



**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. 9 - 1:30 p.m., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1992**



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

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

---

<b>NAME</b>	<b>CONSTITUENCY</b>	<b>PARTY</b>
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, 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 8, 1992

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of W.J. Karle, J.P. Karle, Thom Irving and others, requesting the government of Manitoba to pass the necessary regulations which will restrict stubble burning in the province of Manitoba.

### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs). It complies with the privileges and the practices of the House, and it complies with the rules (by leave). Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

To the Legislature of the province of Manitoba

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

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

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

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

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

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

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### Bill 208—The Workers Compensation Amendment Act

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), that Bill 208, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

**Motion presented.**

\* (1335)

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to recognize the occupational health hazards encountered by firefighters in the performance of their duties while protecting the lives and property of Manitobans.

Medical studies have shown that there is a greater incidence of heart injury and injuries to the lungs, brains and kidneys of firefighters than for any other compatible profession. Firefighters were covered for such work-related injuries until Workers Compensation regulations were struck down by Justice Lyon in 1988, due to the lack of specific legislation. This bill provides the specifics, Mr. Speaker.

This firefighter protection bill has been extensively debated by all members wishing to do so in the last session of the Legislature and was, except for procedure, nearly passed at committee.

I am sure that all members support firefighters and would wish to move this bill forward with a minimum of debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Motion agreed to.**

### 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 General Wolfe School, fifty Grade 9 students. They are under the direction of Mr. Herold Driedger. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

Also this afternoon, we have from the St. George School, sixty Grade 9 students under the direction of Mr. Clint Harvey. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render).

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

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Decentralization Criteria

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

The government is proceeding with their decentralization programs and having announcements being made by various cabinet ministers at various photo opportunities almost on a weekend-by-weekend basis.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Doer:** We are obviously hitting a raw nerve, Mr. Speaker.

The government has proceeded with decisions to announce 26 jobs in Carman and deliver 31 jobs. It has proceeded to announce jobs in Winkler and deliver those jobs. It has proceeded to announce various jobs and even exceed that in some communities held by Conservative cabinet ministers.

On the other hand, communities with higher unemployment, with just the same kind of economic needs, if not greater economic needs, outside of Winnipeg, like Dauphin, were promised 34 jobs in 1990, pre-election, I might add. Only seven jobs have been delivered and some 60 jobs have been lost.

I would like to ask the Premier: What criteria are his government using in the decentralization program that he has implemented?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, the criteria involve a common-sense analysis of what services can be provided by government at least as efficiently and effectively outside the city of

Winnipeg as they can within the city of Winnipeg, where they will also provide economic benefit to the communities in which they are located.

We have steadfastly said that if we lack either the technology or the ability to provide the services as efficiently if not more efficiently and effectively in the host community, then obviously we cannot transfer the jobs into the host community. Consequently, every individual decision has been based on that kind of analysis, and we have proceeded, as the member has well documented, to decentralize more than 550 jobs now throughout the province of Manitoba, some 600 jobs. In all of the communities, they have been very well received. The services are proceeding very, very well, and the public is happy with them. The host communities are happy with them, and it is a win-win situation for everybody.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, we have decisions being cancelled in areas of higher unemployment, in northern Manitoba, in the parklands of Manitoba, and we have decisions to proceed with many, many jobs in southwestern Manitoba, where the unemployment rate is the lowest in Manitoba.

I would like to know from the Premier: Are the criteria political considerations of the Conservative front benches or the economic considerations in Manitoba in terms of opportunities and economic requirements of Manitobans?

**Mr. Filmon:** The commitments that we have undertaken to northern Manitoba have either been proceeded with in totality or are still underway. For instance, CEDF, Communities Economic Development Fund, which is a fund for rural and remote community development, was operated for all those years out of Winnipeg, a terribly inappropriate place for it. That has been located and is operating out of Thompson—it has been for quite some time—because of a result of a decision of this government. We are doing that. There have been jobs decentralized to Flin Flon, the MHSC jobs. In all cases, we are working to ensure that these jobs are made available to these areas to ensure that they are being done efficiently, effectively in serving the people of the province and, at the same time, providing substantial economic benefit to the local community.

**Mr. Doer:** The Premier quotes Flin Flon; he should note that there were 24 jobs promised, seven delivered, and 12 jobs lost so far in Flin Flon.

I would like to ask the Premier: He has argued for fairness with the Prime Minister; he has argued that Manitoba be treated fairly by our federal Conservative Prime Minister. Would the Premier please be intellectually consistent and tell us whether political constituencies were part of the criteria that the cabinet used and the Premier used to choose where the jobs would go in this province?

\* (1340)

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, we will talk about intellectual consistency and the New Democrats. That is a contradiction in terms. The New Democrats may want to judge us based on their criteria, and we will not accept that judgment. They played politics in everything they did, and we will not do that. That is why we have placed jobs in Thompson, that is why we have placed jobs in Flin Flon, that is why we have placed jobs throughout this province, in Brandon East and in many areas that are not represented by members on this side of the House, because we are doing it in the interests of fairness, we are doing it in the interest of consistency, which is more than I can say for my colleague opposite.

**Mr. Doer:** I have a new question for the Premier, and I want to table a memo from the clerk of cabinet, who works directly for the Premier, to the co-ordinator of decentralization. I would like to quote from that memo that states, quote: The Honourable Jim Downey brought a provincial map showing locations of decentralized operations to cabinet. Please prepare a similar map using a provincial constituency map as the base for showing the proposed decentralization moves.

I would like to ask the Premier: Is this the criterion the Premier actually used and instructed his whole government to do pre-election in 1990 in terms of decisions of this government?

**Mr. Filmon:** I cannot believe that the member would even put that forward when he knows that we have put jobs in Dauphin, we have put jobs in Thompson, we have put jobs in Flin Flon, we have put jobs in Brandon East, we have put jobs in Selkirk. We have put jobs in all of these areas that are not Conservative seats. The member opposite has totally destroyed his own argument by virtue of the information that we have provided for him. It is absolute nonsense.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, when the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) and the co-chair of the election

planning committee bring a map to cabinet, that is not good enough for the Premier because a geographic map is not good enough for their cabinet. They need a constituency map before the election.

How does the Premier justify instructing the Civil Service through the clerk of cabinet to prepare a constituency map, and how can he say and stand up in this House and not admit that this was a political decision from Day One? The cancellation of jobs in rural Manitoba were political, and this Premier ran the whole decentralization campaign in a political partisan way with a constituency map of this province.

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, because we anticipated that we would get this kind of foolish argument from the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), we wanted to make sure that we had the evidence to demonstrate that we had put jobs in Thompson, that we had put jobs in Flin Flon, that we had put jobs in Dauphin, that we had put jobs in Selkirk, that we had put jobs in Brandon East, because we knew exactly the kind of foolish argument that he would put forward.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, he did in fact promise pre-election jobs in Dauphin, and then he cancelled them after the election. He promised 34 before the election, 60 of them lost after the election; promised jobs in Flin Flon, 24 before the election, seven were delivered, 12 were cancelled after the election; promised jobs in The Pas, six were delivered, 19 jobs were lost.

What are the criteria this Premier is using? He is using partisan, political interference in the delivery of public services in this province. This memo proves that this Premier was only interested in his own re-election, not interested in the economic well-being of Manitobans throughout this province.

\* (1345)

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite comes forward with absolute balderdash. The reality is that there are many communities that have not got the jobs that have been promised, one being Souris, for instance. The town of Souris, why did you not bring that one up? How about Gladstone? How about Hamiota? Those are areas that are represented by Conservative MLAs. There is absolutely not a shred of truth to the statement that is made by the member for Concordia, which is totally consistent with all of the accusations that he makes in this House.

totally consistent with all of the accusations that he makes in this House.

### Video Lottery Terminals Legion Participation

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

This government's "anything goes" gambling policy is hurting a great number of Manitobans. In fact, we have one legion in Ste. Rose that has sent out minutes indicating that they are going to have to shut down the legion, by the looks of it, by the end of this month, because of the way in which this government is introducing its gambling policy, if they even have a gambling policy.

My question to the Premier is: Will the minister change the policy and allow VLTs in the legion halls, given that it is an absolute shame, the manner in which this government is treating the legions throughout this province, absolute shame?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member for Inkster one policy on gambling that I have, and that is that I will not bet on his chances of being the next leader of the Liberal Party. The answer to his question is—[interjection]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Filmon:** Well, it shows that the New Democrats never could handicap properly.

The answer to his question is: That is a matter that we are still under discussion with with representatives of the legions of this province on, and we will continue to consult as we move forward on various different aspects of our policy with respect to gaming in this province.

The minister responsible, the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), has been very fair and very reasonable and has spent time listening to people who have concerns, from all areas of the province and from all various sectors, including the legions.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat unfortunate that we have one legion in particular that is having to look at closing their doors because of actions of this government, which is most unfortunate, because this government is not prepared or was not prepared to introduce a gambling policy, that it has decided to do it in such an ad hoc way in which you are pitting communities against communities.

Why did this government not think through all the implications before bringing in the VLT system?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, the various programs that have been brought forward in this province have been brought forward with intent and purpose.

The member talks about a legion possibly closing its doors. We would have lost half of the hotels in southern rural Manitoba if we had not brought forth the policy of implementing VLTs in those hotels. The hotel keepers and the hotel owners have said that publicly. He, as a member of this Legislature, ought to be concerned about that because it would have been a very negative impact on many of the communities in rural southern Manitoba had that occurred.

I know that the member for Interlake (Mr. Cliff Evans) understands that full well. It is a very substantial economic benefit to those people, so we have brought forward these policies after careful consideration. We have announced that these policies are progressing step by step, and so that when we brought the VLTs into rural southern Manitoba, it was to address a very severe problem being faced by the hotels in that area.

We have said that we are going to be expanding it so that hotels within the city of Winnipeg are the next step in the chain. We have done those things after careful consideration and a great deal of consultation. We are in the process of consultation with the legions as part of this overall approach to ensuring that it is done carefully and in the best interests of all the people of Manitoba.

\* (1350)

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier says that he was concerned and he listened to the hoteliers. Why is the Premier not concerned in listening to what the legions are saying? Why is it that the Premier is being very one-sided on this whole debate? There has been no public consultation. There has not been any coherent policy. An ad hoc—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Inkster has put his question.

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, the question was, why am I not concerned? The answer is that I am concerned; that our government is concerned. That is why we are in the midst of consultations with the legions. If we were not concerned, we would not be in discussion with them.

### Decentralization Criteria

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace that this government should consider political interference as they plotted decentralization on constituency maps.

I want to ask the Premier: Is this map still in use, or has the map changed since the election, and is that why all the decentralized jobs are going to Tory ridings or ridings—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member has put her question.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker—

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We do not need a singsong right now.

**Mr. Filmon:** You know, Mr. Speaker, here we have the member for Swan River and her colleagues all of a sudden crying wolf when they voted against decentralization. They were opposed to the entire policy, opposed to the policy. Here we are, through the process of decentralization, transferring jobs into Thompson, transferring jobs into Flin Flon, transferring jobs into Dauphin, transferring jobs into Selkirk, transferring jobs into Brandon East, and they now are complaining about the fact that their constituencies are getting jobs. I cannot believe it.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Mr. Speaker, we voted against political interference.

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier tell us then when we will see this government carry through with the balance of its promised jobs? When will we see jobs in Dauphin? When will we see jobs in Thompson and in The Pas?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, you know, here is the member for Swan River; we have a personal care home being constructed, thanks to the policies and the decisions of this government, right in her community of Swan River, and she has the audacity to complain about this government and its fairness. She ought to be ashamed. She does not represent her people, and she does not have any sense of fairness and reasonableness when she asks her question.

### Completion

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, will the Premier admit that he is not telling

the truth when it comes to that they are not going to proceed with decentralization since—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would ask the honourable member for Swan River to remove that remark from the record.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Yes, I will remove that.

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable member for Swan River, kindly put your question now, please.

\* (1355)

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Will the Premier admit that he is misleading the public while carrying on about proceeding with decentralization since the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) has already told the Dauphin media that the remaining 160 or 170 jobs will not be carried out for the next two or three years, or is this government—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member has put her question.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, we announced, I believe it was about three years ago, at the Union of Manitoba Municipalities annual meeting, in fact, it was November of 1989 in Brandon, we announced at that time that we would be decentralizing a total of 693 jobs. Now, despite recession, despite difficult challenges for this government, despite the opposition of the New Democratic Party, we have decentralized over 600 jobs. That is a commitment that we made, and that is a commitment that we have kept.

In conjunction with that, jobs have gone to Dauphin, jobs have gone to Selkirk, jobs have gone to Brandon East, jobs have gone to Thompson, jobs have gone to Flin Flon, all of those areas of New Democratic Party holdings we, we have decentralized jobs, Mr. Speaker. That is because of a commitment that this government has made, a commitment to fairness, a commitment to balance and a commitment to rural and northern Manitoba that was not supported by the New Democrats. They ought to be ashamed, embarrassed, to even bring forward these questions.

### Decentralization Northern Manitoba

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, the North has been particularly hard hit by cuts in government positions and the political decisions as to where decentralization is taking place. The unemployment rate currently in The Pas sits at 25

percent, and the more further north you go, it is 90 percent.

My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon): Since unemployment in the North is the highest of any region in the country, why did this government put the majority of jobs in southwest Manitoba, which has the lowest unemployment rate in Manitoba? Has he not realized the effects of the Repap layoffs and cuts to the Clearwater Nursery, and other increases in the unemployment rate in Manitoba?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, for a member who decided to run for a party, who was unable to get one thing under the New Democratic Party, to ask this kind of a question, where in fact the Community Economic Development Fund, with some 12 employees, is now operating out of Thompson, Manitoba, where it should be, not sitting downtown at 55 Carlton on the 12th or 15th floor where nobody could get to it—it is now very appropriately placed in Thompson, Manitoba, providing the needs of the North.

The Pas, as well, was a recipient of decentralized jobs, which are important in that community and, as well, Mr. Speaker, major initiatives by this government to assure the ongoing operation of the Manfor Repap plant, a credit to this government, not to the one he chose to sit with.

### Decentralization Northern Manitoba

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is again directed to the First Minister.

How does the First Minister explain the fact that there are fewer civil servant positions in northern Manitoba today, after decentralization, than when the Premier began this plan in 1990?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, there are fewer civil servant positions overall in this province. That is the reality of having government be more efficient and taking less dollars from the taxpayer. That is the reality. We do not want to add more taxes like New Democrats do. We absolutely refuse to raise the taxes in the obscene way that the New Democrats did. As a result of that, we have 1,200 fewer civil servants across the province as a whole. We believe that is the right policy, and the people of Manitoba believe it is as well.

### Keewatin Community College Funding

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, my last question is again directed to the First Minister.

Over the past two years, despite a rising unemployment rate in the North and the need for more training, Keewatin Community College has had major reductions. I would like to ask the First Minister if he would assure the House today that KCC will not be hit again in the next budget.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, you know, this is a wonderful way for the New Democrats to start rumours in this House, is to imply through questions that something is being considered. I know of no plans to target any particular area. We have an obligation to review the entire workings of the Civil Service to ensure that we can deliver the services of this province as efficiently and effectively as possible. We will continue to examine every possible avenue. We will go through line by line, position by position, department by department, section by section, and make sure that we can have this Civil Service operate as efficiently as possible, and we will examine every particular option, because we do not want to raise taxes like the New Democrats raised taxes. That is the wrong policy, and we reject it.

\* (1400)

### Video Lottery Terminals Revenues

**Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural Development.

Last July, when the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) announced the establishment of video lottery terminals for rural Manitoba, he said the revenues would be used for rural economic development. The expected amount for the first year was to be \$5.3 million. While the actual figure is reported to be \$7 million, a week ago, the Minister of Rural Development said any amount over the REDI program's budget of \$2.4 million will go to general revenues.

Can the minister tell the House when he changed the policy and why? Why is this minister breaking a commitment made to the people of Manitoba?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know where



the member does his research and gets his information, but indeed neither the \$7 million—that was a figure that I do not know where it came from. Certainly it did not come from our office. I indicated in the very beginning that we had been given some \$2.4 million for the REDI program from VLT revenues. In addition there was over \$895,000, I believe, given to the Grow Bonds program from the VLT revenues. In addition, we put \$740,000 into The Green Team. So, in total, we have committed over \$4 million to various Rural Economic Development Initiatives across this province.

It is true that the anticipated revenues were going to be \$5.3 million. That is something that we had to put our best efforts in guessing, what the revenues were going to be, because we had no history of VLT revenues in this province prior to us introducing them last November. If there are additional revenues, those will be dealt with through the normal process and the budget process.

**Mr. Gaudry:** In case the minister has not seen the press release from his department, I will table it. A promise was made to direct all revenues into rural economic development, a promise this government is breaking. If it was the government's intent to use VLT revenues for general purposes, why did this minister not have the integrity and the honesty to say so from the beginning?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, It is interesting that the member gets up now in support of rural economic development, because first of all they voted against it in the beginning.

Let me say that, indeed, every penny that we were given in the Estimates process and in the budget process will be used for Rural Economic Development Initiatives. As I have indicated, we have already committed over \$4 million towards Rural Economic Development Initiatives in rural Manitoba. Our largest commitment was to Ayerst, where we were able to commit \$1 million from the video lottery terminals, and Ayerst is in Brandon, a rural community in this province. Indeed the monies we have committed have gone to rural Manitoba, to Rural Economic Development Initiatives in the province.

**Mr. Gaudry:** If the minister has committed it, will the minister commit today to channel every penny raised from rural VLTs back to rural Manitoba in the form of rural development initiatives that create jobs and strengthen local economies?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, when we introduced video lotteries into this province, first of all the opposition and, I might say, the member's own party, the critic from the Liberal Party, his own party, were opposed to video lottery terminals and the whole concept. We indicated at that time, in anticipation of revenues of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5.3 million, that those revenues would be used for Rural Economic Development Initiatives. That commitment stands. We have committed over \$4 million to date to Rural Economic Development Initiatives, and our commitment is to rural Manitoba.

### **Decentralization Vital Statistics Branch**

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) stood in this House and said that politics and constituency maps had nothing to do with the criteria in making decisions with regard to decentralization. Yet, since the 1990 election, we have had, of the 34 jobs that were to be transferred to Dauphin, only seven of those transferred. So 27 were not transferred to Dauphin. In addition to that, we have had over 30 jobs lost in Corrections, in Agriculture, in Natural Resources, in Highways, in various departments, over 60 jobs lost.

I want to ask the First Minister or the Minister of Rural Development why those jobs for Vital Statistics were not delivered to Dauphin as promised.

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development):** Mr. Speaker, I have indicated on several occasions that when the commitment was made, I believe it was 640 jobs that would be decentralized throughout rural Manitoba. Since that time, we have gone through some budget reductions in government as a whole. I can indicate to the House today that instead of 640 jobs which we had promised at the beginning, we are up to over 760 jobs. The decentralization to Dauphin was one of the first decentralizations that we did as a matter of fact, and the opening at the Native Education Branch was one of the first that I attended in Brandon.

So our commitment is to rural Manitoba. Indeed, Vital Statistics had been identified for Dauphin. As I have indicated in many questions with regard to Vital Statistics, there were reasons why we could not decentralize Vital Statistics at that time. The computerization program that has to be updated is

one of those major reasons. When that has been completed, we will then reassess the entire situation.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, that answer is absolutely untrue. In this same memo that my Leader quoted from earlier, it said that at cabinet each minister will be required to agree that each proposed move within their department is practical, feasible, logistically sound and achievable by the established target date.

What is this minister's excuse for not delivering? How is it that he is saying he found out later about computerization—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member has put his question.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Dauphin just read the answer into the record when he asked the question. First of all, it has to be practical. Secondly, every department was asked to ensure that before we decentralized any positions, we would make sure that the decentralization process would be such that would benefit the community and would not be done in such a way that would be a haphazard way.

If we compare our decentralization program to any of the other provinces that have attempted decentralization, our decentralization program is probably the most successful in Canada, and I am proud of the program.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, how can this minister stand in this House and tell this House the information that he has when in fact this memo was written February 16, 1990, prior to the public announcement? It was his job to ensure that these decisions were logistically sound before they were announced. If they met that criteria, why were they announced if they could not be delivered? What games were—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member has put his question.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member from Dauphin that indeed our commitment is not—

**An Honourable Member:** For Dauphin.

**Mr. Derkach:** For Dauphin, because he is not from Dauphin.

When Vital Statistics was identified to be moved to Dauphin, one of the things that the department did bring to our attention was that it would be far

better and far more practical for us to do the entire computerization system renewal before that kind of an initiative could be embarked upon. The co-ordinator of decentralization pressed the department to get some answers in terms of how long this would take.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated on many occasions that when that process is complete, we will then revisit that decision and make sure that we will live up to our commitments.

### Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Recommendations

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

We raised some questions in this Chamber yesterday about the AJI, and I noted the minister's press release with respect to the AJI that 107 recommendations or 36 percent of the recommendations of the AJI were within provincial jurisdiction.

Can the minister outline today how many of those recommendations have been implemented?

\*(1410)

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** In addition to support of the government of Manitoba to the St. Theresa Point Youth Court, in addition to the support of this government for the Human Justice Training Program which helps aboriginal people be trained for justice work, in addition to ongoing work that is taking place with specific communities respecting an aboriginal court model in Manitoba, in addition to this government's support for the Hollow Water sexual abuse project, in addition to this government's support for the DOTC probation services, in addition to this government's support for the DOTC police department, this government has in direct response to the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry responded—in addition to the Department of Natural Resources, Northern and Native Affairs, Family Services and the Women's Directorate in the Justice department, we have responded by addressing the recommendation respecting the granting of interim legal aid certificates over the telephone; we have developed in conjunction.

### Youth Programs

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** The minister specifically, in the press release, indicated there

would be three initiatives taken out for youth and crime, youth specialists to work with young offenders, family abuse teams and crime prevention programs for youth in aboriginal communities.

Can the minister indicate the status of those three specific programs that the minister indicated at the time he would be implementing?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** We have begun that process with our support for the St. Theresa Point Youth Court and, I suggest, the Hollow Water sexual abuse project.

As I said, we have begun consultations with respect to aboriginal court models in selected aboriginal communities for the most part in northern Manitoba. With respect also to our response to the inquiry and to the need that is there, was there long before the inquiry and remains there, in conjunction with aboriginal advisory groups, we have developed a proposal for changing the operation of the circuit courts. The justice of the peace program is being reviewed with a view to appointing more native justices of the peace. We have elder services available in all of our correctional institutions in Manitoba since the release of the report.

**Mr. Chomiak:** My final supplementary to the same minister: The minister indicated that these three specific programs to youth—and that is very timely because youth and crime is a very serious issue in our society—would be implemented. Has the minister implemented these three simple programs that he indicated in his press release January 28 he would be implementing?

**Mr. McCrae:** We have engaged in more cross-cultural training, native awareness training programs amongst officers in our correctional facilities. These are being revised and updated by officers of aboriginal ancestry. The program is part of the basic training program for all recruits in corrections. Correction officers who have not taken the course in the past five years will be enrolled with a view to completing the course within the next two years. We have native advisory committees already formed at Brandon and Dauphin, and we are attempting to create them for all the other institutions. I mentioned DOTC services. In the area of prosecutions, we have made direct responses to the Harper and Osborne aspects of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry.

### **Hazardous Waste Environmental Liability**

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** My question is for the Minister of Environment, Mr. Speaker.

In the last session of the Legislature, the House passed amendments to The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act, giving power to the director of enforcement in the department to issue cleanup orders against almost anyone who was ever involved with a piece of contaminated property, whether or not they were directly involved in the contamination. Flowing from that the minister appointed an advisory committee on environmental liability. It has now come forward with its report, and the minister has had it since October 5.

Mr. Speaker, my question for the minister: That report clearly calls for decisions of liability apportionment to be taken outside of his office's hands and given to an independent decision-maker. Will the minister commit today to abiding by this report's recommendation and putting environmental liability decision-making authority in the hands of an independent body, such as an administrative tribunal or court, instead of making those decisions out of his office?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I think on one hand the member would like this minister to take far more arbitrary action, but on the other hand, he is not sure that he is really committed to that. This report that is referred to is a very valued report, as a matter of fact, a multisectoral response to what is a very difficult problem for the Department of Environment. But what he has overlooked however in his question is that we committed ourselves to a much broader consultation as well on the national scale. I have attempted to put this on the agenda of the national ministers' conference, and we will continue to push forward on a broader basis so that Manitoba, or any other jurisdiction for that matter, does not become an island in terms of how we pursue these issues.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister will answer this question. On the last page of this report, under recommendations, the committee specifically indicated that the government must take stronger steps to prevent future contamination.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that this minister and this government has to continue to suffer the admonishment of groups from the business community like the Canadian Bankers' Association,

the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, who are both on this task force? Why does the government have to keep being criticized by these bodies to take action to enforce its regulations? This is the third time this year that this government has been criticized by the business community for its lack of enforcement.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, there is, I think, a little bit of contradiction between what the member would like to portray and what actually occurs. As a matter of fact, I am admonished many times for the department being too active in its activities in relationship to enforcement and control, but let me assure you that the implementation of The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act is the priority function of the department at this juncture, and we are moving forward in that respect.

**Mr. Speaker:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

### Nonpolitical Statements

**Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa):** Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable member for Niakwa have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

**Mr. Reimer:** Today I would like to pay special recognition to an event that has been entertaining us for many years and now has been formally recognized by a major American travel organization. Yesterday Folklorama was named the top event in Canada for 1993 by the American Bus Association, which in the world of tourism is a very prestigious award.

The American Bus Association is a major travel industry organized in the United States, consisting of 600 motor coach and travel companies and 2,000 travel-related businesses from across Canada and United States. Simply put, to be recognized by this group, is quite an honour. Folklorama will now be featured in the association's annual top 100 events publication which is distributed throughout North America and overseas.

The American Bus Association chose our Folklorama over 70 other Canadian nominations because of its multicultural appeal, its reputation, its attendance, the theme and the accessibility to motor coach travel. This award recognizes the outstanding effort put in by more than 20,000

volunteers who work efficiently together to create the largest multicultural festival in the world.

These people put in countless hours staffing booths, stamping passports, preparing food, performing and demonstrating handicrafts. In fact, many give up part of their holidays just to work at Folklorama. Through their enthusiasm, their teamwork, their professionalism, these volunteers have placed Folklorama, the city of Winnipeg and the entire province of Manitoba in the tourism spotlight, not only in Canada and United States, but within the world.

As I mentioned earlier, one of the factors that resulted in Folklorama being named the top event in Canada for 1993 was the multicultural appeal Folklorama offers. Multiculturalism is one of this province's greatest assets. It should be preserved and cherished. Through Folklorama, thousands of Manitobans and visitors to this province are able to enjoy our rich culture and our heritage. More than 40 pavilions offer the sights, the sounds, the smells of our proud grassroots.

I, like thousands of other people, have been a regular visitor to Folklorama. I am proud of Folklorama and what it does for preserving multiculturalism, and I ask all members in the Assembly to collectively congratulate the organizers and volunteers of Folklorama.

\* (1420)

**Ms. Marianne Corliss (Radisson):** Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to make a nonpolitical statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the member for Radisson have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

**Ms. Corliss:** I would like to join with the honourable member from the government side and express congratulations to the Folk Arts Council and the number of community groups in Winnipeg and throughout Manitoba that ensure that Folklorama has become such an important festival to the summer in Winnipeg. I would like to express some appreciation to the American Bus Association for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to put on the record a couple of concerns that are expressed to me and I also expressed at the press conference yesterday regarding Folklorama. I just want to say that a number of community groups have expressed to me their concern that Folklorama is in some ways causing them to go into debt and that we have to

look at carefully to ensure that the \$30 million coming to the economy from Folklorama is going to the communities that are doing the hard volunteer work and are representing us so well.

I would just like to encourage all of us to support Folklorama and show that multiculturalism is a great asset and one of our strengths in Manitoba. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for myself—

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable member for Inkster have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to stand up and to pay tribute to all the volunteers, and there are literally hundreds of thousands of volunteers who have contributed in some way over the number of years that Folklorama has been in existence.

I know my colleague from St. Boniface was a mayor of the one of the pavilions at one time. For many of us inside this Chamber, we have participated in different ways, whether it was participating as a member of the audience, possibly even getting up or recruited on the floor to participate in a dance or a song—for some of us who have volunteered our services, but most importantly, to those volunteers that take so much of their personal time. I am aware of individuals who will take their holidays on or during Folklorama so that they can contribute that much more towards ensuring that this particular event is a success.

Mr. Speaker, I guess those are the individuals whom I really want to pay that special tribute to, those individuals who go far beyond what most would expect in terms of being able, as I say, to taking their holidays, by immediately leaving their workplace and going to the pavilions for a straight week. It is no easy feat.

We are not talking about a small number of individuals. We are talking about a significant portion of Winnipeggers and individuals outside of the city of Winnipeg who all contribute to ensuring that we have what I would classify as a first-class world event that has attracted individuals not only from North America but throughout the world.

We look forward to seeing Folklorama for many, many more years to come. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, do I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the member for Gimli have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Speaker, I rise in this House today to pay tribute to a man who has left his mark on many Manitoba communities and on millions of tourists who have travelled to these communities over the last number of years.

George Barone died yesterday in Kelowna, B.C. He was 76 years old. George Barone was one of Manitoba's most noted sculptors. His work is enjoyed throughout this province. In my constituency, he created a famous Viking statue which has watched over the town of Gimli for many years.

His other well-known works include: Tommy Turtle in Boissevain, Alpine Archie in McCreary, the Ashern grouse, Sara the camel in Glenboro, King Miner in Thompson and the very famous white horse which has been standing just west of Headingley for about 35 years. Millions of tourists have stopped by these statues and had their pictures taken beside them.

Barone arrived in Winnipeg from Italy in 1949. He had worked for the CBC as a set designer, as well as in his own studio. Mr. Barone and his family eventually moved to the Kelowna area 12 years ago. Not only is he remembered as a great sculptor, but as a great human being as well. He is survived by his wife and two sons.

His larger-than-life statues are known for being able to withstand our hot summers and bitterly cold winters. Besides the many in our province, there are about 15 communities across the country that have the Barone statues.

If you want to find out how much of an impact Mr. Barone's work has had on Manitoba towns or villages that hired him, just ask anyone who has visited Gimli, Ashern or Boissevain, and you will always hear about the statue that belongs to each community. I believe that this is the greatest compliment that we have paid to this sculptor.

Mr. Speaker, I call on all members of the Legislative Assembly to pay tribute to Mr. George Barone. Thank you.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**  
**THRONE SPEECH DEBATE**  
**(Eighth Day of Debate)**

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) for an address to the honourable Administrator in answer to his speech at the opening of the session, the honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to address a few remarks to the Speech from the Throne which very clearly laid out the continued mandate of this government to attempt to use a steady hand in directing the province in terms of developing opportunities to take advantage of international opportunities.

I want to congratulate you on being back in the Chair and wish you good luck in trying to keep a steady hand on members of this House who sometimes get a little unruly, probably myself included, but I wish you luck in trying to control us, because we all understand that in a democratic system this is a very important medium to help the public understand what is going on, and it helps to direct the government in the decision-making process.

I would also like to welcome the six new Pages to this House. I hope that their experience here is a very good one in terms of understanding how the democratic system works. Sometimes what they see in Question Period is not really what goes on in government all the time. There is a little more harmony between the members of this House than what we see in Question Period.

I want to welcome all members back to this House, particularly the new members to the House—the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) here for the first time. I am certain he is going to make a very valuable contribution to our caucus and to this House and, particularly, representing the members of Portage la Prairie. I would also like to take this opportunity to wish well to the former member of Portage la Prairie. He was a good friend of mine in this House, who came to this House and represented his constituents well. He probably left under conditions that he would have preferred to have been different, but he made his contribution, he was a respected member of this House, and I wish him well in his retirement.

I would also like to welcome the returning member to the House from Crescentwood who was on a brief sabbatical between 1990 and now. She is a good person because she comes from rural Manitoba, in fact the riding I used to represent. She grew up in Virden, and I wish her well in this House representing her urban constituents.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Welcome me back, too.

**Mr. Findlay:** The Minister of Natural Resources also would like to be welcomed back, and since he is the dean of the House he is probably the one I should speak about first. He is certainly into his 26th or 27th year, one or the other. It is a very remarkable record in this day and age.

I would like to pay tribute to the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), the member for River Heights, who has obviously made a decision that it is time for her to step down as Leader. I know we did not often agree on many things, but I will say in the course of my Estimates we tended to agree on more things than we disagreed. So in that environment we had a good interrelationship, but in Question Period probably we are certainly on different sides of pretty well every issue.

Also, the member for Churchill, the former member of Rupertsland, I wish him well in his announced retirement and whatever he pursues in the future.

\* (1430)

I want to briefly comment on a few things about agriculture in the few minutes I have available to me. I would like to start by reminding all members of this House, particularly the urban members, of the value of the agriculture industry. One little thing that happened here, I guess it was last spring, when a certain billboard was erected in Winnipeg by the Royal Bank. If any members saw that billboard, I would like to remind them of the slogan. It was a grandpa and a grandchild, and I can reflect on that because I have seven of those grandchildren. The little child, about one or two years of age, was saying: Grandpa says town people need agriculture, too. That was a very good slogan: Town people need agriculture, too. I think a lot of people take for granted the fact that food shows up on shelves, and I would like to remind—[interjection]

Yes, the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) says he was raised on a farm, and I hope that in the process of thinking about agriculture issues, food

issues, urban issues, he remembers the contribution that people in rural Manitoba have made in the last 125 years of this country and particularly the last 123 years when Manitoba has been part of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but remember a comment that I heard from an urban person in a setting where there was seven or eight people from the city of Winnipeg sitting around, and we were talking. This is about the first year I was elected. They were talking about the agriculture issues and, of course, I was talking about some difficulties out on the farm and back in those days low grain prices was the topical issue.

This urban person said why should she worry about farmers because she gets her food at Safeway. I have never forgotten that statement, because she meant it. She truthfully meant it. She thought that food magically arrived on the shelves of Safeway.

We have many, many people in urban settings, Winnipeg, Brandon, all across the world really, who live in an urban environment where food is basically plentiful, particularly in North America and Europe and they take for granted the fact that that food is there. There are a lot of people who have worked very hard to develop a very positive industry in this province, in this country and most of us have, if we think back long enough and hard enough, ancestors who started on the farm.

When this country started 125 years ago, the majority of the occupations were farming or trapping. We have evolved from there and, certainly, the fur industry has encountered some very tough times because of public attitudes. Certainly, we have had some public attitudes that have not been positive about agriculture but, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind all honourable members that there is no place in the world that anybody can produce or consume food of higher quality, more reliable food safety, than they can right here in Manitoba in this province, in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the agriculture industry as a whole in this province generates about \$1.8 billion of income at the farm gate. Sixty percent of that product has to be exported outside of this country in order to be consumed. That is why I so often comment on the value of trade and the relations we have had with countries all over the world in positive trade relationships.

Mr. Speaker, in the grain sector we export over 80 percent of what we produce. We export to some 60 countries of the world. On the livestock side, we export to lesser countries, but nonetheless a significant portion of the livestock sector income also comes from exports.

Mr. Speaker, I have often heard members across the way, both parties, chastise us about supporting trade, about supporting the very lifeblood of our industry. They think that free trade is a dirty word. I want to remind members that in agriculture, we have basically had free trade ever since we started to export from this country. We have had free trade to the United States, free trade to many other parts of the world.

How we function in that I think is something to be proud of, not to make fun of, and the members over there often like to make fun of the fact that we export to the United States large volumes of product. When we are exporting to somebody who is paying cash, we are obviously exporting to somebody who is a willing customer, a satisfied customer.

In Manitoba, since we are so far from salt water, east or west, the United States is becoming a more and more important market for us. I have commented on this in the House in the past and, again, I have had derision from the other sides of the benches in that we have in Manitoba just four years ago exported 14 percent of our total exports to the United States. Today, it is over 30 percent. That is how significant the change in trade routes have been. That is how important it is that we have a trading agreement that allows us to continue to have access to a country of that size. They pay cash. They buy our products regularly. They like our quality. I do not care whether we are talking durum or wheat or oats or barley or pork or beef or pheasants, they like our quality. It is the best there is. We have a reputation that we are very proud of.

Just to give the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) some statistics, because he seems to be interested in the fact that we are successful in that way, just for instance in cattle. From 1988 to '91 we have gone from \$58 million of exports to the United States to \$124 million. So a free, open border is rather important to us. In the cattle industry, we have had a positive trade surplus with that country eight years out of 10. In other words, we are selling more than we are buying from them.

We move trade both ways. We are on a level playing field basically. We are competitive and we succeed very well.

In swine, we have gone from \$30 million to \$50 million of exports over that three-year period. In barley, we have gone from \$4.8 million to \$7.3 million. In many cases here I am talking about a 50 percent, 100 percent increase in the sales in basically three years. In honey, we have gone from \$2.9 million to \$4.1 million, just to give the member some examples. One more example I would like to throw in because of the importance of the crop is canola oil, where we have gone from \$45 million to \$57 million, or canola meal, from \$11 million to \$18 million.

That is how important that market is to us, and that is why we talk so positively about free trade. We have had free trade in this industry as long as I have been here, as long as my ancestors have been here, you know, and I could not help but remember a comment of somebody in the cattle industry during the World Series, saying: Is it not interesting? We have free trade in baseball.

Free trade in baseball—we have free trade in all sports. We have free trade in agriculture. We get so hung up on a few other areas. If they would just follow the examples of sports and agriculture they would do very well in trade.

We are part of the world. We are part of the global trading system, and this industry very definitely is. There is no way you can hide from it. I hear constantly about members on the other side really talking about building the walls higher, preventing trade, impeding trade, trying to hide from the world. We have not in this industry and I am very proud that we have not. We have succeeded relatively well.

That is why it is so difficult for us to understand why certain elements in the United States brought against us trade actions, countervail on pork and swine. Certainly through the dispute settling mechanism with the United States, we have resolved the issue in terms of live swine. We continue to win case after case on pork, and I hope that sooner or later those kinds of trade actions stop from the United States.

Nonetheless, what is really happening day to day right now is more of the opposite. We have a 332 investigation started by the International Trade Commission of the United States Department of Commerce initiating investigations on peas, lentils,

beef and live cattle. I think we will be very successful in defending ourselves and proving that there is no reason that the United States should be able to put countervail in place, but the trade agreement allows a mechanism that will go through that process of trying to protect ourselves.

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

Madam Deputy Speaker, let us face it. In trade, the really big issue is international trade, and it is the GATT agreement we have all heard so much about it. It started back in 1986 under the Uruguay Round. It has been a long and tedious and difficult process. It is one issue in which across Canada, all 10 provinces, all agricultural producers, the federal government, the agribusiness industry all supported the stand that Canada put forward. It was a balanced approach of asking for protection for supply management, meanwhile bringing down trade barriers where there is trade barrier harassment created by trade-distorting subsidies.

I am very proud that in the agricultural industry we were able to come to a conclusion that was unanimous across the country. We have not changed that position from start to finish in this dispute process, but over really the last 18 months, the whole process of those discussions continuing to proceed has been somewhat very difficult for us to accept, because the United States and Europe got into loggerheads over what they were going to do with the agreement, their bilateral discussions went on and on and on, and there was a meeting in Brussels and meetings in Washington. There never seemed to be any breakthrough until late November. There was announcement that the United States and the European Community had agreed on oilseeds for a mechanism that would allow every nation to get back to the larger table to talk about resolving the international trade difficulties, eventually leading, hopefully, to a signed GATT agreement by all countries of the world.

Those 108 nations have been back at the table now for about two weeks, and over the course of the last two weeks you have heard of a lot of difficulties arising in France because their farmers are rioting and refusing to accept the bilateral agreement that was negotiated between the European Community and the United States.

\* (1440)



It is very encouraging to read, in today's Free Press, a comment out of Brussels that the European Community, where the trade and agriculture ministers have been meeting the last two days from the European Community, the 12 European countries, decided yesterday to reject France's demand that the EC refused to discuss farm subsidies and world trade talks unless concessions are reached in other areas. So now at least 11 countries in the European Community would appear to be rejecting the position France has taken.

France has threatened to veto the agreement, either the bilateral agreement or the GATT agreement, at some point along the way. There have been different analyses as to whether they have that power or that right, but basically within the European Community agreement apparently there has to be unanimity in any decisions.

France is saying, they will not agree, so they are more or less saying there will not be unanimity but, Madam Deputy Speaker, this comment from the trade and agriculture ministers of the other 11 countries is relatively encouraging that maybe they will make France understand that in the long-term best interest of their country, and all the countries of the world, we have an agreement that allows a more level playing field in the future than we have had in the past.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there has been each year over \$300 billion spent in the world in agricultural or food subsidies—over \$300 billion. That is a staggering figure, and I ask: Does anybody know if it ever did anybody any good to do that? The taxpayer put that money up. Is it doing the right thing?

If I was to say what my interpretation is, it is promoting production where it is not necessarily economic. It is trying to create production where maybe a comparative advantage says it should not happen.

Madam Deputy Speaker, and all members of this House, without those kinds of subsidies, the economy of rural Manitoba and western Canada would be greatly improved. We have used a lot of taxpayers' monies in the last five or six years trying to offset the impact of those kinds of subsidies: in special grains program payments in '86 and '87; a drought program in '88; a crop loss program in 1989; and then starting with the revenue insurance program in 1991 and '92.

It is a lot of money to try to offset the impact of other people's treasuries. If we do not have resolution of the GATT process, we all know it is very difficult for either provincial or federal governments in this small country to continue to put forward the kind of money we put forward in the past.

Certainly, the entire farm community that I have talked to in the last two years wants to see an agreement reached. Many of us understand that there will be adjustments that you will have to make in the overall process of different government programs, federal or provincial, in terms of what we have to do to be consistent with that agreement.

Many people in the supply and management area are looking at the what ifs in their situation. Particularly, the milk industry is going across Canada, having hearings, some processors and the producers together, trying to deal with how their system was run in the last 20 years, and supply and management in the sort of second generation. From here on, what are the realities?

Really, they are talking about more opportunities to produce raw product in this country, process it and export it all over the world. I condone that. I thank them for that exercise to try to find ways and means that the producers and the processors will work together to improve production, improve processing and sell more product to the world because that creates jobs in rural Manitoba, creates jobs for western Canadians and basically all Canadians.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we have to continue that intense consultation process because if we do not work together from the farm gate right to the consumer, we will miss opportunities. I have said so often to producers across this province we must remember there is one person who guides our industry and that is the ultimate consumer, wherever they are in the world. If they like the quality of the product, the reliability of that product and the food safety aspects of that product, they will continue to buy it. If they are not buying it, we are in big trouble in the industry, and many sectors of the agricultural community have realized that and are working aggressively to try to achieve that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we are in a world of change. We are, no question, in a world of change. It is driven by mankind's ingenuity. It is change that has happened ever since we first set foot in this country 125 years ago—in the case of my ancestors,

just a little bit longer than that. We have evolved, we have evolved, we have evolved, through research and development and trial and error. We have done things better, faster, more efficient, less cost and really we must never lose sight of that, because the ultimate buyer looks for the highest quality at the lowest price, whoever they are, wherever they are—if we do not recognize that and try to evolve our industry in that direction and seek new opportunities where they are economic. We must look at ways and means we can diversify our production base, and we have done a good job of that in the last 20 or 30 years, particularly in the special crops areas in this province where we have the soil and climate in order to do it.

In the livestock sector where we have again the soil and the climate and the entrepreneurship to do it, we have diversified, but I have often said to producers it is only good if it is economic on the bottom line for everybody in the industry, producer, processor, transporter, exporter, whoever they are. Everybody must have a black bottom line in that process or it is not going to be functional.

We must have more value-added industry in this province, in other words, take the raw product, process it and sell a product that has generated more jobs for us. We have had an industry that evolved on selling the raw product, selling the grain, selling the pig, selling the cattle beast. We are moving more and more to understanding that if we can create value-added industries in this province, we can have more jobs.

Certainly a couple of classical examples come to mind. PMU operation, absolutely a fantastic growth industry for this province. It is an industry that started back about 1966 with four people in western Manitoba going down east to talk to the company in Montreal to convince them that in Manitoba we had horse people who would collect the urine from pregnant mares and deliver to a processing plant. That plant was built in Brandon in the late '60s. It has grown and it has grown and it has grown, and that is one industry that has never come to government for stabilization program or for support monies or for bailouts. It is an industry that has evolved very, very effectively, and the announcement a few months ago in Brandon that the company is going to triple its capacity in Brandon will allow the increase in the number of horses and farms in that business in rural Manitoba, and in Saskatchewan, Alberta and North Dakota, but 60

percent of the horses on line are in Manitoba, have been and will continue to be.

We have a lot of people who have gone into that industry in the last few years. We have about 355 operations in that business and will probably be going to grow to over 400, maybe 500 operations in that business, and 60 percent of them will be in the province of Manitoba. We now have some 32,000 horses on line and it will probably grow to about 85,000 horses. That creates hundreds and hundreds of jobs in rural Manitoba in terms of the farmers, the horses, the trailers, the barn building. Madam Deputy Speaker, there is barn building going on in rural Manitoba at a phenomenal pace right now in order to house these horses. There is a horse industry there in terms of breeding and raising the mares. There is a horse industry in terms of the colts and finishing them and slaughtering them and moving them to market.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there is a market for horse meat. We must remember that. We must develop that industry in the province of Manitoba. It is a good industry. It creates jobs, and again I remind all members of this House it is an industry that has never knocked on my door for stabilization or public dollar support. That, I think, is very positive. One must not forget another element that is happening with this industry. It represents diversification in rural Manitoba. It represents value-added industry, and it also represents selling a commodity in the nonfood market.

In agriculture you always think of traditional food. This is nonfood, so we are using acres of land to produce a valuable product profitable outside the food area. The ethanol industry is another example in that direction. One can say the forage seed industry is another example in that direction. Those are the kinds of things we need to do on into the future.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have been very encouraged by the kind of leadership shown by farmers and their leaders in rural Manitoba. About two years ago I went back and I looked at the number of individuals in Manitoba who are leaders either nationally or internationally, people who are respected leaders, chairmen, vice-chairmen of boards and commissions all across this country. Thirty-four people from Manitoba are in those positions. I challenge any province to have an equal level of representation, so we have a lot of leaders. I have talked to these leaders as they

come in to talk about their industry, commodity by commodity, over the years. I have been very privileged to have the opportunity to work with these people.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as I said earlier, we are in an industry of change, and that change will not slow down. No matter what the opposition members would like to do to slow down change and hide from change, we cannot do it, and none of our farm leaders want to do it. That is why in our Speech from the Throne we have indicated that we will put on a major forum to bring these leaders together to focus on where we have been successful, where we need to go in the future, where our opportunities are, and how we can work together, whether we are talking farmers, agribusiness people, processors or government. How can we work together?

\* (1450)

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** How about sugar? It has a fantastic market. What are you doing for sugar for the 90 percent that we need?

**Mr. Findlay:** The member for Dauphin would like to know about sugar. Again, it is a good example of diversification and value-added industry. That industry has been under some degree of challenge because of the lack of a Canadian sugar policy which allows dumping of cheap sugar into this country. We have been constantly making representation to the federal government that that must be solved. I do not want any different trade action on the border than what we face going south and the same should happen coming into this country. There is an opportunity for growth in that industry; there is no question.

The federal minister now has a special measures committee to deal with the sugar industry. It is farmers and processors trying to decide how to deal with the future of the industry. We expect that special measures committee to report fairly soon, and we will be looking for how we are creating equal protection on our border relative to other countries in this world. It is my understanding we are the only country in the world that does not prevent the dumping of sugar. I do not think that is fair. I asked for an open border, but I also want fair trade, equal across the border, and our industry is going to need that if they are going to continue to grow. We have about 27,000 acres in sugar beets. It is a very high-valued crop, very technologically involved, and

we have tremendously good and competent producers in that industry.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that member who sat in the government on this side of the House in 1987 absolutely refused to give stabilization to that industry so it could survive the rough time. They never would have done it if this member and this government—the members who are on this side now who were on that side then pushed that government into doing it. Had that stabilization program not been in place, the industry would not be here today.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in the farm community, in the farm industry, we have definitely put in stabilization programs, safety net programs, but all farmers want to have their income from the marketplace.

I have just a few minutes left. I would like to reflect quickly on some of the sectors. I have already said, the PMU business requires no stabilization, because the industry is sound and solid the way it is.

The cattle industry has never been stronger than it has been this last year. In fact, it has had seven good years in a row, and the tripartite stabilization program is in surplus, Madam Deputy Speaker, because of the strong marketplace.

The hog industry has had its up-and-down cycles.

We have seen growth in the cattle industry, faster in this province than any other province in this country, regardless of what Saskatchewan or Alberta does in terms of programs trying to unlevel the playing field.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the hog industry, as I said earlier, has its up-and-down cycles. They have gained considerable payments under the tripartite stabilization, particularly in the last three quarters, anywhere from \$12 to \$15 a hog, but our hog numbers in this province continue to be there.

We have more barns being built, and we have a challenge in that industry because members around this rural Manitoba seem to want to speak out against building hog barns nowadays. Naturally they are large units, have a lot of hogs, a lot of manure, but the technology is there to set those operations up and run them in an environmentally responsible fashion.

The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) is over there talking to me, so probably she is opposed to building hog barns in rural Manitoba. She is

opposed to agriculture. She is probably opposed to irrigating crops so we could produce product and create jobs for processing in rural Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in the grains industry in Manitoba—

### Point of Order

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson):** The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) referred to me, and I would just like to clarify for the record—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) does not have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Findlay:** The grains industry in rural Manitoba is in difficulty because of international trade problems. There is no question. Major stabilization has gone into that industry.

I hope that the window we see in GATT, that there will be a resolution before Christmas. I hope that that promise comes true. If it does, it will be a breath of fresh air. We will not see instant recovery of international prices, but at least we will start on the recovery mode, and that is the kind of self-confidence people in the grain industry need in rural Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it has been a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak to this Speech from the Throne, because it does lay out a very positive pattern for our province, certainly a more positive pattern than we see in the provinces neighbouring us east and west.

I look forward to the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) and the kinds of questions he will raise in the House in the future. I would hope he is promoting the industry, rather than trying to bring the industry down as his questions of the last two weeks have indicated.

Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to continue on my remarks I started last night on the throne speech.

As I was saying last night, Madam Deputy Speaker, the throne speech document was indeed a very disappointing document. I mentioned last night what I thought a throne speech would be like as it was explained to me before. I got the impression that the throne speech is supposed to

be really a blueprint of what the government was intending to do in the session, but this paper that we were given is, as I said last night, very vague. It has a lot of language that needs to be made workable. I gave the example last night of, for example, language such as "Specific approvals processes will be reviewed with a view to streamlining and better co-ordinating . . . of provincial regulatory bodies." Now I fail to understand how that kind of language in the throne speech would produce employment, particularly in the North. So the more I looked at the throne speech, the more I wonder why our Premier attempted last week to distance himself from the Prime Minister. It is a do-nothing document, as I was saying.

I was just going to explain last night why I view it as a do-nothing document, why this government is a do-nothing document, saying last night that when I was chief of my band, Madam Deputy Speaker, every once in a while I would get accused by my constituents of making the odd mistake and so on. But as a chief, I like to think that I accomplished quite a bit when I was trying to lead my people at The Pas reserve. Yes, I made a mistake here and there, but on the whole I think I accomplished quite a bit. I see this government as being afraid to do something because it does not want to upset anybody, but when it is sitting there doing nothing, of course nothing gets done. So I was going to advise the First Minister last night that for myself I would sooner be criticized for trying to do something. I prefer not to be criticized for doing nothing, because that is worse.

After all, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) pointed out, he was satisfied that the two levels of government, the federal and provincial, were really following the same basic policies. He said, I am satisfied we are on the right track along with the federal government. The problem is that both levels of government are having the same results, they are producing the same results, and that is more people are out of work. There are more layoffs; there are more cuts to programs and services. Of course, the deficit is not going down, it is continuing to go up. People are being thrown out of their jobs and onto the UI system and eventually into the welfare system. These businesslike people who are in government now are supposed to be running the government in a businesslike way, except that they are not producing the results that they are supposed

to be producing and, at the same time, the deficit keeps going up.

The provincial government also likes to say that they have not raised taxes. Although they may once in a while complain about the federal government offloading onto the provinces and, yet, the provincial government does the very same thing by offloading onto municipalities and school boards.

\* (1500)

Another reason is, of course, the provincial government and this Tory government do not like to complain too much about the federal government because they know that the federal government raised income taxes and the province gets a percentage of every increase that the federal government puts in. One notes, Madam Deputy Speaker, that they never complain about the federal government, which has repeatedly raised taxes in the past. As well, when Manitobans use provincial government programs and services, they will note that the price has gone up 50 percent in most cases and well over 100 percent in many cases over the past four years.

As a northerner, of course I am very concerned about the effects of the throne speech on the North. If this is indeed the blueprint for government action as far as the North goes, then the North, I am afraid, is very much in trouble. The North has always been left out.

The Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) quite openly and honestly, I might add, yesterday when he was making his address admitted that rural Manitoba and northern Manitoba do not have the population the South does. In other words, most of the people in the province of Manitoba are situated in southern Manitoba. There are more people in the South than in the North and so, of course, that is where the people are and the votes are. So the North can articulate their needs, their aspirations to this provincial government, but so long as this provincial government does not care about the North—they are more willing to listen to people who live in the South—then the North, I am afraid, is going to continue existing the way it has existed for a long time.

The words "jobs" and "unemployment" were, in my mind, purposely left out of the throne speech. This is again a disturbing message to people of northern Manitoba. The people from northern Manitoba are facing high unemployment. As a

matter of fact, they are facing higher unemployment than any other region. In fact, northern Manitoba has the highest unemployment in any provincial region of this country. As I said earlier today, The Pas is experiencing a 25 percent unemployment rate, as we are speaking today. As you go into the more remote communities, the aboriginal communities, the unemployment rate gets worse. In some communities, the unemployment rate is as high as 90 percent.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) also said a little over a month ago that it is time that his government became more aggressive about negotiating jobs, not just at Repap, which he mentioned, but throughout the North. The Minister of Finance admitted that up until now his government had been too passive and that they may have to be a bit more aggressive in its negotiations with Repap.

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the Minister of Finance in that statement. It is time to get aggressive in the negotiations with Repap. As I am standing here today, 200 workers from the lumber division of Repap have been laid off for the past three weeks, and they will continue to be laid off until mid-February, I am told.

So it is time that the Minister of Finance included the people of the North in its negotiations for jobs with whoever he is negotiating with. It is time that the Minister of Finance and his government realized and accepted that people from northern Manitoba belong to Manitoba. Northerners are basically ignored in the throne speech, Madam Deputy Speaker. Problems, of course, in the pulp and paper industry, Repap in particular, were not mentioned despite the fact that the province itself had admitted, as I said, the negotiations to strike a new deal with Repap had been fruitless to date.

This year has been very bleak for those workers at Repap, Madam Deputy Speaker. They are laid off two or three months. They are called back to work for a couple of months and then they are laid off again for two or three months. It is not a very good way to live.

The commitment of this government to the Clearwater nursery is suspect at best if we go by the number of layoffs that occurred at the Clearwater nursery and also the refusal of this government to commit itself to stabilize the future of the nursery.

So we have little reason to be hopeful for those of us who come from the North. This government has not learned from the mistakes of two years ago when positions were cut, for example, from Keewatin Community College, Natural Resources, Department of Highways, northern employment offices, et cetera.

The admission by the Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. Vodrey) recently that she was looking at cuts of as much as \$17 million from her budget is also disturbing, indeed. More than ever, Madam Deputy Speaker, northerners need educational and job training opportunities, not less, but more job training opportunities. That is the key to our progress and development. We should not be cutting those opportunities at the time that we need them the most. We need more of such opportunities. We need more. We do not need to be told that because you come from the North that you should leave the North; come south or to Winnipeg or elsewhere in Canada to get training or jobs.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about the program that this government always talks about when I raise questions in the House and that is the Bachelor of Nursing program that is being operated out of The Pas. I hope that the government is going to be monitoring the progress of that program just as I will be doing in the days ahead.

It was also very disturbing, Mr. Speaker, that there was not a single reference to either the bayline or the Churchill rocket range in Churchill. As my colleague from Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) pointed out the other day that the rocket range was correctly listed as a priority item previously. After all, if the range is reactivated, it would provide approximately 200 jobs in northern Manitoba and would lead to other major economic development in the North as well as to assist the entire provincial economy. Just why this provincial government has yet to donate a single dime to that project is hard to believe. We can only hope that with enough pressure from people who live in the North that they will in time be forced to act before it is too late.

\* (1510)

The threat to the Port of Churchill, Mr. Speaker, deserves more than the one sentence it got in the throne speech document. We have yet to see a real

commitment from this government, and it is indeed sad to note that they have totally failed to get any promises from their federal colleagues on the future of the port. In fact, all that we have seen has been a series of threats to the port itself. Additionally, no mention was made of the recent royal commission report which recommended cutting Via service on the bayline, a measure that would hurt not only the Port of Churchill but several communities that are situated along the line.

This government, Mr. Speaker, made a big deal about changes to the way fishermen sell their fish. I can tell the minister right now that a restoration of the Fisherman's Loan Program, restocking of lakes and some marketing by the government would do far more than this proposed change might accomplish. Whether that change that is being proposed will actually benefit fishermen in the North certainly remains to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, regrettably, this government was never committed to the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry. Whatever commitment this government may have had on the AJI has pretty well disappeared within this throne speech that was delivered last week. We saw where the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), in my questioning yesterday, was reduced to reading tired excuses from last year as to why very little has been accomplished on the implementation of the recommendations of the report.

Naturally, I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Swampy Cree justice project will get some funding along with a few other projects in other communities. But it is clear that the minister is no longer interested in proceeding with many of the recommendations. Over the next period of time we will continue to raise the AJI because we believe that the report has much to offer Manitoba and because it is recognized everywhere in Canada except by this government that change must occur.

We do not need lectures by the Minister of Justice or his colleagues on the state of justice in this province. I have lived here all my life, and I know far too well the state of justice that exists for aboriginal people in Manitoba and across the country.

I am not going to side with the government, because aboriginal people know very well where they stand with the Tory government agenda. I know where I stand. So what we see in this throne

speech is more of the same that we have seen in the last two throne speeches.

For northerners, Mr. Speaker, this throne speech is not good news indeed. Thank you for giving me the time to finish my address that I started last evening.

**Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface):** Monsieur le président, ça me fait plaisir et c'est toujours un honneur pour moi de me lever dans cette Assemblée parlementaire. Premièrement, j'aimerais te souhaiter encore la bienvenue. Puis ça fait plaisir de te revoir dans la chaise puisque tu fais toujours un bon travail. Un peu d'humour est toujours ajouté à la non-partisanerie, on espère. En tout cas, bienvenu encore dans cette position très majestueuse si l'on peut le dire.

**[Translation]**

Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure and honour for me to rise in this parliamentary Assembly. First of all, I would like to welcome you back. It is a pleasure to see you again in the Chair since you always do good work. A bit of humour is always added to nonpartisanship, one hopes. In any event, welcome back to this very majestic post, if we can put it that way.

**[English]**

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome the Pages, the ones who have been named for this session. It is always a pleasure to see young, new faces. It is quite an experience for them to see the parliamentary procedures, I am sure. I wish them well and that they enjoy their stay here during the next session.

First and foremost, I would like to express my regrets to see our Leader who is leaving our party as Leader of the Liberal Party. She is more than just the Leader of the Liberal Party. She was a friend, and I am sure to many of the colleagues in the Legislature. To me, the door was always open, and I am sure it was to all my colleagues in the caucus. It is sad to see her go and she will be missed in the Legislature and I am sure in the Liberal Party because I am sure she is going to do something that she will be enjoying to do herself in the future. I wish her well in her endeavours. Like I say, she will be missed. She was a grand lady.

Also, it gives me great pleasure to welcome the new members in the Legislature, our colleague of 1988, the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray),

who is back in the Legislature. It is nice to see her back here. I am sure she will do well again like she did before.

I would like to welcome the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister). I am sure he is a good man. He is succeeding a great person in the person of Mr. Connery who resigned. He was a friend to everybody here in the Legislature and worked very well and supported his constituents. I am sure the member who was elected last September will do the same and will follow in the shoes of Mr. Connery.

Another person that we did not get a chance to compliment when he resigned last January was a colleague of ours, Mr. Jim Carr, the former member for Crescentwood, who was also a good friend and a very competent MLA. He worked very hard. I was sorry to see him go, but of course with a young family it is not easy. He decided to go for better things. I would not say better things, because it is always a pleasure to work for Manitobans, and I know he enjoyed working for Manitobans and worked for everybody who was in the Legislature.

Mais c'est surtout un devoir privilégié d'adresser quelques mots sur la planification du gouvernement telle qu'elle a été présentée à cette assemblée délibérante, lors de la lecture du Discours du Trône de la quatrième session de cette trente-cinquième législature.

Il va de soi que l'on peut dire que cet agenda politique du gouvernement ne se distingue d'aucune innovation; n'annonce aucune mesure extraordinaire; ne donne aucun souffle d'espoir aux Manitobains et aux Manitobaines d'entrevoir une issue de secours afin de sortir des périls innombrables, et combien malheureux, de la récession économique.

Dans tout système parlementaire, comme celui dont nous avons le privilège d'en jouir les bienfaits au Canada et au Manitoba, le respect du devoir civique de chaque député doit faire honneur à la confiance léguée par les électeurs et les électrices. Et ce, peut importe que l'on soit parmi les rangs du gouvernement ou bien assis parmi les ou les partis politiques de l'opposition.

Les allégeances idéologiques doivent servir de fil conducteur tout en permettant à la pensée de ne pas outrepasser la réalité. La raison d'être de notre assemblée législative, de contribuer à l'amélioration des conditions de vie des Manitobains et des Manitobaines, doit être la source d'inspiration qui

permette au gouvernement et à l'opposition de se compléter l'un à l'autre. Oui, oui, je vais en parler toute à l'heure, il n'y a pas de problème. Ça s'en vient. J'aime attaquer le gouvernement pour commencer.

Je ne discuterai pas ici de manière systématique les différences des deux bords parce que la chose est déjà faite de façon habituelle. Néanmoins, j'aimerais préciser qu'il est du rôle de l'opposition de montrer avec force et pertinence les insuffisances du gouvernement.

Monsieur le président, je me sens malgré tout quelque peu ravi de constater que le gouvernement démontre une certaine sagesse de pensée en retenant les suggestions du Parti Libéral. Je fais bien entendu référence entre autre à la carte Pharmacare dont nous en défendons les mérites depuis maintenant plusieurs mois, quelques années, je dirais même.

Par contre, monsieur le président, c'est avec grands regrets mais sans surprise que je constate que le négativisme prend de plus en plus d'ampleur chez les NPD; ce qui est probablement à la source de leur étroitesse d'esprit démontrée par une critique constante et vide de toute suggestion correctrice. Je parle des Néos là. Mais je ne voudrais pas m'éloigner plus longtemps du sujet principal de mes propos qui est le programme que le gouvernement prétend nous présenter dans ce Discours du Trône.

\*(1520)

Monsieur le président, quand je dis "programme", je suis généreux, car il n'y a rien dans ce que le gouvernement nous présente qui n'ai pas été mentionné auparavant. En effet, je ne vois dans ce Discours du Trône aucun élément déterminant, aucune innovation ou aucune indication, innovations, comme la chef libérale avait dit, qui étaient mentionnées neuf fois dans le Discours du Trône, mais il n'y a rien de concret, que le gouvernement planifie en terme de mesures économiques orientées à sortir les manitobains et les manitobaines de la récession, une bonne fois pour toute. D'ailleurs, je pense que le mot "récession" a dû sortir du dictionnaire conservateur car, sauf erreur de ma part, il n'apparaît pas une seule fois dans le Discours du Trône. Comme il serait agréable à tout le monde, moi-même y compris, si le gouvernement pourrait faire

disparaître la réalité aussi facilement qu'il fait disparaître les mots!

Monsieur le président, le gouvernement parle de mise en marché des produits et services du Manitoba au niveau mondial, en faisant référence au fait qu'il soutient l'Accord du libre-échange nord-américain. Je dois donc demander où se trouve la logique du gouvernement en terme de réalité commerciale. Comment une telle rhétorique en matière économique peut-elle être viable? En préconisant la libéralisation de l'échange commercial international avant même de normaliser le marché domestique, n'encourageons-nous pas une discorde provinciale, voire nationale, où un débat cruel met injustement les valeurs sociales, économiques et politiques manitobaines et canadiennes en opposition avec la nécessité d'un échange commercial stable avec nos pays voisins, outre-mer et continentaux.

Monsieur le président, en matière économique, l'action d'un gouvernement doit permettre d'aboutir à un certain nombre de résultats. Je crois que le premier résultat économique fondamental, c'est de faire du Manitoba une véritable province prospère au sein d'un Canada industriel. Le second, c'est d'assurer certaines mutations nécessaires dans des domaines bien précis, comme par exemple, dans les domaines agricole ou du commerce.

Mais, il faut également se soucier que ces mutations se fassent dans des conditions telles qu'elles ne créent pas de souffrance tout le temps.

C'est pourquoi j'attache pour ma part la plus grande importance à ce que l'action sociale du gouvernement soit tournée, par priorité, vers les plus défavorisés et vers ceux et celles qui souffrent à l'heure actuelle de la transformation nécessaire et indispensable, de notre économie.

Etpuis, il y a un troisième aspect, que je crois très important du point de vue économique, c'est de donner à l'économie manitobaine une dimension nationale et internationale.

Bien entendu, j'ai déjà traité de cet aspect plus tôt où je soulevais le point que cela veut dire un Canada où l'échange commercial interprovincial est bien trop souvent inexistant; ceci est dû entre autre chose, à un problème d'ordre national, un problème que j'appellerai le problème Mulroney. Je vois que le membre de Saint-Norbert est d'accord avec ces commentaires-là. Ah, oui, ça c'est mieux. Ça s'en vient là.



Tel que je le mentionnais également plus tôt, il n'est pas concevable en matière économique, de prôner une politique d'échange commercial orientée singulièrement vers un pays étranger même voisin, tout en ignorant les provinces et les territoires avoisinants et qui se trouvent être les autres composantes constitutionnelles de notre nation.

Monsieur le président, c'est, pour ma part, ce que je crois être l'objectif fondamental, parce que je ne vois, pour une province de la dimension du Manitoba, que deux issues: ou bien se refermer à nouveau sur elle-même, et vivoter, à l'abri des humeurs américaines de l'accord du Libre-échange, et par conséquent dépérir, ou bien alors être en mesure de participer pleinement au marché international, avec ses dimensions actuelles qui s'ouvrent déjà, pour englober non seulement le monde occidental et oriental.

Il va de soi que cela suppose une transformation des esprits, que cela suppose un effort d'investissement considérable, et que cela suppose des ententes interprovinciales et des créations d'entreprises de taille provinciale et nationale dont il existe très peu encore au Manitoba.

Le Manitoba a trop longtemps vécu dans ce protectionnisme inter-provincial qui a été véhiculé successivement par les Néo-démocrates et les Conservateurs. C'est contre le protectionnisme domestique qu'il faut agir, et c'est sur ce point que pour ma part, je ne cesserai de répéter que le gouvernement ne maintient pas le correctif social indispensable afin d'assurer un équilibre économique stable au Manitoba.

En matière de renouveau économique pour notre province il s'agit là d'une transformation énorme, et le gouvernement démontre une nouvelle fois qu'il craint de ne pas être en mesure de prévoir et de prévenir les conséquences sociales de cette transformation.

Monsieur le président, je suis déçu du manque de planification concrète de la part du gouvernement à créer des emplois. Ce n'est pas assez de proposer que tous les premiers ministres se réunissent prochainement afin d'étudier, encore une étude, la réduction des obstacles au commerce interprovincial; ceci n'est simplement pas assez.

Monsieur le président, je suis soulagé d'entendre le gouvernement déclarer qu'il est résolu à soutenir et à aider les familles et à veiller sur les défavorisés.

La stabilité sociale de notre société exige d'un gouvernement qu'il prenne les mesures nécessaires à protéger les enfants vulnérables. Toutefois, pour le meilleur intérêt de ces enfants, je suis convaincu que l'efficacité du Bureau de protection des enfants ne sera assurée que si ce dernier répond à cette présente Assemblée et non au gouvernement par l'entremise du ministre des services à la famille.

#### [Translation]

It is, more than anything else, a special privilege to say a few words on the government's planning as it was presented to this deliberating Assembly upon the reading of the Speech from the Throne of the fourth session of the 35th Legislature.

It goes without saying that the government's political agenda is not distinguished by any innovation. It does not announce any exceptional measure. It does not provide any breath of hope to Manitobans of glimpsing an escape out of the innumerable and sad perils of the economic recession.

In any parliamentary system, such as the one whose advantages we enjoy here in Canada and Manitoba, the respect for civic duty of each member must do justice to the confidence that voters have invested in him or her. This is so, whether we are among the government ranks or seated with the opposition party or parties.

Ideological allegiances must serve as the main theme while enabling thought not to overreach reality. The raison d'être of our Legislative Assembly, to contribute to the improvement of living conditions of Manitobans, men and women, must be the source of inspiration that enables the government and the opposition to complement each other. Yes, I am going to talk about that later. There is no problem, that is coming up later. I like to attack the government at the outset.

I will not discuss here in a systematic manner the differences between the two sides because this is already done regularly. Nevertheless, I would like to specify that it is the role of the opposition to point out vigorously and relevantly the government's inadequacies.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of everything, I feel somewhat delighted to observe that the government is demonstrating some wisdom by taking up the Liberal Party's suggestions. I, of course, am referring among other things to the Pharmacare

card, the merits of which we have been defending for several months now, a few years I would even say.

On the other hand, it is with a great deal of regret, but without any surprise, that I observe that negativity is growing ever greater among the NDP. This is probably at the root of their narrow-mindedness as demonstrated by a constant and empty criticism regarding any corrective suggestion. I am talking about the NDP here. I would not like to digress any longer from the principal topic of my remarks, which is the program that the government is purporting to present to us in this Speech from the Throne.

\* (1530)

Mr. Speaker, when I say "program," I am being generous for there is nothing in what the government is presenting to us which has not been mentioned before. In fact, I do not see in this Speech from the Throne any determining component, any innovation or any indication—innovations which as the Liberal Party Leader said, were mentioned nine times in the Speech from the Throne, but there is nothing concrete in them—detailing what this government is planning in terms of economic measures directed at bringing Manitobans out of this recession once and for all. In addition, I think that the word "recession" must have been taken from the Conservative dictionary for, unless I am mistaken, it does not appear one single time in the Speech from the Throne. How pleasant it would be for everyone, including myself, if the government could cause reality to disappear as easily as it causes words to disappear.

Mr. Speaker, the government is speaking of the marketing of goods and products in Manitoba on a global scale by referring to the fact that it supports the North American Free Trade Agreement. I must accordingly ask where the government's logic is in terms of trade reality. How can such rhetoric in the economic sphere be viable? By favouring the liberalization of international trade even before rationalizing the domestic market, are we not encouraging provincial or even national discord where a cruel debate is unjustly opposing Manitoban and Canadian social, economic and political values with the necessity of stable commercial exchange with our neighbouring, overseas and continental countries?

Mr. Speaker, in the economic sphere, a government's action must make it possible to achieve a certain number of results. I think that the first fundamental economic result is that of making Manitoba a truly prosperous province within an industrial Canada. The second is to ensure certain necessary changes in certain very specific domains, for example, in the area of business or agriculture.

But we must also be concerned that these changes occur under conditions that do not always create suffering. That is why, for me, it is of the greatest importance that the government's social action be oriented as a priority towards the most disadvantaged people and towards those persons who are currently suffering from the necessary and indispensable transformation that our economy is undergoing.

Then there is a third aspect, Mr. Speaker, which I believe is very important from the economic point of view, and that is giving the Manitoba economy a national and international dimension.

Of course, I have already dealt with this aspect earlier when I brought up the point that this means a Canada where interprovincial commercial exchange is all too often nonexistent. This is due among other things to a problem of a national order, a problem which I will call, the Mulroney problem. [interjection] I see that the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) is in agreement with my comments there. [interjection] Ah, yes, that is better. That is coming along.

As I mentioned earlier also, it is inconceivable in economic matters to praise a policy of commercial exchange that is oriented solely towards one foreign country, even if it is a neighbouring one, while ignoring the neighbouring provinces and territories which are the other constitutional components of our nation. This is what I believe to be the fundamental objective because I can only see, for a province of Manitoba's size, two ways out or two options: one, turn inward again into itself and struggle along in the shelter of the American ups and downs of the Free Trade Agreement and consequently waste away, or instead be in a position to participate fully in the international market with its current dimensions already opening up to embrace not only the western but also the eastern world.

It goes without saying that this presupposes a transformation of attitudes and that this presupposes a considerable investment effort, Mr

Speaker, and that this presupposes interprovincial agreements and creation of businesses on a provincial and national scale of a kind of which few exist yet in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba has for too long lived in this interprovincial protectionism which was put forward successively by the New Democrats and the Conservatives. It is against domestic protectionism that we have to act and it is on this point that for my part I will not stop reiterating that the government is not maintaining the indispensable social corrective in order to ensure a stable economic balance in Manitoba.

In terms of economic renewal for our province, this is an enormous transformation, and the government is demonstrating once again that it is afraid of not being able to foresee and prevent the social consequences of this transformation.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed by the lack of concrete planning on the part of the government in the area of job creation. It is not enough to propose that all the First Ministers get together in the near future once again to examine the reduction of interprovincial trade barriers. This simply is not enough.

I am relieved to hear the government stating its resolve to maintain and assist families and to watch over disadvantaged persons. The social stability of our society requires that a government take the necessary measures to protect vulnerable children. However, in the best interests of these children, I am convinced that the efficiency of the office of the Children's Advocate will only be guaranteed if this agency is accountable to this Assembly and not the government via the Minister of Family Services.

**[English]**

Mr. Speaker, I also have to stress once again the critical need of confronting elder abuse. Many seniors in Manitoba are victims of physical, financial and psychological abuse. The majority of elder abuse is perpetrated by family members or friends of the victim, thereby making seniors reluctant to contact the police or to report their abusers to proper authorities.

There is at the present time an urgent need to address the situation of the lack of shelters for abused elders. Most of the time, the facilities being used presently do not respond to the needs of the seniors with mobility, hearing and sight impairment. Thus, I wish the government would be more explicit

in explaining what it means when it says that it will co-ordinate resources and develop multidisciplinary teams to respond to elder abuse concerns throughout the province.

Our elder people in Manitoba need more than teams, they need shelters, and they need them now. Therefore, I will be presenting two resolutions: one confronting elder abuse and another about shelter allowance for elderly renters' indexation. However, as I mentioned earlier, I am glad that the government took up, on the suggestion of the Liberal Party, about the Pharmacare card. That was we must not forget about the great number of our seniors who are faced with financial difficulties. This card should eliminate the administrative delays for our seniors to get reimbursed, and this Pharmacare is based on a system that will require seniors to pay only their deductible, as we suggested. Maybe this would not have happened last April where several of our Manitobans were out thousands of dollars because of a change in a ruling by this government.

Avant de conclure Monsieur le président, j'aimerais soulever un point relatif aux dispositions de la partie III de la loi sur la ville de Winnipeg, un point très cher aux Franco-Manitobains et aux Franco-Manitobaines de Saint-Boniface.

Puisque de par une tradition bien respectée, les services en français sont encore une fois les grands absents du Discours du Trône, j'espère sincèrement que le gouvernement assumera ses responsabilités vis-à-vis des résidents et des résidentes de Saint-Boniface. Les bureaux municipaux du boulevard Provencher ne peuvent pas et ne doivent pas être fermés, quoiqu'en pense et qu'en dise un conseiller municipal à la recherche de publicité gratuite aux dépens des gens de Saint-Boniface.

Dans le domaine juridique, je le répète, il est très déplorable de ne toujours pas avoir de présence francophone à la Cour d'appel du Manitoba.

Le gouvernement parle d'initiatives innovatrices afin de stimuler l'économie. Un centre permanent de traduction juridique à Saint-Boniface qui desservirait l'Ouest canadien est probablement un très bon projet pilote pour raviver l'essor économique de la collectivité.

En conclusion Monsieur le président, j'aimerais de nouveau reconnaître l'honnêteté et la franchise du Premier ministre à implanter les suggestions du Parti libéral. Je puis vous assurer que les députés

libéraux qui siègent dans cette chambre continueront à proposer des résolutions fortes et pertinentes afin de contribuer au développement économique, politique et social de notre province du Manitoba, y inclus Saint-Norbert pour le député de Saint-Norbert.

Comme vous pouvez le constater, Monsieur le président, mes commentaires sont assez brefs, ou d'une longueur proportionnelle au contenu de la présentation du gouvernement. Pour de plus amples pensées et réflexions, je vous invite ainsi que tous mes collègues députés à vous reporter à mes interventions de la dernière session, car tout compte fait les Discours du Trône de la 2e, de la 3e ou de la 4e session ne sont qu'une répétition de verbiage dont je doute que les résultats réduiront la clientèle de Winnipeg Harvest.

**[Translation]**

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring up a point regarding the provisions of Part 3 of The City of Winnipeg Act. This is a point very dear to Franco-Manitobans and to the Franco-Manitobans of St. Boniface.

Since a well-respected tradition has once again kept French language services out of the Speech from the Throne, I sincerely hope that the government will assume its responsibility vis-à-vis the residents of St. Boniface. The municipal offices on Provencher Boulevard cannot and must not be closed whatever a city councillor in search of free publicity at the expense of the people of St. Boniface may think or say.

In the judicial area, I will repeat that it is highly deplorable that there is still no Francophone presence at the Court of Appeal level in Manitoba. The government refers to innovative initiatives in order to stimulate the economy. A permanent legal translation centre in St. Boniface that would serve the Canadian West is probably a very good pilot project to revive the economy of the community.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like once again to acknowledge the honesty and frankness of the First Minister in implementing the Liberal Party's suggestions. I can assure you that the Liberal members who are sitting in this Chamber will continue to propose strong and relevant resolutions in order to contribute to the economic, political and social development of our province of Manitoba, including St. Norbert and the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau).

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, my comments are fairly brief or at least they are of a length proportionate to the content of the government's presentation. For more detailed thoughts and reflections, I would invite you and all my colleagues to refer to my speeches of the last session because in some the Speeches from the Throne of the second, third or fourth sessions are nothing but a repetition of verbiage whose results are unlikely, in my opinion, to reduce the number of people going to Winnipeg Harvest.

**[English]**

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish every one of my colleagues in the Legislature a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year and peace. Thank you very much.

**Introduction of Guests**

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to recognizing the honourable member for Elmwood, I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the loge to my left, where we have with us this afternoon Mr. Jim Carr, the former member for Crescentwood.

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

\* \* \*

**Mr. Jim Meloway (Elmwood):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to the Throne Speech Debate for this session. As I look around, I see some people who I am glad are here to listen to my remarks. I do not see some people who I wish were here who need the benefit of the remarks, but I am hopeful that they will show up.

Mr. Speaker, this throne speech is really a mirror of what this government is all about. There is absolutely nothing in this throne speech. There is nothing in this throne speech that is worthy of even calling a session of the Legislature for. When we look at the bills that this government has so far introduced to the House, we see very, very minor amendments to The Insurance Act. We see a number of other very minor changes. It is very clear to me that this government really has no plans for the future.

The one exception is the Sunday shopping bill that this government plans to bring in, and that to me, Mr. Speaker, is not a sign of progress in any sense. In fact, it is a knee-jerk reaction. This government is pretty well the last good that I would

have thought that would have embraced wide-open Sunday shopping in this province. I think that these members must have been dragged kicking and screaming into line on this particular position, because when one looks at what the wide-open Sunday shopping is going to do to the people who they represent, to the small retailers in their constituencies, they really must have been bamboozled in a major way by their leadership over there to follow this one blindly through. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this particular initiative was taken without any public debate on the matter. There was no public debate at all.

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

In fact, just days before the opening of the Legislature the government announces that it is going to arbitrarily open Sunday shopping on the 29th of November, I believe it was, and we are expected in this House to debate the bill starting tomorrow and to retroactively pass legislation allowing Sunday shopping to take place. That is absolutely abhorrent to me that this government would have at the last minute announced this legislation and been put in a position to retroactively pass this measure. One would have thought that if this government had any sense of planning at all that they would have conducted public hearings months ago, that they would have had a full airing of the issue in the public and that they would have brought it in in the form that they were going to bring it in after they had gone through that public debate process.

It seems to me that the government will pay ultimately for this decision, because I will be looking with great interest as will the other members on this side of the House to whether or not the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is able to drag along each of his 30 members on this issue.

In effect, what we are doing here certainly in the long term will devastate small businesses in this province, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I start with the rural businesses. The rural businesses within driving distance of Winnipeg will be facing—if you think that we are in a depression now, wait until you see what will happen after a couple of years of wide-open Sunday shopping as people drive in from Stonewall, Gimli and other centres, most of which the members opposite represent, will come in on Sunday to shop and will be buying their whole week's supply of groceries

and goods in Winnipeg. If the members think that that somehow builds the fabric of Manitoba society, then I think they had better think again. The small convenience stores and so on that do their best business on Sunday are going to be possibly even wiped out by this legislation. The government is going to have to come to grips with that.

The government likes to maintain that the employees will be able to make their own decisions on this matter and that they will not be forced to work Sunday. Let me tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that when employers are hiring employees, from now on they will be checking in advance, they will be asking during the interviews as to what the people's attitudes are on Sunday shopping. If the attitudes do not conform in a positive sense with what the employer wants, then those people will be passed over for jobs, so do not tell me that you will take care of protecting employees by this legislation, because it is not going to happen.

Another area that the government promises responsibility in on this legislation is that they are planning to reassess this question after five months.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think most of here know that once this trial period is over, this will not be revisited. The whole issue will not be reassessed, and we will not see the situation rolled back to where we were before this initiative was announced.

\* (1540)

Once Sunday shopping is a part of the normal activities here in Manitoba after the five-month trial period, the government will not be rolling back the clock to where we are right now. I would say that we as a society will all suffer, will all pay the price for this. The member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) will certainly bear me out on this, that in his lifetime alone he has seen society move from an agrarian environment to a very fast-paced, fast-moving urban environment.

What this government is really saying is that heart attacks will not be optional at 50 anymore. They will be mandatory, because with the advent of the video lottery terminals and wide-open gambling which, by the way, the Liberals seemed to be embracing today in Question Period, with the advent of 24-hour, wide-open gambling, with 24-hour, wide-open shopping, what we are seeing is a society that is moving around so fast that people who are now being driven to distraction, nervous breakdowns

and heart attacks will be not having them at 55 anymore. They will be having them at 50.

This government is destroying the fabric of society, Madam Deputy Speaker. The members opposite are making some noise here and I have not heard what they have to say. [interjection] Well, the members opposite are having fun once again, and they will have plenty of opportunities to participate—

#### Point of Order

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Would the honourable member for Elmwood permit a question?

**Mr. Maloway:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I certainly will permit as many questions as the Minister of Health or anybody else wants to ask after I am finished.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Maloway:** I have a way to go before I am finished with this crowd, because they know what they are doing to Manitoba society by this measure. It is basically a knee-jerk approach and a knee-jerk reaction and a short-term approach. What they are inadvertently doing is causing a virtual disintegration of society as we know it right now. They will pay the price in their constituencies in the next election, because the people of Manitoba are not comfortable with this idea and they are not happy with what the government is doing.

I would ask these members opposite to try working on Sunday and having to go through that situation. I think that once they try it, looking at it from the other standpoint, the standpoint of the employee, once they have to deal with it from the employee's standpoint, they would not be so encouraged to go on with this measure.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think that this is not a very helpful initiative that this government is taking, and our caucus will have much more to say about it beginning tomorrow and in the next coming days, as our critics take the initiative here and point out what this government is really up to with the Sunday shopping and the detrimental effects that this measure is going to have.

The government falsely assumes that somehow consumers are going to have more money to spend. In a recession out in the society right now, we are

seeing people who are earning at minimum wage and little above minimum wage who are having a difficult time making their money go far right now. These people are now able to spend their money in a five-day cycle, in a six-day cycle in the stores. All we are asking this person to do is take their normal salary of \$20,000, \$25,000 a year and spread it over to another day. The costs to the business are going to increase because the business people will have to spend more on their overheads and more for labour and more expenses being open on Sunday.

This would be a fine argument if somehow people were going to have more money to spend. If somehow people were going to have an extra \$1,000 or \$2,000 to spend at the end of the month, then one could perhaps argue that somehow having an extra day to spend this money is necessary but, Madam Deputy Speaker, I can tell you that most people I know have no problem spending all of their money and more in the hours that the stores are open at the current time. People do not have trouble getting into debt in major ways right now, so this is a false argument.

The idea of a day of rest is another major issue here. I have heard from members of churches; I have heard from just members of the general public who are very upset because this will destroy the one day that they have as a family right now. People in this day and age are having a difficult time as it is, having a day during the week, or two days during the week with their families, and now with Saturday being pretty well a full shopping day, people have been cut down to one day a week with their families. Now we are going to take even that one day away from them, or jeopardize that one day, and it will be that much more difficult for them to—

**An Honourable Member:** They do not have to go shopping, Jim.

**Mr. Maloway:** The member opposite says, well, people do not have to shop, and that is true, they do not have to shop on a Monday or Tuesday either, but the fact of the matter is that the member does not recognize that they do have to work. That is part of the issue here, that we are going to force people to work on Sundays to allow this extra day, so that he and the other members opposite can, in a more leisurely manner, spend their money than they are right now.

The whole question of the businesses. I mean, this government maintains very loudly that it listens to business, that it understands business. You will hear this from them all the time. In fact, of the chambers of commerce in Manitoba, they do not have the support of the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce in this matter, and they know that. The squeaky wheels on this issue seem to be the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and a few of the big stores in town. That is where this initiative is coming from and their fear of cross-border shopping no doubt is a major part to play in this matter. The exchange rate that we are currently seeing right now, Madam Deputy Speaker, is in fact choking off a lot of the cross-border shopping at the current time. We have a currency question here that has intervened to help solve part of the problem.

The other question too, I suppose, is that a lot of people who shop in the States were doing it not necessarily for the prices but for the novelty of it and the outing. Once the novelty wears off—and I mean driving 60 miles or whatever to save a couple of dollars I do not think is really the reason why a lot of people go there. I would think that over a period of time that the whole fad will die out and that people will not do as much shopping there as they did in the short run.

Another reason that the government made this move in my opinion is because of the drop in retail sales. They look at these figures and say, oh, my God, the opposition are going to be raising Cain with us now because retail sales have dropped and it is all our fault because we are the government and we are driving the province into a recession that will never stop. The fact of the matter is that the retail sales drop is due to the recession that is upon us right now. If and when the recession ends or the depression ends that we are in right now, then the retail sales will move back to their previous levels. I have no problems with that.

\* (1550)

I have dealt with the whole area of the retroactivity of this question, and I am very unhappy about that because this is being presented to us as a fait accompli. I mean we are not in a position, and I might tell you that a couple of years ago when I did suggest to the government that they change the laws in a couple of instances in The Business Names Registration Act to help out in The Brick situation, the Attorney General of the day, the current Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) said to me,

oh, well, we cannot do that because retroactivity in legislation is something that we would never consider, that retroactive legislation is not something that governments like, governments never do. They could count the times that retroactive legislation was used on the fingers of one hand this century, something to that effect and that we would never do that. Well, here, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have a situation where the government is in fact endeavouring to do something.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I did want to deal with the deregulation in the airline industry and the situation that has resulted. It came about as the result of the initiatives of this government and the Liberals. By the way, I think the opportunity has come to deal with the Liberal Party here, the diminishing, disappearing Liberal Party that is now down another member and now the Liberal Party is leaderless and rudderless. So far we have one aspirant, the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), who has come forward to lead that dispirited group. We can see from the performance to date that the Liberal Party is going nowhere.

As a matter of fact, my colleague from Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) tells me that the Liberals are not only rudderless, but they have no boat. The Liberals are facing absolute disaster here, where with a leadership convention planned, I believe it was for April 1 or some such time, they have had to postpone the leadership convention because they have one person that even wants the leadership. They cannot even interest a second person in the leadership of the Liberal Party, so I think we can say goodbye to the Liberal Party. I do not know whether we want to have a collection for them and give them a going-away present or even when we should have the going-away party, but the member for Inkster is bound and determined to bury the remnants of the Liberal Party. We wish him well.

I tell you that I personally support the member for Inkster in his endeavours. I support him all the way to the leadership of the Liberal Party and beyond. I wish him well. I know that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) is quick to say, not now, Kevin; but we say, now, Kevin, go for it. We are all for you, Kevin. We wish the member for Inkster well in his endeavours, and we look forward to seeing the two-party system develop again in this province as it did over the last 20 years.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I know that our time is near, and we must—my time is near and I must move

on to allow my colleague to make his speech. With that, I would leave you until the next speech.

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to be able to have the opportunity to address the throne speech this afternoon. With our limited time, I would like to touch on a few of the topics from the throne speech that relate to my constituency and to some of the things that are occurring in my constituency.

First of all, I would like to welcome, as other members have, the new Pages that we have in the Assembly, and I wish them well in their endeavours through this session in putting up with the different idiosyncrasies and the game-show politics that we sometimes provide for the people here in the Assembly. To the new members who have been elected just in the past by-election, I would like to welcome the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), and I would also like to wish her well in her return to the Assembly. I would like to also, and more importantly, like to offer my heartiest congratulations to the new elected member for Portage (Mr. Pallister). I have a soft spot in my background and in my heart, my sport side of me, welcoming the member for Portage la Prairie. I had the opportunity through the many years to participate against and, at times, watch the honourable member pitch in fastball over the years. His contribution to Manitoba softball and his competitiveness, also his participation in Canadian tournaments and, again, wish you well in your endeavours here.

To the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs), I would like to just say that I wish her well with her announcement, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think that she has added many positive things to this Chamber. I know in the two-plus years I have had the opportunity to be in this House, I have gained a tremendous amount of respect. I wish her well and her family when she does decide that time is ending and again I wish her well.

Madam Deputy Speaker, just lately also we have had the latest announcement of one of our members, the past member for Rupertsland leaving the Assembly to go on to different things. In the two-plus years and with the aboriginal issues that are amongst us now, I think that Mr. Harper was a man who had his true, true spirit for the aboriginal people and spoke well for them. He gave me lots of insight as to the problems and the concerns that the aboriginal people have here in this province.

With eight reserves within my constituency, Madam Deputy Speaker, Mr. Harper took time out to meet with me and the chiefs and councils and go to different functions amongst my aboriginal constituents. I thank him for that, and especially the one time that he took time out from his busy schedule when he and I, through some adverse weather, took the opportunity to go to Arborg and speak before the Arborg Collegiate students. I wish him well, and I thank him very kindly for his participation and support for myself and my constituency and the aboriginal people within the Interlake.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as far as the throne speech goes, I have certain concerns that were brought up. I would like to relate some of those concerns again and some of the problems that we are facing in my constituency. I hope that this government recognizes the problems, not only in my constituency but throughout Manitoba and deals with them rather quickly, not going through studies and innovative discussions and future studies and looking into and discussions, but dealing with them.

\* (1600)

One that I find very interesting, and I know that it had been discussed before, Madam Deputy Speaker, was the part of the throne speech that this government has promised to enact new regulations that will impose substantially higher standards for new installations and will require testing existing facilities and clean up of sites. That is contamination caused by petroleum product leaks and we now are dealing with an issue, a very serious concerned issue in the community of Ashern.

I know I have brought it up in the House here. I think it is a very, very important issue. The people in Ashern, some 20 to 25 or 30 people right now, are having water brought into them so that they can bathe, so that they can drink, so that they can have water for their coffee, Madam Deputy Speaker. I hope that with this type of legislation, depending on when and if and how this government does implement this act, will prevent and assist. I think that is the issue right here and now regardless of putting in some act to prevent something in the future and have some sort of control over these things, it should be done now. The assistance should be there now.

Now I must say that in the past few months, the people of Ashern have been put again against the



wall and have waited for the last two years with this problem. They have come to the government, they have come to the federal government, to assist in helping them so that they can have proper drinking water or restructure a new drinking water program that they want to implement within the community.

I would like to think that this government, who talks about initiative and who talks about the doing and the wanting to do, will act, will do. The people of Ashern have been waiting, Madam Deputy Speaker, as I have said, for two years for this, for something, for some assistance, and all they have received is promises to look into it.

I hope that under this particular act that we are able to assist my community, the community of Ashern, and others, as we have seen in Stonewall, that there can be some action taken so that we can have legislation intact that will prevent this type of thing and will also ensure that if it does happen, the people who are responsible are going to deal with it and are going to be dealt with. So again, it is a problem. It is something that they intend to propose. I would like to see the government act on this and propose it within this session.

The throne speech indicates that the government will implement necessary measures to control and properly dispose of hazardous wastes and, not only that, but the waste management burden in small communities, small municipalities such as mine. Right now we are dealing with this problem right throughout the whole eastern part of the Interlake. We have four or five or six communities who are in desperate need of landfill sites and direction to take, and again, are we getting any action? Are we going to get any action from this government to be able to assist these municipalities and these governments and communities to go ahead and have safe waste management areas so that they can take their landfill waste and take their community garbage as such so that there is some protection for the people and protection for the natural resources within our community?

Madam Deputy Speaker, the gas that they have talked about, natural gas, I know that the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) had made some comments, and I think we on this side of the House are strong advocates in that part of the throne speech. I think the necessity for rural Manitoba is there and it has been there for some time.

The people are looking for ways to improve their social and their economic benefits, rural benefits. I think natural gas gasification would be a plus to the communities. I think it would be a certain plus to not only the community of Riverton and the community of Arborg, the community of Ashern and Fisher Branch, I think the other communities in the rural areas would benefit greatly. It would be able to provide them with access to be able to go out and have something for the people in the community to go out and bring in economic development within their community, to be able to go out to some manufacturing firm, to be able to go out to any manufacturing company and say, we can provide you with the natural gas—but action.

Now, we within the Interlake, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I believe since 1989, we have approached this government. I was part and parcel, in 1989, when we came to talk to the former Rural Development minister, the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner). We spoke to him on this and made a proposal, along with the Interlake Development Corporation, on a dehydration plant, and the community has moved very, very strongly.

We talk about what the Premier (Mr. Filmon) says as far as initiative again and doing things and investing in ourselves. Madam Deputy Speaker, the communities around Arborg and farmers and producers around Arborg have worked diligently for two and one half years, three years, in providing a study, providing an effort to be able to bring a dehydration plant within the Interlake between Teulon and Arborg. Gasification would be something that would assist that plant along, create jobs, some 20 to 30 jobs, would bring in economic benefit within the community, to within the whole area. We are saying that it is a necessity for the dehydration plant to go ahead. It is a necessity.

I am saying to the honourable members across the way that let us act on the things that they are supposedly going to do. We want to see it. I want to see it. I think all members here see it. But what are we going to see? Are we going to see anything?

I think, generally, if you try and read around the throne speech, we are not really sure, we are not positive, this is what we are thinking of doing. I am saying, let us do, let us act with what you are proposing here; and, if you are not, as in some of the other initiatives in the past throne speech that we have heard, then why put it in? Why make promises? Act.

Madam Deputy Speaker, again we have a certain amount of proposed changes to the Natural Resources part of things. You know, we, the minister and I, have sat a few times and discussed certain things in my community, within the whole province, as far as problems through Natural Resources. I have brought problems to the minister from within my own constituency, big problems. He knows what the problems are.

I think this may relate somewhat to the budget. I promised the minister, and I think I am going to follow up on my promise in making a comment in the throne speech, and again in the budget debate I will bring this up, the fact that natural resources are a tremendous commodity, a tremendous resource to our Interlake and to the province of Manitoba.

There are needs out there for Natural Resources within the parks, within the fishing industry, within the water resources, and I had promised the minister that I would make mention of the fact that we hope that Treasury Board and cabinet and senior management would look towards the Natural Resources department with being able to fund the natural resources area, not to take away but to assist and put the funds and the money where it is needed for natural resources.

\* (1610)

Natural resources and tourism within the Interlake and within many parts of the province go hand in hand. We need certain resources. We need control of the parks, and the minister himself says when I come to him with a problem within the constituency relating to the drainage system—I would venture, not to guess, but I would venture to say that 500-plus acres alone in my community, in my constituency this year, were under water because of the drainage situation. [interjection] Of course, a wet year—we understand that to a point, but the minister himself understands and realizes—he sees the problem. I have brought the problems to him. Funding is not there. It is cuts.

I am saying to the government that when the time comes for the budget, that natural resources, Madam Deputy Speaker, not be left to the side, not be left on the back burner, but come in and assist.

I would just like to encourage again, and let the minister know that the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk)—and I have spoken to her about it—and the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), we want to see

the Natural Resources department be a department and be a part of this province, that it is recognized as being an important part of this province.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, with some of the comments, and I guess we can go back to the conference some two or three weeks ago that the minister and I attended.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to be involved with the three-day conference, listening to the fishermen, the aboriginal people and all the fishermen throughout the province, throughout Saskatchewan, representatives from the Northwest Territories, representatives from Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba wanting their fishing industry to be seriously looked at, not only by the present Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), but federally.

Through that three-day conference, Mr. Speaker, I heard concerns, concerns with the marketing of their fish, and I think that the concerns were put forth, resolutions were brought forth. People were able to make presentations as to the dilemma that the fishermen are facing now and have been facing for some years, as the grain farmers and as other commodities, the lack of marketing, the lack of price for their product.

At the conference, the delegation and all the representatives had requested that the present minister assist with being able to provide some access to a better system, to have the Freshwater Marketing Corporation looked at, looked at for the reasons that the fishermen are giving us.

Mr. Speaker, coming from and hearing day in and day out about some of the problems that fishermen have, the marketing system right now is perhaps failing certain areas of the fishing industry. It may be failing the northern fisheries. It may be failing the Lake Winnipegosis fisheries, Lake Winnipeg fisheries, and this government has decided to bring about an amendment to The Fisheries Act to allow commercial fishermen to sell their catch directly to restaurants, retailers and processors.

Mr. Speaker, that may, in fact, be a start in some aspects. I wonder, and I hope that the minister, before these amendments are brought forth, listens to all the fishermen, not just in a certain area over on this side or a certain area on that side, but throughout the fishing industry, the northern fishing industry.

There are bigger problems than marketing their fish in northern Manitoba. I think the minister heard that; I heard that. There was not a problem so much with the fact that, well, the Freshwater Marketing Corporation is not doing their job for us. There are other things that are of concern—concern with the freight, cost of bringing that fish from the northernmost communities into Winnipeg to be processed, to be sold, to be marketed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is one of the messages that I got loud and clear. If you open up the market, not everyone is going to benefit. If you open up the market, how is it going to be controlled? I have to say, that I have to, myself as with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), listen to the advisory board and have to listen to fishermen make their presentations on this. Is it really going to be the right way to go for everyone, or are there other concerns that this present minister and this present government could address immediately to assist the fishermen throughout Manitoba?

Mr. Speaker, throughout the three days, one of the main points that I had heard from the fishermen in my constituency was the fact that they did not have proper representation from the Freshwater Marketing Corporation. Granted, that perhaps is something that should be seriously looked at through the advisory board and the Freshwater Marketing Corporation. I think it should be looked at.

The aboriginal people themselves feel that they do not have enough representation on the board, on a board that is very important to them in how their fish are sold or marketed. Is it worth it for these fishermen to even go out and fish through a season? The costs are outrageous. The price for their fish is nonexistent. Whether this new amendment and legislation that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) and this government is going to bring in is going to be the answer to all answers, I would think that he should, in fact, very seriously consider all the pros and cons of bringing in an amendment to this act about a situation that the fishermen are in.

One of the two other main points, freight assistance, freight subsidy. I think the minister will remember that in a session in 1990 I brought this before him, after the first budget, after we had been elected and our first budget. I was not really too sure of how the whole system worked. We met with fishermen, who were very concerned because this government was going to cut some hundred and

some-odd thousand dollars off the Northern Freight Allowance subsidy for these fishermen to assist, to subsidize them for transporting their fish, bringing them in to southern Manitoba so that they can be marketed.

The costs were outrageous, so I would think that the minister should, in fact, when he is looking at implementing this act to allow the fishermen to sell to anyone, look at the other issues and the other problems that are facing our commercial fishermen in this province.

I would hope that the minister in his wisdom or in his position would and is going to insist that the northern freight allowance be stepped up, be increased so that the fishermen in northern Manitoba, who have to transport their fish at great distance, at great cost, are in fact assisted and helped so that when they do get their payments for it their costs have been subsidized so they have something that they can take home with them. Now they have nothing.

\* (1620)

Now, a lot of these fishermen in northern Manitoba are saying, by the time we pay the bills, by the time we pay for the boats, the maintenance, the gasoline, the transportation, there is nothing left. We cannot exist. Our young people do not want to continue to fish. They do not want to continue doing anything as far as the fishing industry goes, because it is not viable.

I think the other aspect of the problems that the fishermen have is with the loan program. Since the loan program was changed in 1990, '91, I get many, many complaints about the system. I think that the loan program falling under the Minister of Northern Affairs' (Mr. Downey) responsibility—he should really go out and hear what the fishermen are saying as far as the system goes with the loan program. The whole program seems to be lacking in expediency, seems to be lacking as far as availability, seems to be lacking in many situations.

People who need that assistance, that loan program must know in plenty of time whether they are going to receive, what they are going to receive, how much they have applied for. The season is starting and some of them are not receiving any comment as to whether they are going to receive the money, when it is coming.

These fishermen cannot go to the local supplier of equipment and take out and purchase any

equipment, because they are not sure about the program. They are not sure if the money is going to come to them. I think it is a serious note. Fishermen are limited. Not only are they limited to the amount of money that is available to them, now they are limited and put on the back burner because there is no action taken when they are in a loan program.

The loan program, I think, out of Thompson, has been in place now for a year and a half, and fishermen are more in the dark with this program. I think between the freight subsidy, between the loan program and the marketing end of it, I would say to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) in this government to seriously look into the problems that the commercial fishermen are having within our province. I would think that would be a start as to hearing what they have to say.

I mean, Mr. Speaker, I have already been receiving comments just in the last week from different areas with concern as to this amendment that the minister is proposing for selling fish to stores and restaurants.

**An Honourable Member:** You mean your fishermen do not like it?

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** Not all the fishermen. There is a problem out there. There is a concern out there. I am saying to the minister, I am talking about a fair majority. This is the concern I am hearing—[interjection] Well, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) talks about this. Just this past weekend I spoke with some fishermen, and the majority of the fishermen are saying that the Freshwater Marketing Corporation should be looked at. Also, a majority are saying that they would want to see this whole act and how it is going to be done before it is gone. Before it goes through legislation, they want to see. I have quotes here about certain concerns. I am not a fisherman. I am saying what I hear.

The honourable Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger) is saying for me to put it on the record. I am saying what I hear from the people. It is not my personal opinion to express. It is an opinion to express what my constituents are saying, and the fishermen. Again, I would say before and during the negotiations with this amendment there should be some serious consultation between the fishermen and the government. That is what I ask and that is what I say.

Mr. Speaker, I did not have the opportunity to also offer my congratulations and best wishes to you as the other members in our House have done so gallantly and elegantly. I know that your co-operation and support for all members here is truly appreciated. I know it is by myself and other members here on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my time is limited, so I would just like in closing to say to the government, on the throne speech, instead of smoke and mirrors, instead of a study, the communities in Manitoba and rural Manitoba, the communities in my constituency are taking the initiative to go ahead with different things so that we can provide economic benefit. My community alone, Riverton, has been working very diligently in taking the initiative, taking the steps toward providing and increasing the economic viability within their own system. They are going ahead with a plan to restore Main Street Riverton, a plan that has been in place for a few years, has come to the government action. I think we want to see some action—not promises, but some action.

Some of these other issues will be brought up during budget. Again, I encourage the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) that the support is here from this member to be able to provide that minister with more—from this member to the minister saying I will push and I will say and I will speak up when the time comes during budget debate to make sure that the minister has within his portfolio and his department the funds that are needed to be able to provide this province with the proper funding to be able to keep our natural resources, which in fact also provide for tourism to be able to have those funds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to in closing say to all the members of the House, my colleagues and members of the second opposition and to government members a very Merry Christmas and the best of the New Year season, and to you, Sir, to all the Pages and new members, thank you very much.

**Hon. Gary Fillmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said on a number of occasions in the past, it is always a pleasure for me to rise in response to one of the major debates in the House, the throne speech and the budget.

Although I am now embarking on my 14th year in this Legislature, I still get that old thrill, that same old feeling when I stand up and have an opportunity to participate in one of these debates in which, I think,

members on both sides of the House have an opportunity to talk about their philosophies, their hopes, their goals, their aspirations for the future of this province and to be able to have a bit of a freewheeling discussion about the things that separate us in terms of our approach to government and our principles and our priorities.

I just want to, as is traditional, welcome you back to your position in this House as the arbiter of all the matters that prevail in this House. You have always been, I believe, fair-minded, showing an equal treatment to both sides of the House. I compliment you for that, and I wish you well in your continued endeavours.

\* (1630)

I would like to welcome, of course, the new Pages to the Legislature. They are in their first days in this House and just experiencing the great thrills of being a part of this wonderful process. I am always reminded of the story that says that people who enjoy sausage and laws should not watch either of them being made. This, of course, is true here. Sometimes with all of the antics that carry on in this House, particularly in Question Period, I do not think that tender newcomers ought to be exposed to this without at least a little bit of briefing to make sure that they understand how the process works. I know, Sir, that you have done that for them.

I welcome, of course, all members back to the House and pay my respects to the former member for Rupertsland who regrettably announced his resignation before I was able to speak in this throne speech. I certainly join all members in the House in wishing him well, in extending our very best wishes in whatever he chooses to pursue. That does not mean that our good wishes will go so far as to supporting him should he run in another election at another level, but we certainly will indeed remember his many contributions and, particularly, the personal relations that we had with him as a member of this House.

I can remember numerous occasions in which all members gathered, his quiet but very effective sense of humour, and the way in which he interacted with us was always a very positive and enjoyable experience. His contributions to the House will certainly be remembered by many people in this province and certainly those of us who knew him well.

I would certainly, as well, like to welcome to the Legislature two new members. I will begin with the member opposite, the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), who is not a stranger to this House, and say that despite the fact that again I have to admit I did not work for her, I certainly accept the will of the people. I am above all a great adherent to the democratic process, and I welcome her back to the Legislature. I might say that the former member for Crescentwood is sitting in the gallery observing her behaviour today. I am not sure if he is here to hear me speak or to watch her reaction to my speech, but in either case we are delighted to have her back and to have her contributions. I might say that I read her contributions to the Throne Speech Debate and thought that she handled herself very well.

I certainly did not expect her to be light in her criticism of our side of the House, but I appreciated the fact that she found something to criticize in both the New Democrats and the Conservatives. In that, I think that she was balanced. That is probably better than we can expect from some people in this House, so we will accept that as a step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker.

I also welcome, of course, with great enthusiasm the member of the Legislature for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) who, despite his youthful appearance and despite his few days in this House, has already cast a long shadow. Mr. Speaker, he brings with him a great deal to recommend him as an effective and capable member, and I know that all of us are looking forward to his great contributions and additions to the House.

I know that he has had, as I say, much experience in a wide variety of areas. Like myself, he happens to be one who is very devoted to sports, a great enthusiast for sports. You can tell by, of course, our stature that both of us are basketball players.

I might say, as well, that when I was in Toronto as part of our delegation for the Pan Am Games, I might have influenced a vote when I told the representative of softball in the Pan Am Games that we had a new member of the Legislature by the name of Pallister from Portage la Prairie. He said he knew him well, in fact, had coached a team that competed against him when the member for Portage la Prairie was arguably Manitoba's best fastball pitcher and player.

So I hope that little bit of reference resulted in our getting the one vote that decided the—I am not sure,

but we may have had the vote already, Mr. Speaker, but in any case, the member is well known beyond the borders of this Legislature and this province.

I see that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) is already challenging us to a baseball competition. [interjection] Well, we will take it one at a time. We will go squash first and then we will go basketball, then we will go baseball, and if you have any energy left then we will take you on in hockey. [interjection] Oh, it is winter.

Well, that reminds me of the story that used to be told here about a certain member opposite. I remember this was the first speech I ever heard given by the member for Arthur (Mr. Downey). He talked about Lloyd Axworthy when he was on the other side of the House and how he was on the one hand and on the other hand. He said he reminded him of an old farm hand he had when in the wintertime he would tell everybody what a great baseball player he was, and in the summertime he would tell everybody what a great hockey player he was, Mr. Speaker.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, moving on to the throne speech which I believe is my task at hand, it certainly gives us the opportunity to examine and to debate and discuss the immediate and the long-term plans of the government of Manitoba. I am very pleased to have heard the comments of many of the members opposite in the Assembly. I am particularly pleased to be able to respond to some of those comments and those contributions because I think, as I said earlier, it is a speech and it is a debate in which we definitely see the partisan divisions between the two sides of the House.

From our perspective, the throne speech provides a clear vision for the future of Manitoba. It deals with the problems facing Manitobans today; it does not just dwell on them, Mr. Speaker. I think it is important to make that distinction because Manitobans are certainly well aware of the problems that they face today. In many cases they face them every day, in their working life, in their home life, in their community life, and our government certainly has had the experience of dealing with, both on a government basis and on a personal basis, so many of the challenges of life in the '90s.

Many of us have had to face the problems, sit down with friends, with family, with neighbours, and deal with situations that we never believed would happen to the people who seem to have been in the

prime of their working lives and all of a sudden because of major shifts in the world are in a difficult position that they never anticipated. But merely dwelling on the problems and, in fact, taking some partisan delight out of pointing out the worst of them to the media in interviews or in Question Period does nothing to help find solutions for tomorrow.

All of us on this side of the House know that, when our New Democratic friends take great glee in sowing the seeds of gloom and doom, they are really working to ensure that Manitobans reap a barren harvest, because all of us know, and I know teachers know in particular, educators know, that when you tell someone time and time again that they are going to fail, then surely, inevitably they do fail. There is no encouragement for Manitobans when we look at the contributions that have been made in this Throne Speech Debate and in Question Periods of recent time; there is no encouragement for Manitobans given by the NDP.

But, no matter what the New Democrats might say, Manitobans are strong. Manitobans are out there working, and Manitobans have great resilience that will see us continue to fight the good fight and, indeed, ultimately when the recession is behind us, succeed again in the future. We see glimmers of that coming forward, more of them in recent times—a number of announcements.

We all took great delight, and I compliment both opposition parties for taking a positive view of the announcement on the Pan Am Games because it is something that will do many things for Manitoba. It will leave a lasting legacy of physical works: additions such as a new baseball stadium; a new field house at the University of Manitoba; an addition to the Pan Am Pool, a second practise pool; and another track within the velodrome; and so on and so forth. All of those will be a lasting legacy of those games to Manitoba.

\* (1640)

Secondarily, and I do not think it should be secondarily, almost \$140 million of spending that takes place in the province of Manitoba—tremendous economic boom to the province. In addition to that, as many as 2,000 full-time and part-time jobs—very positive things. Of course, who can put a value on the intangible of the volunteer spirit and the sense of togetherness that once again it will give our province? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) referred to Jim Daly. I

remember his slogan, Total Community Involvement, that he coined in 1967 that was so much a part of the enjoyment of the Pan American Games.

Then again on Thursday, ISM Manitoba, Information Systems Management Corporation, announced that it was purchasing Atlas International Canada, moving their entire operations to Winnipeg—45 new high-tech jobs for the province of Manitoba. A very positive development that was there. On Wednesday of last week, UMA Engineering announced that they would enter a joint venture with Black & Veatch of Kansas City, Missouri. That venture will see a power engineering centre of excellence for Winnipeg, utilizing the technology of Black and Veatch, as well as the infrastructure of the very large UMA Engineering organization—net financial benefit to the province in excess of \$1.5 million, employ an average of some 45 people up to a maximum of 100 people, again, high-tech jobs very important to Manitoba. We are talking in both of these announcements about things for people who are trained in the technologies and in engineering.

I was, this summer, at a class reunion in Calgary, of all places, of my civil engineering graduating class. I am a graduate of the '60s when there were plenty of jobs for engineers who graduated at the University of Manitoba, but they were not always in Manitoba. In fact, a third of my graduating class is in the province of Alberta. They had come here for four previous reunions and said, we want the rest of you to come to Alberta. So we went there and we enjoyed seeing so many of our classmates.

By some of these announcements, the people in the technologies, in engineering, will now have greater opportunities for employment here at home in Manitoba, and I think that is a good thing. I remember speeches from the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) on numerous occasions about our university students having opportunities to stay in Manitoba because, I think, if we share one thing in common, we all believe that this is one of the finest places in Canada, if not the world, to live, and that is why we are all here.

But these accomplishments that I am talking about have one thing in common. Their success has been the result of Manitobans taking action, working and succeeding, and in each instance, we as a government have been pleased to have a role in support of these efforts, to encourage, to work

alongside Manitobans to help make their dreams and their aspirations come true. I am very proud that if our efforts have made any positive contribution, that the end result will be more opportunities for Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech is also realistic in setting Manitoba's goals and action plans, and this too is very, very important because to date, realism, I think, has been a scarce commodity from some of the opposition benches.

I for one and all of my colleagues would not try to fool Manitobans into believing that there could be short-term, quick fixes to our economy. That is precisely the message that is in the throne speech, is that no matter what 10-second clips might be thrown out by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), there are no quick fixes to this economy.

I could take great delight in reading to him some, I think, very intelligent and very thoughtful remarks made by New Democratic Leaders who happen to be in government, premiers such as Romanow and Rae, people who have to practise responsibility, who cannot afford the quick fix, the ten-second-clip mentality that we see too often from the benches opposite, and the remarks that they are making about how difficult it is to make choices, to make priority decisions in the economy that we are facing and what it means to government.

They have seen, as I have seen, what is happening in the world around us. They, like I, have been to other countries, observed the dramatic changes that countries throughout the world are struggling to cope with today, quantum shifts taking place that have never been seen before.

It is absolutely clear that we cannot simply rely on the old shibboleths, that we cannot just simply repeat the kind of old slogans and the old solutions that were tried before. Those outdated thinking approaches are not going to solve the challenges that face us for the 1990s.

The old ways of government intervention that have been touted as solutions by members opposite just do not work today. The world has changed, and it is continuing to change at a rapid pace. Yesterday's solutions will not work today, particularly those solutions that did not even work yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, most of us in this Chamber and probably all of the taxpayers in Manitoba remember when the Pawley government tried so hard to spend

their way out of debt and into economic renewal and growth. We are all painfully aware of the consequences and where those programs, such as the NDP Jobs Fund, took us. Nowhere. They did not take us anywhere positive, but they did take us deeper into debt. Those short-term, make-work Jobs Fund jobs are gone, and all we have to show for them, of course, is billions of dollars of debt.

I find it interesting when I go back into my archives to see that the Leader of the Opposition in those days, of course, did understand that. He did know that. He did talk about it many, many times. I have quoted him on it before, but I will quote him again, just in case there has been any loss of memory.

I will tell you, the reason that I have to quote him again—I would not have done that—but I read in the Winnipeg Free Press of November 16, 1992, and I quote: Doer—and this was coverage of his major speech to the party's annual meeting, and it says, and I quote: Doer compared his economic blueprint to the Jobs Fund Howard Pawley's NDP government launched in 1983.

Now I found that really difficult to accept because in 1983, when Doer—and I should not refer to him—the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) was the then-president of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, this is what he said of the NDP Jobs Fund, quote: It is bloody immoral in my mind. That is what he said.

Here is the rest of it. Doer went on to further criticize the NDP government for its Jobs Fund, which he likened to the government dropping people who fix potholes on the highways in order to hire people to count flowers along the roadside.

That is what he thought of the Jobs Fund in 1983, and he said further: The government does not understand the difference between a make-work job and a structured economy. Any economist will tell you that a structured job is more beneficial to the economy. That was from the Winnipeg Sun, March 11, 1984, Doer talking about the Jobs Fund. Today, he is telling us that it was so wonderful that this would be the principal plank in his economic renewal platform for the province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not an example of what this province needs, and that is old-think being revisited and regurgitated and certainly not in a way that is going to be, I think, of great benefit to the people of this province.

The only other remnants of the old way of thinking that can be found on the opposition benches and in the New Democratic caucus room are there in the minds of those members who served at that time. I know that the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) and his cronies certainly remember because they were sitting around the cabinet table when many of those bad decisions that continue to cost us were made. When they were finished with those decisions on the Jobs Fund and their interventionist approach to economic development, as the Leader of the Opposition likes to call it, when Manitobans had had their fill, the legacy that was left was not jobs. It was not prosperity. All it was, was debt. The Manitoba taxpayer was left holding the bag and the NDP exited stage left. We have had our share of old-think approaches to government through the NDP taxation schemes.

Now, here is another thing. The member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), along with all of his faithful in the party, had no problem finding new government money in order to satisfy their burgeoning needs in government to spend. They took it from working Manitobans, and all of the families of working Manitobans, in new taxes. I will quote this again: In six and a half years in government they increased the personal income tax take by 140 percent—in six and a half years.

This is where the real talent of the New Democrats showed up, the real creativity of New Democrats. Finding taxation—new ways of taxation—became an art form. I have said it before, but it bears repeating. The New Democrats never found a tax they did not like or did not hike.

Yet, no matter how much they increased taxes, they still could not come close to balancing the budget—never could come close to balancing the budget, no matter how much. Of course, it is not as though they can say—[interjection] Mr. Speaker, I will get to the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), if he will be patient when I get to the issue of mining. We will talk about the member for Flin Flon when we get to that issue.

\* (1650)

It is not as though they have, in fact, learned anything by it or that they can say they would be different today, because we have examples all around us. Here—you see the problem is, I have the utmost respect for Bob Rae. I think he is a man of integrity. He is an honest, a decent and an



honourable person, but he has the unfortunate error of having surrounded himself with a number of refugees from the New Democratic administration in Manitoba.

As a result, they are bringing forward all of these crazy ideas that they put in Manitoba and more. Here is one recent headline from *The Globe and Mail*: Bad news grows in Ontario as Laughren warns of tax hike. That is the NDP Finance minister. The subhead is: Treasurer says, if unions do not keep to low wage demands he will be forced to consider wage freezes and rollbacks.

I am not even going to bother to read the speeches that were made on Bill 70, the outrage that was expressed by members opposite, who said a New Democratic administration would never freeze or roll back wages—never.

Now here we have our neighbouring province threatening two choices: either tax hikes, and he talks about tax hikes, and there are tax hikes that are so creative and interesting that they bear a little bit of discussion, I might tell you, but increases in fees of all sorts; and, of course, the other side of the coin is wage freezes and rollbacks. That is what the threat is in New Democratic Ontario. [interjection] Well, that was a few days earlier. Here is the *Toronto Star* of Saturday afternoon, NDP eyes highway tolls to jump-start recovery—highway toll.

Now, I do not ever want them to razz the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) of our province about his musings about toll fees, because here their colleagues in Ontario are already taking a look at implementing them. Now, these are the three ways in which they are going to jump-start the Ontario economy, I might say.

Firstly, and this is the heading, it says, motorists could soon be paying tolls on some Ontario highways under a massive new government strategy to fund repairs to roads, bridges, sewers, and to create affordable housing. The plan will be presented to the New Democratic cabinet very soon. Here is a quote from one of the provincial officials, this will be done as soon as is humanly possible. We are in the midst of a recession, a depression. We need these programs to begin to start immediately, an official in the Premier's office said.

The three new Crown corporations would be—now listen to this—interventionist government, get to the point. Firstly, the Ontario Transportation

Corporation. This company would build and maintain new roads and bridges addressing the Provincial Auditor's report that 60 percent of the province's transportation systems are in poor shape. The company would then finance the new road systems and repairs by charging tolls to drivers using the new upgraded arteries.

**An Honourable Member:** And off the balance sheet.

**Mr. Filmon:** Off the balance sheet all of the debt, and finance it through tolls to drivers.

Here is the second one. The Ontario Water and Sewer Corporation. This company would fund the estimated \$3 billion in necessary repairs to Ontario's ailing sewer system and allow the NDP government to move ahead on clean water initiatives it promised in the 1990 election. It would repay its debt by charging Ontarians higher user fees for clean drinking water.

**An Honourable Member:** Off the balance sheet again.

**Mr. Filmon:** Off the balance sheet, higher fees for your water.

Here is the third one, and of course members opposite will see a glimmer of familiarity in this one, the Ontario Realty Corporation. Now, the province would become the largest realty company in the world under this scenario a government source said. It would borrow money to purchase up to \$400 million worth of provincial land holdings from the government thus reducing the Ontario deficit. It would then leverage joint agreements with private developers that would ensure construction of affordable housing, and so on.

Margaret Kelch, Assistant Deputy Minister of Transportation, said in an interview that the plan would be to charge tolls on highways without having to erect tollbooths and create massive traffic jams. She told the *Star* the government may adopt a system pioneered by the state of Texas whereby all motorists are issued a highway card the size of a credit card. The highway card is placed on a motorist's dashboard where it will set off an electronic detection device on the entry and exit points of a chosen highway at normal speeds. Motorists would then be billed by the government for their number of trips past the phantom tollbooths.

**Mr. Speaker,** our government knows that bigger deficits and higher taxes are not the answer. You

know, members opposite over the last little while have been making a career of pointing fingers, gleefully talking about the food banks across the street. That is a favourite of the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer). Well, I have been here long enough to remember that there were not food banks in this province until the NDP took office in the 1980s.

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

That was an innovation that was brought about by New Democratic administration in our province. I remember as well that Maureen Hemphill was so concerned about the lack of support that was being given by her government to social services that she started collecting clothing and distributing it to needy families, because they simply were not doing enough in those days. Madam Deputy Speaker, now, of course, the New Democrats are pointing out a finger and saying it is all a result of this administration. Well, all of those things happened under New Democratic administration, and if they want to look at any province in this country, including those with New Democratic administrations, they will see that there is plenty of grief and suffering and brokenness out there for everyone, and that it is not in any way attributable to a philosophy or a government in charge.

\* (1700)

Madam Deputy Speaker, we can start going through the statistics chapter and verse about the suffering, and it does not help any. It does not help. The fact of the matter is that accepting a New Democratic solution to it would not do anything more for the misery, but it would ensure that the long-term debt kept that misery around a lot longer.

Accepting change is one of the most difficult propositions that any person can face, and we know as individuals it is our human nature to be wary of the future and the changes that it might bring. There is no question that we all experience that concern and that anxiety. Yet in Manitoba I do not think there is any doubt that we will not have the luxury of avoiding change, avoiding the creation of new approaches in order to continue to find ways of succeeding for Manitoba. We have to leave the old, even though they are familiar, ways behind. We have to continue to chart a new course.

Things are moving quickly out there. There is a real world out there economically, socially,

politically, that is changing in virtually every sector of the world, every sector of our country, and it is more obvious than ever that we have to be innovative, that we have to be flexible, and that we have to be adaptable to meet the challenges of that rapidly changing world.

The real face of change, I think, is underlined by an example that I think we can all relate to. When we held our last provincial election in 1990, the Soviet Union was the largest country in the world, and Communism still was reigning out there in Eastern Europe. In 1991, when I was in Kiev and Moscow on trade missions, we were dealing directly with Ukrainian and Russian leaders, government officials working together. By 1992 the Soviet Union is already extinct. Manitoba companies are now dealing directly with organizations, companies that have been set up, joint ventures in Ukraine and in other areas of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

Rapid global change has rendered all of the old assumptions and traditional practices almost useless in this new age. We need to find new ways and new thinking to find solutions to the problems that face us. Above all we have to be innovative, and that was the principal message that was put forth by the Economic and Innovation Technology Council forum last month here in the province. It is the new reality. It is the climate in which all of us must compete. Government and the private sector, all of us must strive and compete in that new reality if we are going to excel.

I know that Manitobans can excel in this new world. I know that they will be able to build their future strong again as we go into a new millennium, and I am proud to say that Manitoba is at the forefront. When we were looking at opportunities, for instance, in Eastern Europe we were the first Canadian province to sign a partnership agreement with Russia. We made substantial inroads in Ukraine and Russia. Last May, Industry, Trade and Tourism sponsored a Doing Business in Ukraine and Russia seminar, and conducted trade opportunities and trade missions to those countries.

We have already Manitoba companies like Pollard Banknote supplying lottery tickets into the new Commonwealth of Independent States. We have a Manitoba company, Central Canadian Structures, that has built one three-star hotel in Leningrad and design work has begun on a new four-star hotel for Leningrad. F. W. Sawatzky has

completed its first project in Moscow, five floors, 18,000 square feet of office space for leasing. One of our architectural firms, Smith Carter and partner is working on a resort hotel project in Yalta. We have an organization that we have put together through I, T and T called Arctic bridge with Russia to further assist our private sector companies to gain work over in Russia. Numerous other Manitoba companies and businesses are pursuing projects that I believe will create in future millions of dollars of opportunities and jobs for Manitobans.

Take the People's Republic of China; they are operating on their transition to what they call a socialist market economy. Now I am not sure what exactly that means, but I do know that it is looking more and more suspiciously like a competitive market economy, and they are moving in steps gradually over a decade to get to a market economy such as we find in most areas of the world.

Last month several of us were over there in the People's Republic of China with private sector people to meet with ministerial level people from the ministry of commerce, ministry of energy, ministry of agriculture, ministry of foreign economic relations and trade. Manitoba companies who have the experience and the technology to tackle some of the biggest infrastructure investment projects that have ever taken place in that country are very optimistic about their opportunities. Opportunities to get involved with things such as, of course, high-voltage direct current transmission lines, grain handling, transportation, distribution and storage, \$1 billion investment from the World Bank, projects for feed mills that some are working on. Major projects, major opportunities. Good for Manitoba, good for our employment here.

In the U.K. in September, we met with companies who will be placing \$340 million worth of aerospace work with four Manitoba companies over the next decade. Well, that is I think a very impressive risk.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

You can imagine my shock and disappointment when I found out that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) has been critical of our efforts to foster this kind of investment in trade promotion. You can imagine how shocked I was when the Leader of the Opposition said I was spending too much time out of the province, that this was not good for Manitoba to be stimulating this kind of investment and trade and job creation opportunity for Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, while he was here poor-mouthing Manitoba and wringing his hands, I was out there with dedicated Manitobans working to stimulate investment, working to stimulate job creation and economic development opportunities for Manitoba.

I will go anywhere in the world to promote opportunities for Manitoba. Anytime it means investment, job creation, trade opportunities for Manitobans, I will go there, every time.

Mr. Speaker, you know, in his supercilious way, the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) makes comments about who represents Manitoba. I will just quote from some letters that we got from the people who were with us: Dear Mr. Premier: It was a personal pleasure being a part of the official Manitoba delegation to Hong Kong and Beijing. The fact that we were able to meet with the ministry of foreign economic relations in trade, commerce and agriculture department officials was most valuable to Feed-Rite and Agri-Tec. The discussions with CITIC, that is the China International Trade and Investment Corporation, and the Bank of China were very timely for me in Shanghai. He goes on to tell about the opportunities that have evolved as a result of that and some pretty major opportunities for his company as a result of that.

The next one: On behalf of the Agri-Tec businessmen, I would like to thank you for inviting us to accompany you to China. Premiers open doors that are difficult to access as a businessman. Equally important, the people we see in the normal course of business are aware that we have met with their superiors as members of the Manitoba Premier's delegation. Following your official meetings, Agri-Tec met with various government agencies and organizations. They were all aware of the high-level Manitoba government visit and interested in the Manitoba trade objectives.

Mr. Speaker, these are real opportunities that are being created, and they are not the kind of thing, the cheap, two-bit kind of criticism that we are being given by the New Democratic Party, and I have to tell you that it is interesting that his colleagues who are in government are all over there. Bob Rae was in Japan for the second time in six months—second time in six months—when we were there.

Mr. Speaker, they were all over there because they know that there are opportunities for business and for expansion of their economies, and they

believe in that, but it is only a New Democrat Leader of the Opposition who does not live in the real world, who can get away with that kind of cheap, two-bit criticism—cheap, two-bit criticism.

\* (1710)

Our government has been preparing for and coping with change. For example, even in Japan, in our traditionally strong agricultural sector, the areas of trade goals for Manitoba today and in the future are not in the traditional area of wheat sales, for instance. What are we selling over there? New, specialty innovative agricultural products aimed at niche markets. Grass seed, bird seed, pheasant, goose, turkey, honey, buckwheat, all sorts of diversified products that did not even exist as a market 10 years ago are the markets of today, and you have to be there in order to do the work to establish those markets for our producers and suppliers.

Today, you can find made-in-Manitoba products like books and pressure-treated lattice wood panels; thermopane windows right across the United States, new markets that have opened up even in the past few years; silk blouses at Saks Fifth Avenue in New York; lottery tickets being sold in Spain; busses in San Francisco; french fries at all of the McDonald's outlets in Tokyo; Wrangler and Calvin Klein jeans in Vancouver and Montreal. The Chameleon computer software system that enables consumers as far away as Australia to view accurate colour simulations of home decorating products was introduced by Manitobans.

The international cosmetics giant Estée Lauder is using as their point-of-purchase sale computer software, software that was developed by a Winnipeg firm. In Las Vegas and Ft. Lauderdale, the people who ride these vehicles that give out parking tickets, those three-wheel vehicles that the parking wardens are driving in Las Vegas and Ft. Lauderdale are made in Manitoba.

Those are opportunities that were not there a decade ago. Those are new markets in niche areas that Manitobans are able to fulfill and succeed in. These are positive stories that you never, ever hear from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) or his colleagues. They never want to get actively involved in helping Manitobans to build stronger.

Manitobans, I believe, are looking to their government, to their representatives in government. They are looking to all of us to do whatever we can

to get our economy growing again. It is the No. 1 priority for Manitobans, and they do not want to have somebody out there with negative messages carping and complaining, doom and gloom, cheap shots. They want somebody out there rolling up their sleeves and working to create a better environment. That is what they want.

That is what this throne speech is all about. It is about a vision for a stronger economic base for Manitoba. It puts together key elements of a plan to achieve that stronger economic base. We are going to continue to build on some of the recent innovations that we have brought forward, like the Economic Development Board, that allows us to co-ordinate all of the economic development activities of government under one structure; like the Rural Grow Bonds that have resulted in new and innovative opportunities for growth in rural Manitoba, new businesses created as a result of it; the Crocus Fund, a labour-sponsored capital investment fund that again gives us another opportunity to gather together risk and venture capital to build this province strong; the Vision Capital Fund, yet another opportunity for venture capital in this province; the Mineral Exploration Incentive Program.

Tax initiatives and credits in mining have created new opportunities and stimulated exploration and development that has not been seen in this province for decades. It has not been seen since the early '70s, when the Schreyer government brought in punitive taxation rates on mining and royalties in this province. Finally we are getting firms from as far away as Australia who have not been here for decades investing in exploration and development.

Mr. Speaker, here is an article from The Northern Miner. The title is: NDP killing mining. It goes on to say that the hardest hit provinces for investment in mining are Ontario and British Columbia because of their new approach to mining which is more taxes and more disincentives for mining. It goes on to say that Manitoba is putting out the welcome mat for mining exploration development. The province's new approach is bound to pay off, it says.

Here are some more quotes that were said about the initiatives that were brought forward by the Minister of Energy and Mines, the former Minister of Energy and Mines, and the Minister of Finance in the course of the last two budgets.

Headline in *The Northern Miner*: Manitoba revives mining; headline in *The Financial Post*: Manitoba gives mining a boost. Analysis from Loewen Ondaatje McCutcheon, who are a brokerage firm: Mining taxation in Manitoba, a significant positive development. In an extremely bold move, one province is going against the trend—Manitoba. We regard the fiscal stance taken in Manitoba as evolutionary and very beneficial to the long-term health of the mining industry in Canada.

Another quote, from the president of Noranda Exploration: Manitoba woos mineral exploration with grants, tax holiday for start-ups. It is going to have a major effect when we come around to allocating our funding for projects, he said.

Look at more things that are being said about our mining. From an article in *The Northern Miner*: But the provinces, or at least some of them, are also learning that they have to compete to attract capital to make those mines. In that sense, Manitoba's efforts are particularly enlightened. The changes it has implemented will make it even more attractive when compared with British Columbia, Ontario or Saskatchewan. So when companies are targeting their limited exploration budgets these days, Manitoba may get some of the attention it deserves. That is another article from *The Northern Miner*.

We will continue to improve the way that our government does business. We will continue to upgrade all of the programs that we have for attracting investment and job creation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just take a moment, while I am on the topic of change, to say a few words about the recent announcement by the Leader of the Liberal Party, the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs). Certainly the Leader of the Liberal Party and I have had our share of disagreements over many issues over the past years. But I respect her dedication to the democratic process, and I want to say that on the record publicly.

The member for River Heights has often been, I believe, a good example of opposition, contribution and responsibility. Her enthusiasm and her constructive suggestions, as Liberal Leader, have been a welcome addition to this legislative Chamber when all too often we have heard nothing but negative doom and gloom. We have often been pleased to accept some of her suggestions and ideas because I think they, for the most part, have

come from a genuine concern for the people of this province. I certainly compliment her, and in her resigning her position as Liberal Leader, I think that she has made a personal choice which I can understand and accept, and I wish her well in all that she does, Mr. Speaker.

I think her resignation and her leaving that role leaves a great vacuum there, because we certainly do not get any leadership out of the official opposition in terms of their criticisms. They make these vacuous criticisms, such as the Leader of the Opposition is making a big fuss these days about an increase in Autopac rates, and he is saying that compared to inflation, they are a terribly big increase. Well, of course, you cannot compare them to inflation because what has changed is the increase in claims, and the increase in claims, despite low inflation, has gone up 16.5 percent because of court awards for damage, bodily injury damages. It has absolutely nothing to do with inflation when courts are giving huge increases of 16.5 percent on the claims, Mr. Speaker.

It is absolutely foolish that we see these kinds of—and you know the theatrics that the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) goes through to try and attract attention and to try and portray himself as something, to try and sneak out a clip and to try and plant a seed in the minds of the media.

\* (1720)

We saw, for instance, the member for Concordia go out after the throne speech, and media people told me that four times in about a three-minute scum he tried to compare me to George Bush. Of course, he thought that somebody out there might make the connection and say, well, then, he must be Bill Clinton. I have to admit that I am no George Bush, but he sure as heck is no Bill Clinton either, I will tell you that.

I have to talk a little bit more about his capability as an opposition. The effectiveness of the Leader of the Opposition, I think, was shown by an ad that appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press*. They said: In the Legislature there is the Premier, the cabinet, the official opposition and the second opposition party, and then there is legislative reporter Donald Campbell, the real opposition.

That advertisement may say something about the state of the craft of journalism in today's world, but I believe it says a whole lot more about the sorry state of the opposition benches in our Legislature.

I understand, as a matter of fact, that the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) has now joined the legislative press gallery hockey team. Did I hear that correctly? He is playing for the legislative press gallery hockey team? Well, Mr. Speaker, I was told that the member for Concordia has joined the hockey team of the legislative press gallery, and even there he plays second string.

I just want to make one point here as I draw to a conclusion about some of the contributions that have been made by members opposite. I found particularly offensive a comment that was made by the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli). This is the quote that was in her remarks, and I quote: I hate to say it, but when I look across at the benches opposite, I see a bunch of old white guys. That is the majority of the impression that I am faced with on a daily basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed, I might say, in the media for not picking up on that, because if that statement had been made by a member on this side of the House, or if that statement and the adjective in it had been any other race or colour, there would have been a charge to the Human Rights Commission for that statement, because we in this province and every other province in Canada do not allow discrimination as to age, as to colour or as to gender. That comment is a racist statement which discriminates on all three.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), of course, loves to play this kind of politics of division, this kind of politics of racism. His member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) ought to be not only disciplined, but ought to be ashamed of herself for that kind of offensive statement. I truly regret that we have a member in this House who has that integrity and those ethics.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few remarks about the things that Manitobans can be proud of. One of them is that this government in five straight budgets has not increased taxes. That is no increase in personal taxes, no increase in corporate taxes and no increase in the retail sales tax. As well as doing that, we have controlled our provincial deficit.

In all of those things, we have also been able to continue funding to Health, Education and Family Services by significant increases beyond inflation. As a matter of fact, in reviewing the proportion of our budget that is spent on Health, Education and

Family Services, it is greater today than it ever was under the New Democrats in government—greater than it ever was in those days.

I believe that those are things that Manitobans can be proud of. No matter what the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) says, he cannot change the facts. We are working with Manitobans to create a stronger Manitoba, and our approach is working. Private capital investment is up 8.9 percent this year over last year in Manitoba. That is the best performance of all provinces.

Manitoba is one of only three provinces to record a decline in business bankruptcies in 1992. The Conference Board of Canada said that Manitoba's real gross domestic product growth for 1992 will be tied for second best in the country. Our unemployment rate is the second best in Canada. Winnipeg is the least costly city in Canada in order to start a light manufacturing business. Stats Canada had said that Manitoba is expected to have the second largest increase in total capital investment of any province in Canada this year.

We are ranked No. 1 in manufacturing investment intentions, ranked No. 1 in private capital investment intentions.

There is tremendous change going on in the world, but there is also tremendous opportunity. The simple reality is that there is no easy solution to Manitoba's economic and social challenges. If there were, it would have been used a long time ago. Every world leader would have taken that magic solution if there had been one available.

I believe that as time goes on more and more Manitobans recognize that fact. There is no easy solution, and although they want to hear good news, I believe Manitobans above all want to hear the truth. Good or bad, they just want to know where they stand and who will stand with them through good times and bad, and that is this government.

We have a skilled and productive work force, the most productive agricultural land in the west, abundant mineral and forestry resources, the cheapest hydroelectricity in North America, and an ideal location in the centre of North America, as well as forward-looking economic policies.

We have taken a positive approach to government. I say to you that, no matter how fast the world changes today, we have to be prepared for success just the same way that we have been doing in the past. Each of us has to look for our

strengths in our own regions and our own communities, and turn those strengths into products and services that the world needs and opportunities for Manitobans. Throughout our history, our greatest achievements have been based on hard work and determination to succeed against all odds. It is the thread that binds all Manitobans and upon which Canadians have built one of the greatest nations in the world.

Mr. Speaker, believing in ourselves, believing that we can succeed, believing that we can be the best is the first step toward being the best. I believe in Manitoba. I am proud to be a Manitoban. I am proud of the work of all Manitobans throughout history. I am proud of where we have come from. I am proud of where we are going. We live in a wonderful province in a great nation.

\* (1730)

I invite all Manitobans to work with us to make this province of ours even greater. I will be voting in support of the throne speech, and I invite all members of the House to join me in that support, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to Rule 35(4), I am interrupting the proceedings in order to put the question on the motion of the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay), that is, for an address to the honourable Administrator in answer to his speech at the opening of this session.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

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

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** On division, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** On division.

Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? 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 8, 1992

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Presenting Petitions

Restriction of Stubble Burning  
Cheema

332

#### Reading and Receiving Petitions

Restriction of Stubble Burning  
Carstairs

332

#### Introduction of Bills

Bill 208, Workers Compensation  
Amendment Act  
Reid

332

#### Oral Questions

Decentralization  
Doer; Filmon

333

Video Lottery Terminals  
Lamoureux; Filmon

335

Decentralization  
Wowchuk; Filmon; Lathlin; Downey

336

Keewatin Community College  
Lathlin; Filmon

337

Video Lottery Terminals  
Gaudry; Derkach

337

Decentralization

Plohman; Derkach

338

Aboriginal Justice Inquiry

Chomiak; McCrae

339

Hazardous Waste

Edwards; Cummings

340

#### Nonpolitical Statements

Folklorama

Reimer

341

Cerilli

341

Lamoureux

342

Death of George Barone, Sculptor

Helwer

342

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Throne Speech Debate

(Eighth Day of Debate)

Findlay

343

Lathlin

349

Gaudry

352

Maloway

357

C. Evans

361

Filmon

365