crescentwood is actually much larger and includes a number of unique and distinct communities. It includes the distinct community of the north Fort Garry on the east and west side of Pembina Highway. It also includes the Earl Grey community area which is part of what was once known as Fort Rouge and, as well, includes the Grant Park community around the Grant Park Shopping Centre. All of these are unique communities within the constituency of Crescentwood.

It was certainly very interesting for me to campaign in the Crescentwood area and to represent the Crescentwood area because I feel that is where, since coming to Winnipeg, my roots have certainly been. I live in the Crescentwood area and also my first work experiences in Winnipeg were in the Fort Garry area, so I had the opportunity to meet a number of individuals who lived in Fort Garry and who provide an excellent community service. They are a very vibrant community, Fort Garry, a very growing community as well as the Crescentwood area. It is certainly a very interesting constituency to represent.

One notes in the Crescentwood area many older homes that have been refurbished over the last few years. What I really noticed as I was travelling down the streets of Jessie, Warsaw and Mulvey was certainly the older homes where young families have moved in and again are spending a lot of time renovating those homes. I think that is a credit to those individuals who live there. It is very nice to see that we are starting to see the core or the middle part of our city that is actually being developed and that families are living in these areas.

It is also interesting as we move further west on Jessie and Warsaw streets, one is not a long-time resident of Jessie or Warsaw unless you have lived in your house for at least 40 years. A lot of the individuals who live on those streets have lived there for 40 years, have lived in the community. It is a very stable neighbourhood. The first house that I bought in the city of Winnipeg was on Warsaw Avenue and certainly the neighbours who were there at that time, 10 years ago, are still there today.

It is a very interesting community in that we have a number of professionals who live in the community, business people, artists. There are a lot of artists who live in the constituency of Crescentwood.

We also have the Corydon Avenue business area which is certainly beginning to become the heart of Winnipeg in the summer. I would suggest that it is rivalling the Forks for that particular honour. You only have to know that to attend the Festival of Wine and Roses, which I am sure some of you have over the past summer, and know that it is a very thriving neighbourhood. Whether you start walking from the corner of Nibbler's Nosh and going right down to Daly Street where you have many, many

restaurants, one will see what I hope are thriving businesses in that area.

* (1600)

I think the business association, the Crescentwood BIZ Association should certainly take some credit for the work that they have done to really make Corydon Avenue a street that a lot of people want to shop on and a lot of people want to spend time at. It is very, very much vibrant and I hope that we will see more of that in the city of Winnipeg.

I trust that the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) is also supportive on a provincial level of ensuring that we see neighbourhoods being revitalized. I hope that the Minister of Urban Affairs will also be ensuring that he is trying to renegotiate a third core area initiative so that as well we do see some dollars that can be put into infrastructure into our older neighbourhoods here in Winnipeg.

One of the things as one looks through the constituency of Crescentwood, however, although you can walk along Wellington Crescent and walk by the condominiums there, which are certainly over a quarter-of-a-million dollars, you can also walk through some of the areas where you do find businesses that are struggling. You can find a food bank just on the corner, just outside the constituency of Crescentwood which is certainly used, the Stradbrook-Nassau area, which is certainly used by the residents of Crescentwood.

One thinks of Crescentwood as an affluent area, but that is not necessarily so. Crescentwood is representative of the many problems and concerns that we have facing people in the city of Winnipeg, those issues of lack of jobs, unemployment, difficulties with getting health care in some respects, and just the migration of people out of the Crescentwood area and actually out of the city of Winnipeg. All of these problems I faced at the door during the campaign, and all of these issues people are wanting answers for.

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

Speaking of answers to people's questions, I would like to turn my attention now to the throne speech. Although I hate to make a comment from the paper, I must admit that one of the reporter's comments talked about the throne speech as being a "drone speech." I thought that there really was some truth to that, unfortunately.

When we look at this throne speech again, it is another vague document which is really just a lot of nice flowery words and rhetoric, but when you remove that rhetoric and when you remove the flowery words, there is really nothing there. You remove all the petals and there is absolutely nothing there. There is no meat. There is really basically a commentary on similar throne speeches from the past.

I guess what I found that really came to mind as I was sitting and listening to Question Period today, in response to questions about the rising poverty rate here in Manitoba, we had three separate ministers respond to a number of questions, the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the Minister responsible for Culture (Mrs. Mitchelson) and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer). They all talked about how they had increased the social assistance rate some 3.6 percent and seemed to take a lot of delight and pride in the fact that they had accomplished these things. My concern was, here is a government who is saying, here is what we have done in response to the questions that were asked, but their solutions have not solved the problems.

What good are solutions if they have not dealt with the problems of child poverty? Yes, you have increased the social assistance rates 3.6 percent, but those solutions have not dealt with the rising child poverty rates and the rising unemployment in this province. What does that say about a government that seems to provide these fragmented solutions but yet it is not even dealing with the problems?

When the government gave the throne speech, I was actually quite looking forward to hearing some information on what the new plans would be for education reform here in this province, this being an area that is of interest to myself as a critic, and it certainly was an interest to people in the area of Crescentwood as well, as we went door to door campaigning. Even in the civic election, people talked about the economy and people talked about education.

Again, I was very concerned when I heard the Premier speak on television the other day. He basically talked about the fact that there was going to be a \$17-million cutback to the Department of Education and basically said, well, there has not been a cut for five years so it seems logical that we

might look at cutting that particular department. I thought that was a very poor way to do things.

I would hope that around the cabinet table decisions are not made or criteria are not developed as to how you will look at programs and services based on which department has the biggest budget and which department maybe has not had a slash or a cut, so we will try this one. I would hope that decisions are not made in that way, because if the government is really true and really believes in their statement about economic reform and economic growth being tied into education and that education is the key to unlocking the future of opportunities, how can they look at slashing dollars in the Education budget? Perhaps they should look at ensuring that in fact there were adequate dollars in the Education budget, because in five and 10 years from now that is where we are going to be able to show some results, if the government is prepared to put some dollars and look at that particular department.

When we look at the education—I was quite interested, the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) spoke the other day in the House, and she talked about the importance of parental involvement. She had said that, yes, parental involvement is important and almost intimated that in fact there would be a parent bill of rights. I hope that is an accurate statement, and I hope we do see a parent bill of rights here in this House, because we would be glad, as members of the opposition, to support that type of parental involvement.

Too many times do we have parents who feel that they are not a part of the education of their children. I do not think that that is a negative against the teachers and against the professionals who work in the system. They too are very, very frustrated by the education system that they see today. They too feel that they do not necessarily have control over what they do in the classroom. Classroom sizes are very large. They feel that they are asked to do things that are not part of the teaching role, that they are now becoming paramedics in some respects. They are asked to do medical procedures which they do not feel are appropriate.

There has been this plan, supposedly, by the government, which was actually supposedly started by the former government, to actually co-ordinate the services amongst Health, Justice, Education and Family Services. This plan has now been moved to a deputy minister level, where four deputy

ministers are going to decide on a protocol as to: How do they handle some of the children who are finding themselves really falling through the cracks in terms of any department willing to pick up and provide services for them?

Unfortunately, I would like to see with that deputy ministers' group some input from people who worked at the grassroots level, whether that be the front-line child development worker, whether that be the elementary school teacher, or whether that be the person in the Department of Justice, the probation officer, whoever that individual is. I would like to see some of those people sit on that committee so that the protocols that are going to be developed are actually very much grassroots and are based in reality, because with all due respect to deputy ministers, they do not necessarily know what it is like on the front lines. Sometimes it is very good for them to be able to get opinions from people who are working on the front lines and who are working in the schools. So we would like to see that from this Minister of Education.

What we are still finding, however, is that for families, even though there is supposed to be more of a co-ordination, particularly amongst Family Services, Health and the education system, families are still falling through the cracks. There is still this territorial warfare amongst the various programs of the individual departments, whether it is Programs Branch in Family Services, whether it is Home Care in the Department of Health, whether it is Child and Family Services in the Department of Family Services or whether it is Mental Health Services in the Department of Health. We are finding this territorialness because these branches are saying, well, we do not have the dollars to service these individuals.

So, if someone comes forward who perhaps needs some home care services and child home care services, they say, well, no, we do not provide that because this child has a mental health problem. Let Mental Health provide the dollars. This goes back and forth a lot, whereas it is the parents and the children who get caught in the middle. It is the workers as well who get frustrated, because they feel that they need to take direction from their directorates, so even though they might like to get out there and actually provide the service, they feel that they cannot do that.

* (1610)

I say that as something that has gone on in government, and it has not happened in the last four years. It has gone on in the last 10 and 12 years. There is some recognition that there is a problem, and I hope that there can be some movement so that in fact we are able to provide the best common-sense service to that individual out there, because in the long run, it all comes out of the same pot of money, and that is the taxpayers' pockets.

So, even though it may—who really cares? I mean, that child out there, that family out there does not care whether it is coming out of a line in Health or Family Services. They just want the service for their child. I think if the ministers were able to actually allow some latitude to some of their middle managers, some of the directors, a lot of the managers are prepared to make those kinds of decisions and are prepared to be accountable for them, providing they are not going to get flak from the program directorates. So I think that is something that could be looked at, because, of course, we all have the same goal and that is to provide quality service for people.

One of the other issues in the area of education, and it was quite interesting, since I came into the Legislature, I started to receive very many calls on, and that is in the area of special needs funding for children in the school system. It is a very difficult area. There are not a lot of easy solutions to children with special needs. We have vulnerable children who have mental handicaps who are now integrated into mainstream society in the schools. That was done perhaps with the right intention but perhaps not the right amount of planning and forethought as to how that was actually going to occur. Some of these children were moved and integrated into the school system before the schools were actually able and prepared to deal with these children, and that is unfortunate that that has happened.

But there are other special needs areas where we have children with behavioural problems who are very difficult to deal with by teachers, by resource teachers, by the school system, and even by, sometimes, their parents, and how do we deal with those children? It is not an easy answer because I think if there was a simple solution, the government would have implemented it, that they would have looked at that. But what it does take though, what we need is to have teachers and school trustees and parents actually look at some of these problems and

look at some innovative, creative solutions as to what we might do.

My Leader talked about maybe we need to look at some type of a time-out school, some place where these individuals with behavioural problems can spend some time with resource people or whatever, because there has to be a point where you can continue to teach the other members in the classroom, the other children in the classroom while this one child is having a behavioural episode. So we have to look at some ways we can deal with that in the school system.

One of the other issues, and it was very interesting—I give credit to the River East parents, their advisory council, who have actually written a recent letter to the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) and have expressed their concern as we have here in the Liberal caucus, and concern about the de-streaming of some of the classes in high school. Their concern is that we now will have generic subjects in areas of geography and history and they feel that that is a very regressive step, it is a step backwards, and they are going to be circulating a petition in the River East School Division, in their school, and will be presenting it to the Minister of Education to express their concern.

I certainly will be getting in contact with this advisory group because I think it is important that not only do opposition members express to the ministers what our concerns are, but when parents in the community are starting to express these concerns, then hopefully the minister will take a look and perhaps reconsider what some of the decisions are. Although I have not had the opportunity to get to know the Minister of Education very well, I certainly am very optimistic that here is a person who is flexible, willing to make changes and willing to listen to what the people have to say, and if in fact an idea is definitely not working or is not in the best interests, well then, let us change a policy. Let us be flexible, let us do the right thing for the people of Manitoba.

I think oftentimes politicians and governments do what is politically expedient, but we do not necessarily do the right thing, and it is important that we consider that.

I find it is quite interesting when I listen to the opposition party talk about education and how we must work together. I always remember when I was in the Civil Service how the former NDP government

espoused fairness in the system and co-operation and how we needed to promote people based on merit. I find it quite interesting that here we have a situation—and this relates to education in a sense—where we have a group of people in the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, a group of school trustees, all carrying a political card of one particular stripe who have decided that it is in their best interests and the people's best interests to all be put on these boards and committees and they are then going to make the decisions.

They have actually shut out some school trustees who carry no political card that I am aware of, of any particular affiliation, who have done a good job in the past who were re-elected by their constituents, and they have decided that, no, they can make the best decisions as a group and they can get through the work much faster when they have six people who are all thinking the same way.

I have concerns about that, because I know that the party on the left espouses a lot about fairness, and I know they talk a lot about merit and how it is very important that we co-operate and do the right thing. The words are there, but the actions oftentimes do not follow through and that concerns me. For a collective group to think that because we are all of like minds and we think the same, we are going to get the best solutions. I would suggest to you that oftentimes is not the case and, in fact, when you have people sitting in a group or an organization who may come from different philosophies or backgrounds, sometimes you get the best solution with people who come from those varying backgrounds, because you have to really be creative in your thinking in your decision-making process. So I would suggest that in fact you could be more creative that way.

I could continue on and on about education. I know that I will have opportunities during the response to the budget and as well other debates on resolutions and bills that are presented in this House.

I would like to talk a little bit about the Urban Affairs portfolio very briefly, and I certainly very much look forward to being the critic of Urban Affairs. It is a very interesting portfolio. The part of the city that I live in and the part of the city that I represent is certainly very much interested in Core Area Initiative and in looking at a renewal of that, because it is important that we revitalize these neighbourhoods.

One of the issues that has certainly affected the Crescentwood area and also affects the River Heights constituency which is somewhat of a city issue, but it does relate to Plan Winnipeg, and it relates to the whole transportation issue of the southwest quadrant of the city. Certainly, we have seen some developments out in the southwest part of the city and, unfortunately, those developments have proceeded without any thought on the part of the city in regard to how these people are going to get from point A to point B. Consequently, we have serious traffic difficulties that happen to be in the River Heights and Crescentwood area which are not based on traffic that is generated from those constituencies. It is actually people who are moving from point A to B, from home to work and vice versa, who are travelling through River Heights and Crescentwood. It is a city issue, but there certainly is a group of people in the community which has been spending quite a bit of time and which is working on that problem with the city councillors.

* (1620)

I hope that these individuals, as well, because of their concerns with the development in the southwest quadrant—I assume they will be lobbying the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) on this. I certainly will be speaking to the Minister of Urban Affairs about the development because although we are not against development of the city, I think it is important to recognize we cannot continue to develop in the city of Winnipeg unless we put the proper infrastructures in place. Unfortunately, the city has been very want to put those infrastructures in place over a number of years, and we need to look at that. So that is a local issue that relates to Urban Affairs.

One of the other critic areas that I am responsible for is the Civil Service Commission, and I know that we will be anxiously awaiting the report from the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission (Mr. Praznik) of the Hay audit. I recognize that because of the untimely passing of the Chair of that committee, Ms. Gerrie Hammond, that in fact we probably have a delay in that particular report of the implementation committee, but I certainly urge the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, because that report is about at least a year overdue, that we get on track and look at exactly what the implementation is going to be. I know the Women in Government group are very

anxious to find out what exactly the changes will be in the Civil Service Commission.

One of the interesting areas that I have an opportunity to spend some time meeting with my constituents on is in the area of culture and arts. I feel very fortunate to live in a constituency which is frequented by a number of artists, not only in businesses on Corydon Avenue, but also artists who work out of their home, very talented artists, in the city of Winnipeg.

Certainly a number of them have met with me to talk about the recent Sun articles in regard to arts and arts funding, and there certainly seems to be a majority opinion that it is important that we maintain objectivity in the arts community by having peers adjudicate peers. That was certainly a message that came very strong and clear to me from artists, not just in my constituency, but others as well.

I think culture is a very, very important area and oftentimes gets overlooked, particularly in times of recession and in times where there are large deficits. Oftentimes, it is very easy to look at an area such as culture and say, well, that is where we are going to have to slash and that is where we are going to have to cut, because it is difficult to say that we can keep the funding there when we are looking at feeding children. It becomes a very difficult dilemma for governments of any stripe to deal with, but it is important to recognize that culture is an integral part of our society.

I thought that Margaret Mead who, of course, was a famous anthropologist of the 20th Century—she spoke of culture when she said, and I quote: As the traveller who has once been from home is wiser than he who has never left his own doorstep, so a knowledge of one another's culture should sharpen our ability to scrutinize more steadily, to appreciate more lovingly our own.

I think those words by Margaret were very true, that culture is very, very important, so that we not only have an insight into ourselves, but that we have insight into our neighbours as well.

When I read the throne speech, I guess one of the things that I was looking for, particularly because of my background in families and Family Services, was what is this throne speech going to do for families in my constituency, for families in Manitoba? I was very concerned to see a lack of any type of solution as to what are we going to do about the fact that we have the second highest poverty rate in Canada,

second highest to Quebec. We are even higher than Newfoundland, which has always traditionally been considered a have-not province and very poor off, and yet we have the highest poverty rate. What are we to do about that? What is the government doing about this for families?

We have seen over the last couple of years a slow but steady erosion of a child care system here in Manitoba. We have seen in the last couple of years what I would call chaos in the Child and Family Services system here in Manitoba. We have a government that is now talking about reviewing the Child and Family Services structure internally, and I would suggest that it is long overdue. It should have been looked at before five years, but now we are five years down the road and only now are we beginning to review that particular system.

We see a government that believes that services to our vulnerable citizens, particularly our handicapped, are oftentimes ones that can be frozen or cut. We know that we currently have a freeze right now of dollars in the Department of Family Services, and that freeze is for mentally handicapped children in particular who would normally need to receive services. Workers out there and their families are terribly, terribly frustrated because there are no dollars available that can put some type of plan into place to provide services for mentally handicapped children. It is a great frustration, because there is nothing out there.

I think if the government actually looked beyond the fact that they think they are saving short-term dollars, they would find that if they had a few dollars that were well placed and where they provided services for these children, in the long run they would save dollars, because there would be more time for the workers to go out and spend with other families, there would be less stress on the families so that those families would be utilizing less other services, whether they are counselling services, whether they are home care services, whether they are mental health services.

In fact, they could probably be more efficient in the use of their dollars if they actually said, let us spend some money up front for some of these mentally handicapped children, put a plan in place so that they have reasonable services, because we will save dollars in the long run, but not only that, we will increase the quality of life of these individuals and families, because when families break down and can no longer care for individuals who are

handicapped, what happens is, it ends up costing the health care system far more dollars than what it would have before.

So I would like to see the government and particularly the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), who is willing to look at that—I see that the 40 minutes is running out. That is unfortunate, because I wanted an opportunity to comment on Health, but I know I will have other opportunities to do that.

Let me just finish by saying that I hope in this session of the Legislature that we will see a more kinder, a gentler type of session in the sense that we begin to work together and that we really start thinking about. Everyone should have a sign on their desk that says, my goal is to service the people of Manitoba, regardless of the political stripe. That is our goal, and let us all work together to achieve that. Thank you.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Madam Deputy Speaker, in deference to my good friend from Thompson, I will give half of it in Greek and the other half in English.

I want to, before I get into my remarks, welcome firstly my new colleague from Portage la Prairie, Mr. Pallister. I think he is going to be very, very welcome indeed, because he brings a number of skills to our caucus and to our government, which I think we all can benefit from. I am pleased to be working with him over the next period of time.

I would also say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the former member for Portage la Prairie will be missed by our caucus. He had an unusual tenacity for events and for issues, a tenacity that I think most of us do not have. Once he had a matter in his mind and was convinced that it was right for his constituency, he certainly glommed onto that and held to it come whatever. He will be missed in our caucus. He did, I think, an excellent job for his constituents in Portage la Prairie and contributed certainly to the caucus of the government during his time here, so he will definitely be missed.

I still would like to welcome, Madam Deputy Speaker, the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray). She is not exactly the member we had anticipated welcoming from Crescentwood. We had planned something just a little different.

An Honourable Member: And it was not Tim Sale either.

Mr. Ernst: No, that is for sure. It was another person who ran in that election, but nonetheless, democracy was at work, and the member for Crescentwood received obviously the appropriate number of votes in order to be present here in the House. So I welcome her and wish her well in her endeavours.

The former member for Crescentwood, Mr. Carr, Madam Deputy Speaker, was a fine gentleman and one whom I had as a critic on two separate ministries during my time here in government, both Tourism and Urban Affairs. I always found him to be very willing to listen, to be co-operative, to work together for what ultimately would be for the best interests of the people of Manitoba. I know that, well, from time to time, we had differences of opinion, which is only normal in this kind of a setting. Nonetheless, he was very co-operative and very easy to work with, and I appreciated his openness, his frankness and his willingness to try and work toward good, common goals.

* (1630)

There was no partisan—well, I should not say there was no partisan, because that is not entirely true. I would like to say that, but unfortunately, I cannot. Nonetheless, it is to be expected certainly, but when it came down to issues for which there really was no partisan side, one or the other, even though my honourable friends sometimes, in the New Democratic Party, tend to find partisan issues where there are none present, or at least seek one out or try and manufacture one, I must say that Mr. Carr was very easy to work with. I was pleased to have had the opportunity to work with him here in the House.

It is unfortunate, Madam Deputy Speaker, that from time to time, people who have had a long period of time in public life seek other avenues, seek other ways of fulfillment in their own endeavours. I know that the member for Rupertsland, for instance, is suffering some trauma at the present time, and I feel for him. The loss of a family member, particularly a mother or father, is an inevitable circumstance in your life, but notwithstanding the fact it is inevitable, it really does not soften the blow that much. I know from experience. I know that the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), having lost her mother just recently—Mr. Harper now is undergoing that trauma. I feel for him, and I send

my regards to him and hope that he can find some comfort in whatever he does in the future.

The Leader of the third opposition party has also chosen a different path in recent weeks. She has indicated that she has in her view provided whatever she could to the political party of her choice and to the Legislature of Manitoba. We respect her for that and wish her well and hope that she finds happiness and fulfillment in whatever she chooses to do over the next months and years. We also wish her family well, who are generally around her and are very supportive of her activities certainly through the time that she was here.

I also want to offer my welcome and best wishes to the Pages who are here present in the Chamber. I am sure the Speaker, or whomever it is who engages the Pages to come into the House, provides a much more dramatic picture than really what ultimately happens, at least certainly in the first few days of their work here. I notice, Madam Deputy Speaker, one of the Pages nodding in agreement that I am sure it was glamorized to some great extent to be able to participate in the democratic process in the House.

While initially I am sure they seem to suspect that maybe not all of the facts were laid on the table when they were engaged for this job, if they pay attention and if they learn and if they understand what is going on here they will learn a great deal over the period. I suspect that if they listen to members on this side of the House they will learn a great deal more than they will if they listen to that side of the House.

I think it is important for them to understand that they do have an opportunity here to listen, to hear various points of view from the members opposite and from this side of the House on a variety of issues. While from time to time their duties perhaps seem somewhat menial, certainly the opportunity is there for them to learn. I wish them well and I hope that the experience that they have here over the next year is of benefit to them in their future lives. I am certain that it will be.

Madam Deputy Speaker, over the past couple of years, I guess, three years now, I have had an opportunity to invite to the opening of the session some students from my constituency. We try and spread the invitations around to as many schools as possible to allow those young people to be able to come and witness a little bit at least of the pageantry associated with the Manitoba Legislature.

Very often, and we saw again today, we had a couple of school classes present and unfortunately they tend to see the worst. When you come and sit in Question Period they tend to see the worst of what goes on in this place as opposed to the best. The fact of the matter is that there is a bit of history, a bit of pageantry, a long tradition associated with the Legislature and I think it is an important opportunity for them to see those kinds of things. I think I would encourage all members of the Legislature to do that in order to expose as many young people as possible to the kind of things that go on here in the Manitoba Legislature.

I also want to give my thanks and best wishes to my constituents, Madam Deputy Speaker. There is no one, I think, we should be more grateful to nor should we ever forget than the people who put us in this place. We are the ones who come here to represent them, to provide good government in whatever political form one wishes to subscribe. Nonetheless, we come here on their behalf. It is important that we recognize that we are here on their behalf, that we are here because they voted for us or at least the majority of them voted for us. We are also here to listen to what they have to say. So, Madam Deputy Speaker, we must all be ever mindful.

As I think one of my colleagues said yesterday, it is a distinct honour to be elected as a member of the Legislature. There are only 57 of us here, out of a million some odd people, who are privileged to serve in the Legislature of Manitoba, so we ought to take that job very seriously, and we ought to ensure that we do the best that we possibly can to provide the best government that is possible. I certainly know from members on this side that we are doing that very thing.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

The throne speech paraphrases that great eminent American philosopher and poet, Willie Nelson: When the winds of change are blowing. Certainly, we have experienced in Canada, in North America and, in fact, in the world over the past couple of years a recession unlike none other. There has never been this kind of recession, I do not think, in the history of modern economics at least anyway. It is not just a recession here in Manitoba or Canada. The recession, Mr. Speaker, is in fact worldwide. Economies that have heretofore been

growing at rates of 20, 30 and 40 percent are seeing zero growth rates or in fact declines.

We have seen political upheavals in the world over the past while, Mr. Speaker, where countries like the Soviet bloc have now broken up into a loose confederation of states where they have tried to switch from a centralized economy to a market economy, realizing that the centralized economy to which they have subscribed for the past 60 or 70 years as a matter of fact has not worked, has been a dismal failure and that centralized, socialist philosophy has been recognized by those people as not having worked.

It has been a dismal failure. They have tried for 70 years and have failed year after year after year. So now we see those people now switching to a market economy. We see them attempting in an extremely short period of time to try and switch to the economy that has succeeded year after year after year elsewhere in the free world. But there has been associated with that free market economy, even in those countries where it has been successful for a very long period of time, economic restructuring going on, the likes of which no one has ever seen in the past.

* (1640)

We have seen economic restructuring in the European Community. We have seen it in China, Japan and the United States, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, because of the kind of economy that we have experienced over the past period of time, the consuming economy, one that seemed to exist solely on the basis of growth, that tended to feed upon itself over a period of time, everything seemed to be rosy. Things were going well. People could implement programs in government. People could acquire goods and services and things that were unprecedented. Wage rates, compensation packages for workers of all different kinds rose dramatically over that period of time, as well, and we found out that all of a sudden we cannot do that anymore. We cannot afford that anymore. Governments cannot afford it anymore, businesses cannot afford it anymore, and we have to look at restructuring, a very significant way of change of doing things.

Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech someone accused us of using "innovation" on a number of occasions in the throne speech. That is exactly what is required. Everyone, everyone, not just the

members of the government, but the members of the opposition, the members of every government in this country, municipal, school board, federal government, provincial governments, all of us collectively spend too much money. We spend more than we take in, dramatically more. The time has come, the day of reckoning has come. We now are here to say that we have to look at how we spend our money. We have to look at new and better ways of spending our money, if we are not going to cut services. We can no longer afford to tax. We can no longer afford to tax.

An Honourable Member: So why are you raising the deficit?

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, we will give the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) a lesson in economics any time he wishes. The fact of the matter is, day after day after day in this House it is he and his party who are demanding more and more and more expenditures. They are demanding it daily in the House. We have gone through four sessions now over the past four years, and we have heard that constant barrage every day, coming from members opposite, "spend, spend, spend, spend," and followed closely behind or perhaps even led by members of the Liberal Party here, whose philosophy also is "back up the Brinks truck." We have heard that in the past as well.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for all of us to stop, to take a real hard look at how government does things, how business does things, and how all of us have to look at different, more innovative, more effective ways of spending the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, the private sector has been doing this for some period of time. This is not something that has dramatically happened overnight. This has been building over the last five, six, seven, eight years, where the private sector has had to restructure its own operations in order to be competitive, because if we are going to deal with companies in other countries who are attempting to compete in a world market with us, then we have to be competitive. We cannot all of a sudden just decide that we are going to put up barriers around Manitoba and suggest for a minute that we would ever be able to survive if we did that.

Mr. Speaker, that will not work. Manitoba is an exporting economy. If we do not export we do not live, we do not have the kind of standard of living we

have enjoyed for some period of time. So we have to be able to compete on the global market. We have to be able to go out and say that—and I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever that Manitobans can compete anywhere in the world in terms of quality, in terms of their ability to produce goods and services, and in fact Manitoba companies are exporting all over the world. We have exports not only in manufactured goods, but we have exports in services that are second to none. We have engineering services, for instance, that are provided out of Manitoba 50, 100 times what would be generated by local business, and that is exported everywhere in the world.

Technologies, Mr. Speaker, such as Teshmount Consultants, who are doing direct current hydro transmission engineering work over the world, world-renowned, created virtually the kind of technologies that hydro systems benefit from today in conjunction with Manitoba Hydro over a long period of time.

Our government has been on that path as well, Mr. Speaker, over the past four years. We have recognized that we have these kinds of problems. We have recognized the kinds of issues that have been coming forward because of that restructuring that has been going on. Unfortunately, it kind of landed at the same time as the recession that hit the world's economy. So we have had a kind of double whammy all of a sudden in our economy here in Manitoba, but we have recognized the fact that we have to have some innovation, we have to have some new ideas, some new ways of doing things. My colleague from Pembina the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) occasionally refers to it as new-think as opposed to what has gone on in the past.

The fact of the matter is, we do need to innovate. If we do not innovate, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to survive; we are not going to have a medicare system in this country that we have enjoyed up to this point. My honourable friends opposite's idea of dealing with this issue is to throw more money at it, create more beds, do not look at innovative ways and means of doing things.

At least the Liberal Party has recognized the fact that those innovations are required and that the system will not survive unless we do that innovation. So I compliment my colleague the Minister of Health for the initiatives that he has undertaken. They have not been easy issues to deal with. Until largely understood by the public, they will not be readily

accepted across the width and breadth of this province. The fact of the matter is, they must be done, and he has had the courage at least, Mr. Speaker, to undertake those kinds of changes that other people heretofore have not. They have simply dumped money onto the problem and taxed for it, as opposed to looking for different, new, innovative ways of dealing with things. Those kinds of things are necessary, not just in the Department of Health, but in virtually every aspect of our economy and every aspect of this government.

We have to look at ways and means of dealing with the Family Services problems and service delivery modules in this government as well. We have to look at education. I know my colleague the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) is looking at a number of initiatives, attempting to find better ways of providing an education to the young people of our province. If we do not have those new, innovative ways, if we do not start looking at some of the problem areas that are contained within our education system, we are going to fall dramatically behind.

It is not just good enough to say, well, hire more teachers, build more schools, throw more money at it. We have to deliver a better quality product. We have to deliver a better quality product than we have been doing in the past. We have to have some sound learning principles, and we have to have some kind of measure. We have to understand what kind of an education system we have and how we are compared to others in the same kind of system. How are we compared to the U.S., our major competitor, our major trading partner? How are we compared with Europe, with the Orient, with Japan whose education system is highly commended from time to time? We have to look at those systems, and we have to say what is the best from those systems, what we can implement here so that our people, when they go into the business world, when they go out to compete on a world-wide basis have the same kinds of skills, at least basic skills, that our competitors will have.

Economic development, we have heard a lot about that over the past while and certainly an extremely important issue that must be dealt with over the next period of time. We have, Mr. Speaker, through the Departments of Industry, Trade and Tourism and Rural Development, a number of initiatives underway which are important, I think, in

terms of assisting new economic development in our province.

The fact of the matter is, when you look globally at what governments can do in terms of overall economic development, it is very small, what any government can do. I do not care what political stripe you have, you are very, very limited in terms of what governments can influence in the overall scheme of things. You have to provide a fertile ground for a business to survive. That is the underlying essence of all of the things that government can do.

Governments can have programs, Mr. Speaker, to provide financial assistance. They can have make-work programs; we have seen those in past governments. We can really do something very, very small in the overall scheme of things, because it is ultimately the success, the competitiveness of the company that will ultimately gauge whether it will employ people or not, whether it will pay taxes or not and whether it will contribute to the coffers of government to provide the kind of safety nets that we have enjoyed for a number of years and will continue to enjoy, I am sure, into the future. Without that fertile ground, without a solid base for them to operate from, it is not going to happen.

* (1650)

We have seen what has happened in the past, so what we need to do, and our government has embarked upon this road some time ago when we first came into office, was to provide that basic fertile ground for companies to be able to survive and thrive and do business and create those kinds of jobs and create the kind of tax revenues that ultimately are necessary for any government to survive.

All that has gone on before is not bad. There are all kinds of good things that we need to capitalize on, that we need to build upon, strengths that have been created in the past by people, by pioneers, by governments, by a whole host of players in the economic field.

Certainly we must build upon those strengths and, of course, one of the primary strengths of this province has been and will continue to be for many, many years to come is agriculture. We are accused from time to time to hear that with a "rural-dominated" caucus that is the only issue that we are prepared to look at. It is an important issue and one facet of our economy here. All of my

colleagues recognize that and recognize that because it is a major part of our economy and does drive a great many of the businesses associated in Manitoba as well as the on-farm income, Mr. Speaker, we know that much has to be done. We can build upon that strength.

We have over the past three or four years strongly represented the position of Manitoba at GATT. During my time as Minister of Trade, I had an opportunity along with my colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) to forcefully put our position forward at GATT both in Geneva and at Brussels during what we thought was the final round at that time. Unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) is correct, there have been an awful lot of final rounds over the past two years. I am hopeful, and I think we are all hopeful collectively in this place that there will be a solution found to the trade wars that have devastated the farm economy in Manitoba and western Canada over the past 10 or so years.

Mr. Speaker, we need to find a resolution to GATT obviously, but we also need to encourage our farm community to diversify as much as possible. It is very easy and very comforting, I suppose, not ever having been a farmer I cannot say for sure, but I can say this, it would appear at least to me that knowing just a little bit about the farm economy it is reasonably comfortable to be able to say, well, I can go and I can plant my wheat in the spring and harvest it in the fall and spray it in between and then that is good enough in terms of bringing me a reasonable income for my family. Those days, I think, are slowly drawing to a close and farmers today are going to have to look at diversification a lot more than they ever have in the past if they are going to survive in the kind of economy that we foresee in the future, but not just diversification on the farm front, but diversification on an industrial front to add value-added processing to the kind of products that we do produce here.

There is no reason on God's green earth in my mind why—we grow the best durum wheat in the world here in Manitoba and then ship it to Italy to have it made into pasta. It does not make sense at all. I think we have to try and determine that can we not produce that pasta here and ship the pasta to Italy. It would be a much better arrangement, in my view, than what we are doing at the present time. So that is something that we want to work toward and to look for those kinds of value-added

processing businesses that can add additional jobs to our community, can build upon the products that are grown in this province.

We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have French fry plants, for instance, here in Manitoba by McCain and Carnation that are shipping worldwide. We could have other kinds of plants similar to those I think if we put our minds to it and try and determine exactly what can be done and how it can be done, and I think we should all work toward that end.

We have also in the agriculture community, Mr. Speaker, been able to I think, at least in the short term, help stabilize farm incomes in this province through our participation and the hard work of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) in the GRIP and NISA programs. They are not the be all and the end all, certainly, to any long-term solution, but they are a stop-gap measure to try and stabilize farm incomes so that the people in rural Manitoba know at least where they can head into the future and try and work toward that diversification and that value-added processing and other kinds of things that will ultimately assist them in their business ventures in the future.

As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, in the past, health care industries has been I think a real boon to this province. We have seen some significant changes in the health care industries. They are not readily evident. I mean, you do not see the flashing neon signs necessarily, but what you see is that in 1988 when we signed an agreement with the federal government—and I had the privilege personally of signing that agreement in August of 1988 with Minister Epp at that time—about a dozen or so businesses in the health care product development field.

Today, we have five and six times that number of companies involved in the health care product field. I do not take 100 percent credit. The government prior to our taking office in 1988 had embarked upon this path as well and rightly so. The fact of the matter is that they had built a small foundation upon which we were able to expand and to grow, and I compliment them for that as something that I think in Manitoba was a sound vision, still is a sound vision, and we should pursue it as much as possible.

We have had some successes over the past while particularly in the pharmaceutical area where there have been a number of new initiatives announced for Manitoba. Some are under construction. Some

are still in the planning stages, but ultimately I think we are going to see the major magnet happening almost any moment now. I believe the piling contract has been let for the virology lab in the centre for animal disease control and that should be starting in the very, very near future, Mr. Speaker.

We hope to be able to see that sod turning take place, as a matter of fact, as much work as possible done on that project as quickly as possible to ensure that it ultimately gets finally built in Manitoba where we think it belongs and where we have worked very hard. All of us I think—

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): You better build it before the next election.

Mr. Ernst: Well, exactly. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is correct. We need to have it substantially built because I do not think it is any secret that the bureaucrats in Ottawa would dearly love not to have it built in Manitoba. They would dearly love to have it built in Ottawa. So we need to be cognizant of that. We need to work very hard to ensure that no stumbling blocks stand in the way of that project and that it be completed as quickly as possible.

* (1700)

We have first-hand information in telecommunications work, Mr. Speaker. That is another niche market that Manitoba, I think, can capitalize on. We have had a number of good initiatives occur just in the past while. We had the sale of Manitoba Data Services to ISM, who are capitalizing now on that market. It involved a number of Manitoba software companies involved with them in producing new products and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have some good benefits on the horizon there. Hughes Acoustic Technology is another good example of the kind of thing that can be done in Manitoba very, very well and one which we need to work upon.

Mr. Speaker, we have tourism. For instance, The Forks just received an international award. I was privileged to be able to—I did not have very much to do with what The Forks received the award for. It happened to be in the right place at the right time in terms of being the minister. Nonetheless, I was pleased, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, to accept an award by the International Downtown Association for the very good work that was done at

The Forks, the fact that we are internationally recognized.

At that meeting there was recognition of events and places and projects in countries all around the world. So this was not simply a North American kind of situation but one of a truly international nature, and I was pleased to be able to represent the Province of Manitoba, along with my two partners, Minister Epp and Mayor Norrie, in Minneapolis at that meeting. At the same time we managed to bring the convention back to Winnipeg as well, so that was a kind of a bonus, Mr. Speaker.

We do have a number of attractions here and things we have to work on. We have to revamp our Convention Centre, and our government has committed funding toward that so that our Convention Centre can be competitive. You know, when it was built in 1975, it was one of two convention centres in all of Canada, and now every major city and many not-so-major cities have convention centres and facilities that are trying to attract people, recognizing the kind of draw that centre has for major conventions. So we need to keep up to date. We need to spend some money to refurbish our Convention Centre in order to make us competitive again with other convention centres and facilities, not just in Canada, of course, Mr. Speaker, but elsewhere as well.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, we have to have a stable tax environment, and particularly for companies that wish to come to invest in Manitoba. We actually heard the agenda of the NDP yesterday when the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) made his address to the throne speech and he talked about, Mr. Speaker—he did not talk about competitiveness. No, he did not talk about that. He did not talk about productivity. No. He did not talk about innovation, God forbid. He should not talk about innovation because—there was no discussion on that at all.

What he did talk about was the union line. He talked about the union wages. He talked about the union benefits, their workers, those workers who are out there supporting the union leaders who are the ones who are really the beneficiaries of what goes on in the union movement. That is their priority; they have made that choice. They have decided that they are going to go down the road with the union leaders, and that is their choice. They are fully free and able to do that and make that decision.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) quoted, saying that there were a great many jobs lost in northern Manitoba, which had been announced on the same day as the House opened, and there is not one person in this building who is happy about that. There is not one person certainly on this side of the House and, I am sure, on that side of the House who is thrilled that these people have found that the ore has run out in the mines that they work in and that there is no more work for them in that particular location because the ore has run out.

But then we have the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) saying, no, we are going to have the toughest plant closing legislation. Nobody is going to be able to close it. That mine is going to operate whether there is ore there or not. That, Mr. Speaker, is foolhardy. That kind of attitude will drive not only the businesses that are here out, it will drive anybody who is even considering coming to Manitoba so far away you will never find them. Never will you find anybody associated with that.

I know my time is running short, and I want to make a couple more comments. The member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) commented earlier about a new trilevel agreement for Winnipeg. I have been, for the last year and a half, attempting to lever from our federal colleagues some kind of meaningful agreement that will benefit the citizens of the city of Winnipeg. We have seen a number of very good programs over the 10 years that the Core Area Initiative agreements were in place in Manitoba, very good programs that have benefited a great number of people and ones that we want to see continue.

We have commitments, I have a personal commitment, our government has a commitment toward another agreement. We have delayed, perhaps longer than would have been wise, in retrospect, but nonetheless we have delayed in the expectation that we are going to be able to lever a further \$25 million—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): I wonder if you could ask my colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) and the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Doer) to conduct their conversation outside the Chamber so that I could listen to the words of my colleague.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable Minister of Natural Resources, all members wishing to carry on a private conversation can do so outside this Chamber.

* * *

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, thank you and I thank my colleague from Lakeside (Mr. Enns) for having brought that matter to your attention, Sir. The fact of the matter is that we have been trying to lever from the federal government over the past year or year and a half—[interjection] Pick up the phone, my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) says. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been attempting to lever real dollars, to lever real benefits for the people of the inner city of Winnipeg, and we have not, unfortunately, been successful. We are still trying. We are still trying, because it is important to think, not to simply abandon the hope of receiving those federal dollars, but at that point and that point is rapidly approaching, when we are going to have to make a decision as to whether we go on a bilateral basis and get on with the job, even though we do not have the federal participation, than wait forever.

We are going to make that decision in the not too distant future. I am hopeful that in the period of time between now and then they will still be able to lever some funding from the federal government that is meaningful and real and that will have real benefits for the people of the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, that also is really not a partisan issue; it is an important issue for the people of the inner city of Winnipeg. All of us need to I think be mindful of the fact that we should all be trying, not just yelling at the Minister of Urban Affairs, but all be trying to determine as much as possible or work as hard as possible toward that end for the benefit of all of those people.

The member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) also mentioned the question of urban transportation issues and how they are affecting her particular community. I agree they are, but if you want to know where the root of the problem lies, it lies in the hands of one Mr. Joe Borowski, the former NDP transport minister, who in 1970 put a kibosh on all major transportation routes in the city of Winnipeg. All of the development that took place in the city of Winnipeg that was predicated on certain transportation routes that were to be built, those

were cancelled similarly by Mr. Borowski in 1970. That view pervaded throughout the NDP years in government in this province, so, Mr. Speaker, we did not have those opportunities. Thank you very much.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join into this debate to raise my concerns with the throne speech and also the concerns of many rural Manitobans with the action this government has taken in the throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to begin by welcoming you back as Speaker of the House. I look forward to your guidance. I know many times you have become very frustrated with some of the activities in here, but I am sure we appreciate your fair treatment to all of us.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the new members in this House, both on their re-election and the election for the first time to this Chamber. I hope you enjoy your tenure here. I look forward to working with you and improving the quality of life for all Manitobans.

I would also like to welcome the new Pages who are with us in this session. I hope that their experience here is worthwhile and will encourage them perhaps to carry on and participate in politics at some other level. I hope that they also are not discouraged by some of the carryings on in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to at this time recognize one other member, and that is the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), who has made the decision to leave us at this time. He has indicated that he is retiring, and we would like to wish him luck in his future endeavours.

* (1710)

Mr. Harper has done much to raise the importance of aboriginal issues and cause us all to pay greater respect and look more closely at what has been happening to aboriginal people in this province and in this country. He has been an example for many members. It is through his efforts that we have been able to encourage other members to run and join us here in the Legislature.

He was not only respected by members of our caucus and members of the native community, but many Manitobans respected him for the stand he

took and will continue to respect him. We wish him good luck in his future endeavours.

I want to welcome back all members who are here in the Legislature. I hope that we can all work together and hear each other's views and learn from one another what it is and that government members will listen to the concerns that we bring to the Legislature from those people that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the throne speech, I and most Manitobans expected much from this government. We expected leadership and new ideas, but unfortunately we got very little of that, other than regurgitated old ideas. In fact, as many other members have outlined, many of the ideas were brought forward by the previous government and those are the ideas that we are seeing now.

We are seeing very little from this government. It is a sign of a tired government, a government that does not show real leadership, a government that is prepared to drift and ignore the desperate situation facing Manitobans.

When I look at the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, and I look at the throne speech from the previous year, there are many things that are just put in a second time, but there are also things that were put in the last throne speech that have not been acted upon and have been left out this time. Those are real concerns when you make promises in a throne speech but do not carry them forward.

Mr. Speaker, last week I attended the UMM Convention as did several members from this Chamber, and if the other members were listening, they would have heard a great frustration from the majority of the participants. Major concerns were raised that this government continues to say that they are not raising taxes. Again we hear it from this government, saying in each of the speeches that they have carried through on their promise of not having raised taxes. But that is not the message that has come from the delegates or from rural Manitobans. There is great concern about the offloading that this government has done and the amount of taxes that has been shifted onto a much smaller tax base.

When we had the roads offloaded onto municipalities, taxes had to be picked up at the local level. When the school funding formula was changed, school boards were forced to pick up these extra costs by passing on special levies. This is an increase in taxes. This government cannot

say that they are not increasing taxes. It is what they have been doing that has caused the increase of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, rural Manitobans said very loud and clear that they would make it known that it was not their responsibility that these taxes were increased. It was because of the offloading of this government, and if those members who were there will remember hearing that very clearly, that because of the cutbacks by this government and because the school boards are committed to the education of rural Manitobans they have had to pass on the taxes because they have to pick up the slack of this government.

This government is not prepared to stand up for education in rural Manitoba. The school boards are. They are the ones that have had to pass on the taxes rather than this government fulfilling their responsibility.

Along with taxes, Mr. Speaker, councillors at the convention raised another issue which was not addressed in the throne speech and which we raised last year. I am hoping that this government will address it sometime in this year, and that is the concern of The Municipal Assessment Act.

We raised that during the discussions of The Municipal Assessment Act last year, and the Minister of Rural Development said that we were wrong. There was not going to be an increase in costs on the farmland. Municipal representatives have again raised this issue on the portioning of the residential properties and amount of tax that has to be collected on farm lands and farm buildings.

An Honourable Member: No, no. You misunderstood that.

Ms. Wowchuk: The member across the way says that I misunderstood it. Well, I guess all of the rural people misunderstood him too because there is a great increase in school taxes. Farm land is picking up a far greater portion of educational tax, and he can shake his head as much as he wants, it is not true. They are trying to mislead and act as if rural people do not understand, but I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, rural people are not that foolish. When they see their tax bill and the increase in educational tax on farmland, they can see very clearly that they have been misled by this government.

Point of Order

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): The honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) is putting misleading and incorrect information on the record. The assessment legislation does not—I say the resolution that was passed at UMM does not refer to farm land; it refers to farm buildings.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order. It is clearly a dispute over the facts.

* * *

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but just to correct the member for Emerson, I will read into the record the Whereas. It says: Whereas the changes to portioning implemented in the 1992 tax year resulted in a shift of school taxes from residential to farm land and buildings, the UMM requests that the Minister of Rural Development reduce the portioning of class 30 property from the present 27 percent to a level which will prevent a shift of school taxes from residential property to farm property.

Mr. Speaker, this government is not listening to rural Manitobans, and they are shifting more costs onto the farmland which was something they promised they would not do.

When I look at the government's throne speech on education, they say the keys that unlock the world of opportunity and the future of economic growth and prosperity. There are many concerns with education, and those children in rural Manitoba must have the same opportunity for education as the people in urban centres. With the continuing reduction in population in the rural areas, we have to look at ways to provide the same level of education in the rural areas as we have in the urban centres.

I hope that this government will look at that. I hope the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) will look at ways that we can bring quality education to small schools. The technology is there, and all it takes is a little bit of leadership and the will to provide the same opportunity to all people.

The other area that was missed out of the education portion of the throne speech was first-year distance education. Again, that was another issue that was raised at the UMM

convention. Rural Manitobans, again, want the same opportunity to have a university education in their communities. It has been a good program. The first-year distance education has been working in some parts of the province. There is a need for that program to be expanded.

I am disappointed that we have not seen more initiative to expand that program. In particular, Mr. Speaker, there is a group of people from Swan River who are working very hard, and I believe the Minister of Education has a petition from these people. They are in fact willing to pick up costs so that we can have this opportunity.

I hope that the minister will seriously consider expanding the program into that area of the province as well which is in reality a very important service that I would like to see because it would give those children an opportunity to stay at home one more year, but also tremendously reduces the costs.

Considering the financial situation at the present time, particularly in rural Manitoba, I think that we have to look at ways that we can give rural children the opportunity for an education, so I hope the minister will look at that.

I have one concern with the throne speech and that is in the area of standard exams. I think that the goal of education should be to prepare our young people to find a place in society. Across the province, education is fought in many different ways and it is not necessary that everybody work at a standard exam. I do not see how you can judge everybody the same way.

I think that we should be very careful when we work in this direction in trying to standardize things. I have talked to many teachers on this issue, and they are not in support of it. So I think that we should look at what we are doing in standardizing, because it seems impossible to test everybody at the same level. You get teachers then teaching toward an exam rather than preparing people to fit into a world. I think that you should be thinking very carefully about what we are doing with that.

* (1720)

Mr. Speaker, I also heard a lot of discussion at the UMM convention about the video lottery terminals and the amount of money that is being drained out of rural Manitoba. Millions of dollars are going out of rural Manitoba and nothing is coming back. I guess we have to wonder why we—[interjection] Yes, I did listen to the answer and there was no answer.

Rural Manitobans were told that all money raised in rural Manitoba would be reinvested in rural Manitoba in economic development. The only initiative that we have seen to this point is the Ayer plant in Brandon, and it is a million-dollar investment there. That is the only one.

How much money has come out of rural Manitoba? How much money has come out of the city of Brandon? You will not tell us how much money. I can tell you that out of Swan River, just out of the Town of Swan River, there will be close to three-quarters of a million dollars coming out. Out of the Village of Winnipegosis, they are sending in \$2,000 a week. How much money is going back into rural Manitoba? They will not tell us. Where is the money going? We asked. We want to know what are the figures? Where is the money going? Why is it not being reinvested into rural Manitoba as it was promised? Revenues, as I see, have far exceeded the expectations and rural Manitobans are not getting back what they were promised from this government.

The Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) talks about Partners with Youth and he talks about the Green Team. Those programs are not economic development. I am glad that we had the programs to help our young people. They are not long-term jobs; they are not economic development. They are replacing jobs that this government cut from Natural Resources. Granted, they helped students for the short term. They helped students for the summer period, but that was not the point of the fund. This government is misleading rural Manitobans, because they are taking all of this money out and they are not reinvesting it.

There are many ways that this growth could be stimulated in rural Manitoba, but this government chooses rather to drain the money out and not put anything back. This government boasts about the success of the Grow Bonds program. What did we have for success? We have had three projects. We have not been able to find out exactly how many jobs have been created from those three projects. We do not know how many projects have been turned down. We have no idea what this government is doing. All we know is that they are draining money out of rural Manitoba and putting nothing back.

Government must show more leadership. They must be prepared to invest in jobs and stimulate the

economy if anything is to happen, but this government is afraid to say the word "job." We only saw it once in the throne speech. They are not prepared to invest in rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you a little story about a farmer. There was a farmer who said he could not plant his crop because he could not afford to buy seed. He could not afford to buy seed because he was using all the money to pay for his tractor. He did not realize that if he planted seed he would be able to pay for the tractor and prosper as well. That is the same as this government. They are prepared to invest in welfare rather than to create jobs, and they will get as much as the farmer did for their investment—nothing.

People want to work, and if this government showed leadership and created jobs you would have rural Manitobans working, you would have people paying taxes, you would see the economy grow, but that is not the intention of this government.

I want to touch on health care reform and some of the things that are in this throne speech. The member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine) talked about the number of personal care beds that we are seeing built in this province and the increases, and I congratulate the government on going forward and building those personal care home beds. We need them for those people who are not well, for our elderly, who built this country. We should give them the care that they need. However, Mr. Speaker, personal care beds are very expensive beds.

The minister has talked about reform and other ways that we can look after our seniors and our disabled without having that expensive a cost. Many seniors would prefer to stay in their home but, unfortunately, many seniors are not able to stay in their home, because we have had a reduction in home care.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has said many times that there has not been a reduction in home care, but I believe there has been and so do many other people, particularly in the Parkland.

I just want to read a letter on home care, and I will not give any names, Mr. Speaker: This is how adequate home care is, and you be the judge of that. It is too late for me, but it may help others in the same situation. I fell and broke my hip in March this year, and I was taken by ambulance to Winnipeg, where my hip was replaced. I had infection in my hip, and I stayed there for six weeks. I was promised a nurse

to change my dressings when I came home, a nurse who would come every day. I waited for home care. Nobody came, so I phoned the supervisor in Swan River and asked her how come nobody came to see me. She said, we are cancelling all home care, and I quote, for everybody. You have to hire if you need help and pay for it with your own money. I can only send you a nurse once a week if I can locate her, as she is already working. The nurse came to give me my bath. When she saw my condition she called back to the supervisor and said that I needed help right away. The supervisor came a week later and said, well, you need help but you have to hire somebody yourself.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of home care we have now. We are not looking after seniors, and particularly in the Parkland area we are seeing cutbacks because we have seen other examples. I know that there are other communities that are not seeing nearly the cutbacks that our area of the province is. So this is not a way to look after our seniors by only putting them into personal care homes. We also have to look after them in their home where they can have quality of life and some pride in themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on another section of health care, and that is on the mental health and the return of people with mental disorders back to the community. There is a group in Swan River that has worked very hard, and the minister is quite aware of them, and they have a proposal in to put in a crisis centre. I am very happy for what has been able to happen in the Parklands. They have run into some stumbling blocks with the Department of Housing as far as finding the homes, and there has been a deadline put on them for December 15.

* (1730)

I feel that this deadline is a little bit unfair, because they have worked very hard and found several homes that could have been worked for the crisis home and for the group home, but by the time they got the approval from the Department of Housing those homes were sold. So I hope that this deadline that has been put on them will be a flexible deadline just in case they cannot meet it. They have done an awful lot of work. It is a good move to have these people come back to the community, and I hope that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) will show a little bit of flexibility when they are dealing with these people, particularly the group in Swan River who, as I said,

has worked very hard to establish the kind of care that we need for these people when they come back to the community.

Mr. Speaker, one of the areas that I am concerned about, which was in the last throne speech but not in this one, is the rocket range of the Port of Churchill. We see very little. In fact in the last throne speech there was indication that they would be supporting the rocket range of the Port of Churchill. People in that area have worked very hard. They have got proposals together, but they have not had the support that they need from government. They have raised a tremendous amount of money. They are committed to the rocket range and also the Port of Churchill, but they have not had the co-operation that they need from this government.

I hope that in the next little while we will see some support for this community because I believe the port is very viable. It is something that we should be looking to protect because it does make sense to have an inland port that would reduce the costs for farmers in Manitoba. The government should be looking at ways that we could have two-way traffic coming through that port, ways that we could be bringing more traffic onto the bayline and improving it rather than trying to get rid of it or offering no support and seeing it abandoned. There are many communities that will suffer if the bayline is not maintained, and there are people in the community of Churchill who will also suffer if we do not see some development there. The proposal they have for a rocket range could create many jobs, which we do need not only in northern Manitoba but throughout Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the government is looking to review gasification of rural Manitoba. It is something that I have spoken to the previous Minister of Rural Development about, and I have talked to the present Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach). People in my constituency very much want to see natural gas come in. They have written. We have talked to Centra Gas about it. So I hope that this will not be just a review, that we will actually see some action here, and that this government will bring in natural gas to rural Manitoba. I have to say that I hope this is not done on a political basis to only some constituencies, that we are looking at a broad plan that will address the needs of all rural communities.

As I say, there is interest in the Swan River constituency. There is interest in the Interlake area and there are some excellent proposals. In fact, I have a letter written from the Economic Development Corporation in the Parkland West, where they have outlined all the different things that they have looked at for economic development and companies they have talked to. They have been turned down each time or had to leave the negotiations alone, because there was no natural gas, and those companies feel that they cannot operate without natural gas.

So I look forward to hearing what this government is proposing and working along with them to bring this service to rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other areas that I would like to touch on. I want to touch on Sunday shopping. I am surprised that the government would move forward with such a proposal without having first discussed it in this Legislature. I am surprised that they would go forward with this kind of proposal without giving rural Manitobans, all Manitobans, an opportunity to make presentations. When we have retroactive legislation, there is very little that they can do other than accept it.

I think that this is going to have a very negative impact on rural communities, particularly those closer to the city. I think that it will have an effect on all communities. I do not think that this is going to create new money. There is only so much money to be spent, and if you have spent your money, you spent your money. You can spend only so much in six days or in seven days.

Why not leave that day for family? Why not think about those family businesses that now have to stay open an extra day? What about the small corner stores, or is this going to put the corner stores out of business? Is that not important, as long as the big stores have the opportunity to make money? Those corporate friends, they win. Do the workers win? No, the workers have to divide their hours and probably work on Sundays or spread out.

There are not going to be new jobs here. This is not going to stimulate the economy. I am disappointed that the government would take this initiative, because I do not believe it is going to stimulate tourism, nor is it going to be a great benefit to the businesses, because, as I said, there are only so many dollars to be spent. I find it disappointing that government would look at this as a way to

attract tourism or to get more money into the economy. The money is not there.

Mr. Speaker, under Natural Resources, some of them are very interesting. The government talks about humane trapping technology that will stimulate the fur industry, but to my understanding the fur industry will need a lot more than humane trapping technology to help it. We will await to hear what this technology is that the government is going to bring in. I had so hoped that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), if he was wanting to stimulate the economy, would be looking at reviewing the bear licence allocation which we raised with him during Estimates but have not heard anything on. Many trappers who have a licence to trap a bear are wanting to convert those licences to guiding licences, and we raised that with the minister, but we have not heard a response on that.

There are many guides who are concerned about the concentration of bear licences in the hands of a few large operators. Again, the small person is getting squeezed out or is not having the ability to make a fair living. We do not see that here, but I hope that we will.

I am pleased that the government is talking about co-management programs. We have raised this many times, and we have asked the minister for information on where they are with co-management. We have talked to many people in bands about this and cannot get very much information, and I hope that the minister is serious.

There are many problems, and the minister is well aware of them. In fact, he was at a meeting in Swan River where these issues were raised, and those same issues are being raised again this year. Unless we can sit down and negotiate with all people who have an interest in these areas, we are going to have big problems, and I encourage the minister to have open discussions on co-management so that all people who use these resources can have input into the development of these co-management plans. But we have to move forward with them so that we can protect our resources and have them there for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am also surprised that the government is moving toward expanding the markets for commercial fishermen. I am not sure how this is going to benefit fishermen, particularly in some of the remote areas. I cannot see how they are going to benefit, and I also think that there is only

a certain market, and if we open it up, is it going to result in competition, a lowered price and a lower return? That is the concern that has been raised by many fishermen.

In fact, I was at the fishermen's conference, as was the minister, and the people there were not unanimous in wanting the market expanded. In fact, what they were calling for was a review of the Marketing Board and its powers, although some of them were asking to have the ability to market their fish directly to the retailers.

* (1740)

I would hope that the government would consider a review. Granted, the Fish Marketing Board has been in place for many years now. We should be looking at it. Since the majority of fishermen are aboriginal, we should be looking at ways that they can have a broader representation on that board. At the present time, the board, I believe, is appointed by the federal government. Fishermen want a way to elect their own people onto the board, and I think that is something that we should be looking at, but I am very concerned that we are thinking that we will help fishermen by expanding the market. I am particularly concerned in my constituency where there are no fish, and I am talking about Lake Winnipegosis. There are no fish. [interjection] That is right. The minister again raises the issue of cormorants, but there are two problems.

One of them is that the minister is not fulfilling his commitment to the people on that lake by addressing some of their other concerns, and he has not addressed the issue of the number of cormorants on that lake and a way to deal with that problem.

It is strange that this business of expanding the Fish Marketing Board is one of the minister's priorities, particularly, as I say, when the fish stocks are so low. I wonder, when the minister implements this, how are we going to control? Is there still going to be a quota system? Who will regulate, or are the fishermen going to be able to fish as much as they want and take as much fish as they want and then come back to government and say, there is no fish in the lake? I look forward to hearing how we are going to deal with this and whether the quota system will stay in place or whether this is just the government's way of now abandoning a marketing board, a system that has protected many fishermen.

I talked to fishermen who are very concerned about this. They remember the time when there was no marketing board and they did not know until June or July how much their cheque was going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I also am concerned about agriculture and the lack of leadership on this government's part as far as research. I am looking at alternates. We have the problem of stubble burning that has been a real issue in the last session, but there is no direction, intention or any indication that the government is going to do any research as to possible alternate uses for that straw. Is there any plan on this in this government?

In the area of the environment, is the government going to do any research on how we are going to—we brought in regulations that say we cannot burn anymore and that is good legislation. But it seems to me that is one step ahead of the game. You have not got plans in place on recycling. You have not got ideas on how we are going to use up those tires that are piled up at nuisance grounds, and I see nothing in this throne speech that government is going to show leadership in new, innovative ideas on how to handle these things.

It is one thing to bring in legislation, but if you do not have a way of dealing with it, if you have not got a way of dealing with all the glass and plastic and tires that are piling up, you have to show leadership. You have to put money into research. You have to get new ideas, and I do not see that here. We need new ideas, and we are not getting them from this government. They are not here.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there is nothing new in this throne speech, and this government is ignoring the real pain of rural Manitobans. We see an article in today's paper about the high rate of poverty. We see a report that the jobs that will lead to poverty are in the service industry, in farming, in fishing, forestry, clerical sales and construction. This is a very large group of people that could be facing devastating situations, but we do not see anything from the government that is going to pull them out of it.

We do not see the government addressing the farm prices. Farmers are in desperate need of a cash flow. There should have been money coming from GRIP. They should have had their final payment. The interim payment is not here, but we do not see a push from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) to get that money to farmers.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, it is a disappointment, but this is what we see from this government—a government that has brought in, I believe, six throne speeches but has not shown real leadership or any creative imagination on how we can help rural Manitobans.

There are many suggestions that have been put forward. I hope that they will look at some of them. I hope, particularly, that in the area of environment and in the agricultural industry we will see some money put into research that will help the communities. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) says, what money?

I go back to the other story that I told. Sometimes you have to be prepared to invest money to create jobs that people can work and this government is not prepared to invest. This government is really prepared to spend more. We are spending money on welfare. You are spending more money right now. Just redirect that money and give the people the opportunity to work because many of those people who are on welfare would gladly work. They want to work.

Many of them want to work and there are many good ideas that have come out of the rural communities and from urban centres. I know that there is a group from my constituency who has been here and talked to members of government about converting welfare dollars into work dollars. I hope that the government will show leadership and negotiate with the federal government, so that we can convert some of those dollars into real jobs.

I look forward to working with this government and offering suggestions. As I say, we will be critical when they are not listening to rural Manitobans or all Manitobans. I hope they will show leadership and make Manitoba a better place to live. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: No. Okay.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): It certainly is great to be back in the session again with my colleagues. I certainly want to welcome the new member for Portage la Prairie, Brian Pallister, and also the new member for Crescentwood, Avis Gray, back into the session.

As well, I want to wish the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) well in his new endeavours. I am sorry to see him leave. I also want to send my regards and best wishes to the Honourable George Johnson, the Lieutenant-Governor, who is still, I understand, in hospital. I want to wish him a speedy recovery.

I am proud to have this opportunity to stand up today before this Assembly and respond to the throne speech.

Let me begin by saying I am certainly pleased with the measures included in the Speech from the Throne during these difficult times. It is imperative that the government has a strong plan of action in place which will help make this province stronger. I believe our government has achieved this goal through the measures that we have outlined in the throne speech. With our government working together with all Manitobans, we will come out of these difficult times in excellent condition.

So I am pleased that this government is implementing its new plan for economic renewal. I agree we must focus on new ideas and new ways of thinking—this means every aspect of our province from the economy to child care, from health care to the environment and, of course, Natural Resources.

A Manitoba that will be prepared for what the Speech from the Throne described as the winds of change that are sweeping the globe—well, with the leadership of our Premier Filmon, I believe Manitoba is going to be ready for future challenges.

Our government's plan for economic renewal will positively impact all residents of my constituency, the Gimli constituency. They will be able to go forth with new business ideas, knowing we will be able to be using a foundation of tax control and competitive climate for investment—local business development, international marketing initiatives, investment infrastructure, diversification agriculture and, of course, resource-based activities.

* (1750)

It is also encouraging, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a special focus on sectors of the economy where new opportunities are emerging, like health care industries, information and telecommunications, aerospace, environmental industries, agriculture and tourism.

Tourism, of course, is very important to many people in my constituency and very important to me.

The people in my constituency rely on this industry, many of them do, for their livelihood, and it is reassuring to know that this government is exploring new ways of tapping into this important industry. With the poor summer that most tourist operators had this past summer due to weather conditions, everyone involved in the industry is certainly looking forward to next summer and the pent-up demand that is there for next summer, and I hope that the Canadian dollar stays where it is. This will certainly help to attract new tourists to our province.

So I welcome this government's continuing commitment to strengthen the rural economy. It does not take a university graduate in economics, of course, to figure out that a strong rural Manitoba is the key to a stronger Manitoba. Since forming the government, we have been able to assist thousands of rural Manitobans experiencing tough economic times. With this continued effort, we feel the situation is going to get even better.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Programs like the Rural Development Grow Bond program and the Rural Economic Development Initiative have already had a positive impact in rural Manitoba and on my constituency. The Grow Bond program, for example, has been very effective for one industry in the village of Teulon in my constituency. Last May, the Teulon Rural Development Bond Corporation was given the authority to sell \$800,000 in rural development bonds, with the money raised from this bond sale going into the development of a local manufacturing plant.

I am pleased to report that within three weeks, the whole issue had been sold out, and through local initiative combined with some provincial government expertise, the Teulon residents were able to start the ball rolling toward the creation of another local industry. This means more jobs, of course, which, in turn, means the Teulon economy will benefit.

Grow Bonds allow Manitobans to invest in their own communities, and I am proud that the people of my constituency and of Teulon have taken advantage of this opportunity. [interjection] Yes, that is right. The company, the Care Corporation has ordered their equipment and hopes to be in production by January of '93.

I understand that just recently, Portage had a new bond issue there, so that is just an indication of what

the rural development bond program is doing for rural Manitoba and the jobs that are being created and the investment. I think it is just great for Manitoba.

Under the REDI Program, the REDI Green Team, for example, has just been able to put several young people in my constituency to work. They were given the opportunity to earn some much needed money while learning the values of hard work and repairing facilities in Hecla Island and Winnipeg Beach. Their work was certainly appreciated by the Natural Resources people.

A third program that assists urban and rural Manitobans and deserves mention is the Manitoba Community Places Program.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Funding through the Manitoba Community Places Program has paved the way for a number of community-based groups in my constituency to proceed with projects that are important to our local residents. For example, the past summer I had the pleasure of taking part in the official opening of the Arris Centre in Stonewall.

The Arris Centre prepares adults with disabilities for employment in the community. It plays an important role in Stonewall and the surrounding area. With the help of the Community Places Program funding totalling \$50,000, special-needs adults now have access to a modern facility where they learn key skills that they can use in the work force. This also helps my constituency and the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) and the member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans), so it is a great thing for the whole Interlake area.

Community Places also made it possible for ice skaters in the town of Balmoral to have a longer season through a Community Places grant of \$40,000 in assistance. An artificial ice plant there had been installed in the Balmoral Recreation Centre. The arena is always a popular recreation spot in any Manitoba community for both adults and children. Manitobans rely on their local arenas for sports as well as a meeting place and, by having artificial ice, Balmoral residents can now enjoy their facility for much longer periods of time.

The Community Places Program is, I think, an excellent program and doing an excellent job of guaranteeing all Manitobans access to well-maintained facilities, and I am pleased this

program is available for any community organization.

I am proud of the economic development that was achieved this past year in the Gimli constituency in the town of Gimli. The Gimli street and waterfront project was officially completed. This extensive project involved major redevelopment and upgrading of Gimli's waterfront as well as the town's streets and sidewalks.

Gimli is important to Manitoba's tourism industry, and I feel this project has certainly made the community and the town even more attractive. I am proud that our government has been able to lend a financial hand to see this project to completion. The waterfront committee and the Town Council and everyone involved in the project should be commended for their hard work on this project.

For any of you who have been to Gimli, if you drive down Main Street, you will see the nice blue light posts and one thing and another with the blue and gray sidewalks. The colour schemes are— [interjection] That is right. It worked very well. Last Thursday's Speech from the Throne also included a commitment that I welcome and that I know many rural Manitobans welcome as well. This government will review the feasibility of a new initiative of rural gasification. This is to help provide a more diversified energy supply.

There are thousands of Manitobans across the province who do not have the option of natural gas service in their community, something many urban

dwellers take for granted. As well, with the rural gasification many rural communities may soon become more attracted to industries that require this form of industry and energy in order to operate. I am pleased that this government is going to examine this matter, so that there is the opportunity that natural gas may soon be available across this province. Not only will it help industry, but it is also beneficial to agriculture.

Many forms of agriculture will benefit by providing natural gas for grain drying which was important especially this past fall with the heavy damp crops. The propane companies kind of took advantage of the farmers this past year, just when the demand was at its peak they had increased the prices. [interjection] That is right. This will also help the industries in the Interlake area such as Northern Goose Processors, who are high energy users, Charison's Turkey Hatchery. This will give them an opportunity to develop and grow and be competitive in their industries. So this natural gas is very important to many of our rural communities. Also, natural gas will give farmers an opportunity to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am interrupting the member according to the rules. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have 26 minutes remaining.

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

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Tuesday, December 1, 1992

CONTENTS

Speaker's Statement

Resignation of E. Harper
Rocan

101

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Petitions

Restriction of Stubble Burning
Lamoureux
Cheema
Wasylycia-Leis

101

101

101

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry:
Support of Recommendations
Hickes

101

Condition of Highway 391
Ashton

101

Tabling of Reports

Annual Report, Urban Affairs
Ernst

101

Annual Report, Teachers' Retirement
Allowances Fund Board
Vodrey

101

Oral Questions

Poverty Rate
Doer; Filmon; Gilleshammer

101

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation
L. Evans; Cummings

103

Poverty Rate
Carstairs; Filmon

104

Social Assistance

Carstairs; Filmon; Mitchelson

104

Bill 70

Martindale; Gilleshammer

105

Grain Transportation Proposal

Plohman; Findlay

106

Health Care System

Cheema; Orchard

107

Lockport, Manitoba

Dewar; Driedger; Stefanson

109

Education System

Gray; Filmon

109

Nonpolitical Statements

World AIDS Day

Cheema

110

Wasylycia-Leis

110

Orchard

111

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Throne Speech Debate

(Third Day of Debate)

Santos

111

McAlpine

117

Gray

124

Ernst

132

Wowchuk

139

Helwer

146