



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

39 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXIX No. 3A - 1:30 p. m., MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1990



Printed by the Office of the Queens Printer, Province of Manitoba

ISSN 0542—5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARR, James	Crescentwood	Liberal
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CONNERY, Edward, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
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
HARPER, Elijah	Rupert Island	NDP
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	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	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	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, October 15, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF REPORTS

Mr. Speaker: I am pleased to table the Annual Report on The Elections Finances Act, covering the period January 1, 1989, and December 31, 1989; and also according to Section 55 of The Freedom of Information Act, I am pleased to table the report of the Ombudsman for the calendar year January 1, 1989, to December 31, 1989; and in accordance with Section 42 of The Ombudsman Act, I am pleased to table the Twentieth Annual Report of the Ombudsman covering the calendar year January 1, 1989, to December 31, 1989.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table at this time the First Quarterly Report of The Manitoba Telephone System to March 31, 1990; also the Second Quarterly Report of The Manitoba Telephone System to June 30, 1990; also the Three Month Report for the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission, April 1 to June 30, 1990.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the 1989 Annual Report of The Manitoba Telephone System printed on recyclable paper.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Industry, Trade and Tourism Department.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Family Violence Government Strategy

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): We have an epidemic in our country, Mr. Speaker, an epidemic that again came home tragically on the weekend with the death of a sixth person in Manitoba, a victim of abuse in a family situation. In

fact, there have been approximately two deaths per week in Canada in 1990.

Unfortunately, we have failed the victim of this last weekend. Every time she called upon all of us and all the public authorities, we have failed her and we have failed her two surviving children, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). What action is the Government taking to develop a comprehensive strategy to deal with the victims of abuse, to deal with the restraining orders and the lack of enforcement, to deal with a comprehensive strategy with the police, so that we cannot fail in the future when women and victims of abuse are so sadly failed in terms of our society and in terms of the Province of Manitoba?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the concern expressed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) is a well-placed concern. I am sure all Honourable Members in this House will join with me in expressing sympathy to the family of Desiree Watson. To those who knew her, I think today is a day for that kind of expression of shock and horror and sympathy.

As a result of that case and others referred to by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I received today a copy of a news release put out by the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, along with a letter from Ms. Marilyn Gault, the Chairperson of that Council. My office has also been in contact today with Pam Jackson of EVOLVE. Meetings have been set with both of those people for later this week. I have been in touch also with the Women's Directorate, with the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson), the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) and the Manitoba Police Commission, coincidentally meeting this morning. I discussed the very issues raised by the Honourable Member.

* (1335)

The press release put out by the advisory council makes reference to certain suggestions, certain recommendations. My department is looking very seriously at the recommendations made, but I would like very much to conclude consultations with some

of the people that I have mentioned and others before embarking further or saying more about the matter today.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that my department is extremely concerned about the issues raised by the Honourable Member.

Mr. Doer: I thank the Minister for his answer. My supplementary question is to the Premier. The Ministry of Justice is certainly involved directly and indirectly in the issues raised by my first question, but certainly those issues are beyond just the ministry of Justice. They are in many other departments of Government.

My question is to the First Minister. Will he develop a comprehensive strategy with his appropriate ministries to deal with the fact that on four occasions the restraining orders had been issued, and there still were the tragic consequences to deal with the issues of the crisis centres and the counselling that is necessary to deal with the issues in many of the departments of Government? Will he take the lead to develop the comprehensive strategy necessary to meet this epidemic crisis in our country and in Manitoba?

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I realize that in my first answer I did not make specific reference to victims and restraining orders and police procedures. That was because I felt I had used enough time as it was.

In any event, I think the Honourable Member in asking his question puts aside or perhaps ignores—I do not mean on purpose, but perhaps ignores by his question—some of the many initiatives that our Government has brought forward in the space of the last two and a half years. I refer, for example, to the Crisis Line, Manitoba-wide funded by our Government, the “abuse is a crime” public education program, the domestic assault tracking project underway in my department, the establishment of a family violence court which provides better services for women, for elderly people and for children, the substantial increase in support for shelters for abused women across our province, increased levels of judicial education going on in our province since our Government came along in 1988.

With due respect to the Honourable Member and the Government he once represented, in 1983 his Government brought in a charging policy with respect to domestic violence which is still being carried out by this Government, something that we

are monitoring and perhaps need to monitor further and will do.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, obviously we are failing, and we are failing in 1990 that we have the sixth victim tragically murdered in our Manitoba society. It is part of a Canadian epidemic, as I said before; it is part of a national tragedy.

My supplementary question, therefore, is again to the Premier. Will he bring together all his lead ministries in this very, very crucial area, whether it is the shelters that are potentially closing across Manitoba, whether it is the funding for counselling in areas under health care, whether it is the lack of any enforcement of restraining orders—four restraining orders with this one victim—whether it is the whole issue of counselling and prevention and courts and police? Will the Premier make it a No.1 priority to bring together his lead Ministers to deal with this national problem and indeed, unfortunately, a Manitoba problem?

Mr. McCrae: I do not think it should be unknown to anyone in this province that the issue of family violence is a No.1 priority of this Government. The initiatives that I have outlined I think give testimony to that statement.

The Honourable Member refers to this as being a chronic problem and how the system has failed. Certainly whatever system that has been developed over the years in this province and throughout the country failed Desiree Watson. We know that. We are as concerned about that as anybody could be, being responsible for Justice services, Family Services, Status of Women services, other services provided to the people of Manitoba.

What I am trying to tell the Honourable Member is that I, as one of the Ministers in the Premier's Government, view this very seriously. I know from my discussions with my colleagues that they view this matter very seriously as well. What I am trying to say to the Honourable Member is that the repetition of the types of occurrences, tragic occurrences that we have seen in recent weeks, touching my own community of Brandon during the election campaign, all of those things come together to tell me as Minister of Justice that something indeed further could be done, and if something can be done then it ought to be done. So, therefore, without very much time passing there will be further announcements.

* (1340)

Legislative Building Access Policy

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Driedger). Today, security staff in this building restricted the access of representatives of parent-child centres to their own Legislature as they attempted to visit their duly elected representatives to make them aware of cutbacks in these vital services.

I have a letter from my Leader making clear our opposition to such restrictions. I want to ask the Minister of Government Services when he will stop unilaterally restricting access to Natives, students, parent-child representatives and other Manitobans to their Legislature and to their publicly elected officials?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, let me first of all also express my deep regrets and deepest sympathy to the family for the events that happened in our province this weekend. I think all Members probably feel revulsion at what happened. Certainly I think everybody is sincere about trying to resolve that.

In reply to the question raised by the Member, I want to indicate that we have approximately 60 demonstrations a year that take place at the Legislature. Last year after a particularly boisterous one, we tried to enter into discussion with all parties involved in terms of how to control it. The reason to do that was to try and see if we could protect the safety of people working in the building as well as visiting in the building.

At that time an agreement was reached that if there were demonstrations, those people wishing a smaller group could then make arrangements to see the various Ministers or the MLAs. We have tried to adhere to that to some degree without trying to restrict access to the building.

Mr. Speaker, in the last while, we have had three particularly difficult demonstrations at the Legislature. My staff and I are at present trying to work out some kind of a system to be able to control, to some degree, demonstrations inside. We have a policy that was agreed to that there would be no major demonstrations inside the building, placards, et cetera. There have to be some rules and regulations, but we are trying to see whether we can come forward with a policy that is going to be acceptable.

Parent-Child Centres Funding

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer).

During September, three of five child-parent centres in the City of Winnipeg were forced to close their doors because of insufficient funds after repeated requests for provincial funding. These centres were providing valuable preventive community-based services. They were helping prevent child abuse and neglect, and they were providing positive parenting experiences.

My question to the Minister of Family Services is: Will he now commit emergency funds to immediately reopen these centres which have provided so valuable services to inner city families?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that I, too, am appalled by the events of this last weekend, and I am sure that all thinking, caring people in Manitoba turn their thoughts to the family and friends of the victims.

In response to the question, this department has not funded that agency in the past, and any indications on funding will have to wait for the coming budget.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, until these centres are funded, since they are no longer able to provide these necessary programs, in the interim until a decision is made on funding of these essential services, will the Minister guarantee that similar family support services will be provided for these inner city families, these parents and children who currently have nowhere else to turn?

* (1345)

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, we have a number of agencies, of course, that the Government funds, and we seem to have an unlimited number of groups that are coming forward for funding. These services will have to be provided by the existing agencies at this time.

Family Violence Firearms Confiscation

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae).

I think we are all horrified. I do not think there is any question. One does not have to have any particular political allegiance to be horrified by what happened over the weekend. We all are.

My question is why, when there was a restraining order in this particular case and the man was in possession of a weapon, was that weapon not confiscated?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I think, Mr. Speaker, the circumstances surrounding the case that happened so recently, it is dangerous to get into too many details of a particular case while it is still very current.

The Honourable Member's question raises another concern which gives me reason to be calling for a review of what happened, why it happened, who was involved, and how they were involved. All of those questions, I hope in the near future to find answers to, not only for the Honourable Member, but so that we can come up with procedures that perhaps more effectively deal with situations that can arise.

It is always very, very hard, Mr. Speaker, to know what lurks in the minds of everyone and what motivates people. It is always difficult and it is tough to be in the Department of Justice sometimes and find yourself picking up the pieces where other departments are able to do things that are more in the way of preventative and more in the way of providing counselling and services. Our gun control legislation is there, and if there has been some way that legislation has not been complied with, I want to know about it. I want to see that it does not happen any more.

Mrs. Carstairs: If a Firearms Acquisition Certificate is given to an individual, that is on police files. Can the Attorney General tell us if, from this day forward when a restraining order is given in a potentially violent situation, all of the firearms listed by the police will be confiscated?

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, the point is a good one, and I will indeed look into the matter raised by the Honourable Member just to find out, in this particular case and in other cases, what rules apply to restraining orders and what conditions can be attached to them.

We already know that sometimes that piece of paper is about as good as what it is, a piece of paper. That is the tragedy of the Watson case, but I will take

the Honourable Member's question seriously and look further into it.

Family Violence Firearms Reporting)

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary question to the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer).

Can the Minister tell me today if a report that the former Minister promised me on June 13, 1989, is now available which would indicate the protocols for Family Service workers in the reporting of firearms when they know there is a potentially violent situation?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I will have to get that information for the Member. I will see that you have it in the next few days.

Residential Tenancies Act Introduction

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in June 1988 the First Minister claimed that the new Residential Tenancies Act was too big a Bill to be brought in immediately and would have to wait until the next Session. After stalling for over a year, the Housing Minister finally brought it in in November of 1989 only to be ordered by the Premier to kill it in March of this year.

My question for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) is: When did the Premier order him to drop the Bill, and why did he not say that any amendments could have been done in committee?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): It is our first question by the Member from across the way. We had other Members on that side of the House that seemed to give the same kind of questions. However, we have committed ourselves in the throne speech to bring back that particular Bill—I must say to you, Mr. Speaker, a much improved Bill when we bring it back.

* (1350)

Mr. Martindale: On March 8 the NDP tabled two February letters from the Winnipeg Real Estate Board and the Professional Property Managers Association requesting that Bill 42 be gutted. Despite denials at the time that they influenced the Minister, the proof was obvious to anyone watching.

What changes did these groups order the Minister to make before the Bill was brought back?

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, none.

Lobby Groups

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Burrows, with your final supplementary question.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Real Estate Board recently boasted, and I quote—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to remind the Honourable Member that a supplementary question does not require a preamble. The Honourable Member kindly put his question now please.

Mr. Martindale: Mr. Speaker, we know that the Real Estate Board is bragging that they put pressure on the Minister.

My question for the Minister of Housing is: Will the Minister concede that he was lobbied by this industry, and will he table in the House today all correspondence between his department, himself, the MREA and the WREB concerning the Bill along with a list of all his contributors to his election campaign?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, all Ministers are lobbied by everyone along the way including the Member across the way, who also lobbied the same Minister on behalf of the residents.

Family Violence Rural Crisis Centre Funding

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Family Services.

During the last few weeks the tragedies of family violence and domestic brutality have been brought home to us all quite clearly. Rural women, like others across Manitoba, are faced with life-threatening situations every day. Often they must face these crisis situations alone without adequate services. Uncertain funding has become a major problem for rural shelters like the Eastman Crisis Centre, the Parkland Crisis Centre, Flin Flon and others.

What will your Government do to ensure that these emergency funds will be made available and that further crisis services will not be cut back?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): As I indicated on Friday, our funding record for shelters has been a good one. We have increased the funding to shelters by 47 percent in the last two budgets.

With the Eastman shelter, the funding was increased by 150 percent over two years. -(interjection)- In that case we acted very swiftly. As I indicated on the first day in office, I was made aware of this shortfall and the problems that the shelter in Steinbach was having. That situation has been remedied, and the shelter will be reopening in the near future.

Swan River Abuse Centre Funding

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): A first supplementary question, during the election, the Swan River rape abuse centre was assured by the Premier, in a letter that I am willing to table here, that they would receive \$25,000 in funding to provide abuse service. To this day none of the funds have been received. When can they expect to receive this funding?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): I can assure the Member that we are concerned with crisis shelters across the province and that we will be providing funding for the existing shelters, that our concern is just as great for the shelters in all areas of the province, and we will be dealing with it in the near future.

Ms. Wowchuk: Of the \$25,000 that was promised to Swan River, is that in addition to the \$13,000 that they were receiving, or is the \$13,000 that they are presently receiving included in that \$25,000.00?

* (1355)

Mr. Gilleshammer: Again, our record of funding these shelters over the last two years is very clear. We will be tabling a new budget in a matter of a couple of weeks, and we will be able to go through the details of that budget in the Estimates process.

Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Legal Intervention

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): The Government of Saskatchewan and Premier Grant Devine have and continue to display a complete lack of respect for the laws of this country. Last Friday, the First

Minister indicated that he was content to let Ottawa deal with the situation.

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). Now that Mr. de Cotret has indicated that he will not be pulling Saskatchewan's licence on the Rafferty-Alameda project, will this Government immediately commence injunction proceedings and take the Saskatchewan Government to court to stop the project, or are they going to again let the Wildlife Federation do their job and protect Manitoba's interests?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the approach that we have taken with Saskatchewan and the federal Government is that the federal authorities must exercise their full responsibility in dealing with the sanctity of environmental law in this country.

I have been in touch with Ottawa as recently as this morning again to try to move them into accepting that responsibility, and we will continue to put every effort we can in that direction.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, the Rafferty Dam part of the project could be finished in two weeks. Why is this Government willing to delay taking action to halt construction, like their Tory counterparts in Ottawa? Clearly, that is happening. It was happening today in Question Period. Is this the trade off that this Government entered into with other provinces back in April of this year when they signed a non-aggression pact?

Mr. Cummings: Obviously, the Liberal policy for unity in this country is bring in the tanks.

Mr. Speaker, in moving to have Ottawa accept its responsibility in this area, we are doing the responsible cohesive approach that needs to be taken to environmental law in this country. The Member unwittingly refers to communication between departmental officials about trying to get some clarity in environmental law. We would not have the stupid problems we have with Rafferty if there was clarity in environmental law in this country.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, the pact that was signed to could not be clearer. It calls for interim measures which need to be taken to remove environmental decision making from the courts.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Put your question, please.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, it could not be clearer—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Edwards:—what the ambition of this Government is. Why is this Government—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for St. James.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, why is this Government, this First Minister (Mr. Filmon), willing to put all his eggs in the Mulroney basket when it comes to stopping the Government of Saskatchewan, who is clearly flaunting the law of this country? He knows that this province can expect nothing from the Mulroney Government and never has been able to.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I referred to whether or not we were expecting the federal Government to live up to its responsibility, but I also very clearly stated last Friday, and I will reiterate today for the edification of the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), that we are not waiving any opportunities that we may have to deal with the Rafferty-Alameda situation, and he should be aware of that.

Family Violence Restraining Orders

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Justice Minister (Mr. McCrae).

All Members in this House are obviously shocked by the events of this weekend, and the Justice Minister has indicated that his department will be undertaking policies to review policies in effect at the Justice Department and other Government departments.

We on this side of the House thank him for that, but I wish to direct his attention to specific points, one that he made reference to himself, and that firstly is in reference to restraining orders. The Honourable Minister indicated that restraining orders are not worth the paper they are written on.

In light of the fact in this particular instance there was a restraining order in effect, what steps will the Minister take to ensure that his department and the enforcement agencies ensure to enforce the restraining orders as a preventative measure?

*(1400)

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I welcome the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to clear up the matter of the Honourable Member's misunderstanding of my first answer.

When you are dealing with people who are

prepared to flaunt the law and break the law and commit criminal acts, perhaps in those cases there are times when restraining orders are not worth the paper they are written on. There are many other law-abiding people in our jurisdiction who, when issued a restraining order or bail conditions or any agreements made with courts, are prepared to live by those agreements.

It is when someone goes out with a criminal intent and does a criminal act that we have the difficulties that we are faced with today and the difficulties that form the base of the Honourable Member's question.

I think that we have seen enough abuse of the restraining order system and abuse of the court system where courts issue rules and issue injunctions and people do not obey them. We have seen enough that it is time for us to take a very serious look at that, and that is what I was talking about today.

The form that review will take will be made known in the very near future.

Crisis Centre Funding

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): The second aspect of prevention of course is providing services to victims or potential victims of these types of offences.

Will the Minister in his discussions, in his review, ensure that funding for facilities that provide counselling and other centres, so that women and other people do not have to live in fear, can be dealt with adequately?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Those are the kinds of services that my honourable colleague, the Honourable Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), was talking about. Those are the kinds of services that we find that we talk about quite often because Honourable Members, especially on that side of the House, keep raising issues about services provided to people who are at risk.

Our Government has taken our responsibilities very seriously. In fact, I could suggest dramatically more seriously than the Government which preceded us, the Government which was supported by the Honourable Member.

Services Review

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): My final supplementary is this: Statistics are for losers, Mr. Minister, and in this instance many women are being lost under this system.

My final question is, will the Minister commit to this House when that review and when that discussion will take place, and when he will return to the House with those specific responses?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): As I said earlier, I will move with dispatch to assure that an appropriate review methodology is arrived at in the very near future. I do not want to proceed on anything of this nature before I have finished the meetings that I referred to in my earlier questions, meetings with people in the law enforcement field, people in the caring agencies, people who are involved with counselling victims of these kinds of occurrences.

I do not think the Honourable Member would like me to jerk my knee and make an announcement today before appropriate consultations have been held, but I can tell the Honourable Member and assure him those consultations are happening very soon. My office moved this morning to set meetings as early as possible with people who are interested and prepared to give us advice.

Manitoba Telephone System Community Calling Program

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): My question is to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System. Mr. Speaker, the people in northern Manitoba are used to this Government imposing solutions on the North which may work in the southern part of the province but which clearly do not work in northern Manitoba. One such example is the Community Calling program.

On August 3 I wrote to the Minister responsible and told the Minister that members in the community of Snow Lake and Flin Flon were clearly upset with the way that the Community Calling program was being implemented in those communities. The Minister saw fit not to act and subsequently there have been angry protest meetings in both Flin Flon and Snow Lake.

I am wondering whether the Minister can stand now in his place and justify to the people of Flin Flon and Snow Lake and Cranberry Portage why their

basic telephone rates should increase 56, 66, 80 percent. Can he explain to the House why that is necessary?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System): Mr. Speaker, the Member puts again some misinformation on the record. A significant series of public consultations were held throughout rural Manitoba as the program was developed. Public Utilities Board had hearings on two different occasions on this issue. The board of Manitoba Telephone System has had rural meetings throughout Manitoba each of the past two years, and I would like to remind him that when a meeting was held in The Pas on March 2, there was absolutely no public attendance, so it does not seem to be a particular issue up there. Most recently, the Manitoba Telephone System staff met with the affected people in the Snow Lake and Flin Flon area on October 2, when the issue was raised, to go and hear their concerns directly.

Also, the board has met with the citizens of Flin Flon as recently as October 11, and the board is presently reviewing the plans as to whether the plan as proposed and was not objected to initially, either in the planning stages or in the Public Utilities Board hearing—and the fact is, it is the right plan for the citizens of that area—but I can tell the Member there have been continuous meetings, continuous opportunity for input. It was not till he became involved and started putting misinformation on the record that the public suddenly became disturbed.

Mr. Storie: The Minister has no right to point any finger after the misinformation he just laid on the public record. There was one public meeting in The Pas, as the Member referenced, months before any decision had been made in terms of the rate that would be imposed in Cranberry and Flin Flon. The fact is that those meetings he referenced were well attended.

My question is to the Minister. Given the almost unanimous recommendation of both the meetings that he referenced, will the Minister now acknowledge that the program will not work in those communities? It is not wanted; it is not needed. Will the Minister now order MTS to withdraw that part of the Community Calling Program—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put. The Honourable Minister responsible.

Mr. Findlay: I will remind the Member that, as I said in my previous answer, the board is reviewing the

situation with regard to those communities, but I would also like to remind him that Snow Lake will have access to additional 4,400 telephones in this program, Flin Flon an access to additional 1,200 telephones, and Cranberry Portage, additional 4,400. It expands their area. It is done on the principle of the communities with the greatest frequency of calls.

MTS did that in terms of, between Cranberry Portage, Snow Lake and Flin Flon, the greatest exposure in terms of number of calls placed in the past is used as the basis to determine which community should be put together. That record is there, but the board is going to review it as to whether things have changed in the most recent months, as to whether some other process should be used.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, the Minister continues to get his facts wrong. My final supplementary to the Minister is given that the board representatives at the Flin Flon meeting undertook to have a referendum of subscribers to determine whether this program—(interjection)—

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

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) has been in this House for 10 years. He sat on this side, he sat on that side for two years, I would think by this time he would know that on a supplementary question a preamble is not allowed by the rules of this House.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Opposition House Leader, on the same point of order.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I did not get up earlier to also point out that answers to questions should also not be used as debate which the Minister was clearly doing. I think that is probably one of the reasons why the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) has perhaps been trying to correct the record on other questions. It may be in fact that one is not allowed on supplementary questions to have preambles, but I also believe it is clear in our rules that one should not engage in debate in answers to questions as well.

* (1410)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. Manness), he is quite correct. Supplementary questions do not require preamble.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Would the Honourable Member kindly put his question now, please.

Mr. Storie: My question to the Minister is, given the fact that the board representative clearly said that they would take a referendum, will the Minister indicate today when that referendum will take place so that the people of Snow Lake, Cranberry Portage and Flin Flon will actually have a say on whether this program is needed or wanted—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put.

Mr. Findlay: I will tell the Member most emphatically that this Government does not order the board of the Manitoba Telephone System. This Government allows that board to develop policies. They have made a decision as to how they will handle that particular situation, and they will act as they see appropriate to deal with the situation. We will report back at that time.

Income Tax Personal Rates

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). Last year this Minister of Finance took a lot of credit for cutting some taxes for individuals in Manitoba and yet the individual income tax went up \$7 million in the first three months of this year, according to the Minister's own quarterly fiscal report compared to the same period last year, whereas corporation taxes declined by \$8 million. As a result, for every dollar of corporation income tax paid individuals in Manitoba paid \$5.00. This was in 1988. This year however for every dollar paid by corporations Manitobans had to pay \$6.00.

Is this part of the Government's agenda to shift the tax burden from corporations to the backs of individual Manitobans?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Evans) must have the days of the week mixed up. It is not Friday and I never had a question from the finance other than a Friday.

Mr. Speaker, I guess as the Member understands fully well when we make a commentary with respect to taxation we are talking about rates, and obviously the economy of the Province of Manitoba is doing very well. Obviously, that is why there is more individual revenue on the personal basis.

With respect to the corporate side, the Member is very well aware that we have the highest corporate taxes in the country. So obviously, Mr. Speaker, he is wanting us to take them even higher or the opposite of the case given the Draconian taxation levels that we inherited from the former Government that the corporations in this province are obviously experiencing some difficulty.

Mining Tax Decline

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): On the matter of mining taxes, the mining taxes have dropped a dramatic \$28 million in the first quarter of this year. Well, my question then is, why have the mining taxes dropped a \$28 million? Is it a result of a change in tax collection procedures as referred to in last year's budget? There was a possibility of this, or does it reflect a drop in mineral production in this province?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am shocked at the question. This is the second longest standing Member of this House.

The price of nickel fell from around \$7.5 to \$4, so obviously the production levels that we have seen forecasted for Inco in Thompson are down slightly, not significantly, but down slightly. Obviously the cost of bringing forward that nickel is continuing to increase, and the net profit associated with many of our mining companies is obviously reduced.

Allocations

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, in last year's budget document, the Minister made reference to resolving anomalies in the allocation of corporate income taxes for the mining industry. Can the Minister now advise the House whether he has had these discussions, and if so can he advise the House on what changes have taken place?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Those discussions are ongoing. I want to indicate to the Member that the budget provision a year ago as to a 1.5 percent special mining tax is still in place.

Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Licence Withdrawal

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we were just informed that the federal Minister of the Environment basically rejected the provincial Minister of Environment's recommendation to reinstate the full environmental assessment process.

My question to the Premier is: Why has he not instructed his Minister to call upon the federal Government to withdraw the licence from the Province of Manitoba in lieu of the fact that they have been in clear breach of the federal environmental laws? Why did his Minister not ask for that licence to be withdrawn? Why do they continue to be soft on the Province of Saskatchewan when it affects Manitoba's water quality and quantity?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is not a licence given to the Province of Manitoba, but I am sure the Member misspoke himself.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other options that we are pursuing with the federal Government as well that they may be able to exercise in order to make sure that Saskatchewan follows the spirit and the fact of the environmental regulation.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you might call the throne speech motion in the name of the Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey).

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the Session, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to rise to reply to the Speech from the Throne and offer as we always do our constructive comments on the Speech from the Throne. We are a very constructive Party and we will attempt to keep our comments in a very constructive way.

It is an honour, Mr. Speaker, to again be returned to this Chamber by the constituency of Concordia.

An Honourable Member: Sympathy vote.

Mr. Doer: I would like to thank the Honourable Member for that comment. I know how many efforts he had to try to take away the seat from the New Democratic Party. We like to see the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) in many of our constituencies. It usually helps our Members increase their plurality.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the constituents of Concordia and indeed it is an honour to be back here again, as all of us, all 57 Members, feel that it is an honour to be elected to this Chamber.

I think we should be very careful about casting aspersions on Members. I heard the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) on Friday make comments about somebody in this row and somebody in that row. I think we all started out in the third row. I think it does not make any difference to the 57 Members. It is equal. All of us are elected equally to this Chamber, and I think we should all treat each other as equal representatives from the 57 constituencies in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again congratulate Your Honour on his re-election to the position of Chair of this very tame Chamber. It is an honour I know that all of us respect in terms of the office of this House. Certainly you have gained the credibility of all Members of this Chamber with the job you have performed in the last, the 34th, Session of the Legislature.

As I mentioned in my seconding comments the other day, Mr. Speaker, I think that you have handled this House with integrity and honesty and a fair degree of sternness when necessary and of course with a sense of humour when it is necessary in this Chamber. I recall the pressure you were under just as recently as last June with very, very important decisions to be made with the challenge on a point of order from the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) in this Chamber. I think it is important for all of us to remember that the decisions you rendered, Sir, were consistent with the Rules that a Member has rights and no Party or no majority can ever trample on the rights of the minority. I applaud you for that decision.

We are also proud of the diversity and talent of our caucus. We have farmers and small businesspeople, chiefs and environmentalists, community activists, university professors and

people in small business, people with union backgrounds, Mr. Speaker. We have a variety that mirrors the society of Manitoba. -(Interjection)- Well, the farmer is not the Member for Tuxedo. Quite a successful farmer I might add. I knew that would get a reaction from the Members opposite. I am also proud of the fact that all our Members, whether they are male or female have been given major responsibilities in our caucus.

I would ask the Premier to reflect upon the fact that Manitoba has now got the second lowest per capita ratio of women in Cabinet in Canada. Sir, you are only behind the Province of Nova Scotia and I do not know whether there are any elected members in the Nova Scotia caucus, but I do know, Mr. Speaker, that when we look across the way, we do not think it is appropriate for a province like Manitoba that was the first province to fight for and obtain the vote for women in our province, it has been a province that has fought for rights and equality of women for years, men and women working together to ensure that women receive their appropriate place in our society.

I think the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has failed Manitobans in terms of having Manitoba reduced to the second lowest ratio in Canada, a criticism that we made at the time he made his Cabinet and a criticism that we will continue to make to this Government. We should as much as possible try to reflect gender equality in our decision making and in our important offices and we are committed in the New Democratic Party to righting those wrongs and ensuring that equality is part of our every day decision making, including and starting with the Cabinet of the Province of Manitoba.

An Honourable Member: I trust you will make speeches on the other side when we go to the second highest.

* (1420)

Mr. Doer: I know you will not outdo Bob Rae in the New Democrats in Ontario so we will wait for your decisions. But I am pleased that he made that commitment, Mr. Speaker, because now we know he has to appoint at least four women in the next Cabinet shuffle and so he has made a commitment on the record that he will be the second lowest in the next Cabinet shuffle. That is a very, very major commitment the Premier has made, and he has now said he is going to have four women in the Cabinet, so it is on the record and we will keep him

accountable for that fact. We thank the Premier for that alleged commitment that he just made from his seat and we will see what he does. Just by prodding the Premier just a little bit, we may have moved sexual equality a long way in Manitoba with the Tories. Of course, we know we have to prod the Tories to get any sexual equality in the Province of Manitoba.

We want to address the Speech from the Throne with a couple of general themes in mind and we note, Mr. Speaker, that moving into 1990 we are at the end of the 1980 decade, the "me" decade in North America and in the western industrial world. It is a decade that we thought was over with the changing values that are necessary to take Canada, Manitoba, and the Western World—indeed in fact the whole world—into a changed philosophy, a more co-operative philosophy in terms of the values that are necessary to take society and improve the quality of life.

We should not be proud that in society as a whole, whether it is in the United States—and their philosophy is very much appropriate to the Speech from the Throne of the Members opposite—at the end of the Reagan era, an era that is emulated and greatly admired by Members opposite, in the United States we have a greater rift between the rich and poor in that country, that very wealthy country. As we approach the end of the Thatcher era—again a person that is admired greatly by the Members opposite -(interjection)- in terms of philosophy, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has just echoed from his seat, we have again a situation that has returned almost 85 years to us, where the rich and poor have gone back to 85 years ago in terms of the rift between those two.

I know that is why the Minister of Finance applauds from his seat, because he is very much a fundamentalist in terms of his economic policies. He believes in the trickle-down theory and clearly give the tax breaks to the corporations and hope the crumbs from the table go to the public of Manitoba is the fundamental message in the Speech from the Throne now that the Conservatives have finally got a majority in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we are very disappointed that the Conservatives echoed the "me" decade in their Speech from the Throne, their Darwinian call for the rights of the individual without any balancing in the rights of society, the rights of community, the rights of family, the rights of collective effort and

co-operation which is so essential in our society today and so lacking in the Speech from the Throne that we received from the Members opposite in their presentation last week.

Again, we see the Lyon theory of economic development, or lack thereof. The Lyon theory, the Thatcher theory, the Reagan theory, the Mulroney theory is very much in vogue in the words and symbols used in the Speech from the Throne.

Give the breaks to the corporations, give all the breaks to the corporations, Mr. Speaker, and hope that some of those crumbs trickle down to the rest of us in society so we can have a meaningful and quality life.

These are not just macro-trends. The economy is in very serious trouble, something not even appreciated by the Members opposite in their Speech from the Throne.

I was at a community club yesterday and listening to a number of workers from all political stripe about their plight and their situation in their own plants and workplaces across the province, and I could not believe the stories I heard from those people, stories that are now public, some stories that have yet to have been made public by the people in those plants.

I talked to a CN worker who said it is now at the 12-year seniority level of whether you will be laid off or not and that he, with 20 years seniority, was not sure that in the next couple of months he would not lose his job or be bumped dramatically in terms of his job and his responsibilities at his workplace.

I talked to a Versatile worker, Mr. Speaker, whose colleagues had been laid off just Friday and is worried about future layoffs in his manufacturing base.

I talked to a female worker from Air Canada who has not yet found out whether she will be one of the ones laid off with a deregulation and an Americanization of our airline industry under the federal Conservatives, something that of course has been aided and abetted by policies by this Tory Government in terms of the deregulation policy.

I talked to a worker from a chemical plant whose 24-person operation was just closed down and he does not have a job after January 1, 1991.

I talked to another worker in the food processing industry that just lost their job last month and will be laid off shortly in 1991.

I listened to a farmer whose son, in rural Manitoba, is this close to having to put their operation up to auction because of what is going on, both in combination of the world prices and the lack of response from the Conservative Government in Ottawa and this Conservative Government in Manitoba, auctions that are taking place, I know and he knows, across our province every day.

Mr. Speaker, we have a made-in-Canada recession. That has not been New Democratic assertions. That has been assertions made by the Conference Board of Canada, an independent think tank that is now telling us that the GST, the high interest rates, the Tory high-dollar policy, the Conservative economic policies are driving people out of their work and driving our people out of their livelihood.

What did we see last Thursday? Do we see the Government of the Day picking up the challenge? Do we see the Government of the Day appreciating the crises before us? Do we see the Government of the Day acknowledging that, yes, people are in great difficulty and there must be something done on behalf of Manitoba families? No, we said: let us give business a few more breaks and maybe, maybe that will help out our economy. Do we see the word "leadership" being used to deal with the recession? No. The word is "facilitator."

Mr. Speaker, we believe that we have an alternative vision to our economy. We believe that you cannot take your hands off the wheel of our Manitoba economy when times are tough like the Conservatives believe. When you take your hands off the wheel of the car in the Manitoba economy, the car goes into the ditch. Just as we did in 1977 with Sterling Lyon, I suggest to you, the Conservative Government policies are going to drive the Manitoba car back into the ditch with their economic policies in this province. Mark my words.

Of course, contrary to the evidence of 12,000 jobs being lost in our manufacturing sector, the Premier and his Government says free trade is working quite well with the United States. Well, he has not talked to very many families and very many workers or gone to very many plants without talking to workers that are directly affected by his support of the Mulroney Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, every month we see thousands more people, thousands more people out of full-time work and every month we see thousands more

people in part-time service jobs in our economy. That is why when the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) comes up with the revenue numbers in the first-quarter report that were tabled in this House, we can see that we have a made-in-Manitoba recession, because this Premier has supported the major economic policies of Brian Mulroney.

This Premier stood on the stage in November, December of 1988 and supported Brian Mulroney all the way with his Free Trade Agreement with the United States. That is why Manitoba has lost 12,000 jobs; that is why Manitoba has lost its sovereignty in terms of energy issues; that is why Manitoba is having a terrible time coping with the rationalizations of all the companies. This Premier is part and parcel of the Brian Mulroney economic strategy, and it is failing the people of Manitoba in a very, very dramatic way.

Let us talk about the places that are losing their jobs—just since the election, Mr. Speaker. Remember the Premier, Manitoba is strong. Our economy is strong. Air Canada, 223 jobs; Interbake Foods, 290 jobs; Inda, 200 jobs; Canada Wire and Western Outerwear, 75 jobs; Bristol Aerospace, 45 jobs; Versatile on Friday, 35 to 40 jobs—12,000 less manufacturing jobs in 12 months, and this Government has the nerve and the audacity to say our economy is strong.

Mr. Speaker, we believe a high-paying manufacturing job in our economy is a much better proposition than a low-paying service job or a part-time job in our economy. That is where we are having difficulty; that is why the for-sale signs are all across our province; that is why the bankruptcies are up dramatically; that is why investment in the private sector and the public sector is down. When you look at all the major economic indicators, this Government is failing dismally, and the people that are most vulnerable are suffering the most in terms of our society.

* (1430)

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat surprised when the Liberal Party of Manitoba was critical of the Tories in the last Speech from the Throne, because to me the Speech from the Throne looked very similar to the Winnipeg Winter Club manifesto in terms of the announcements of the economic policies of the Liberal Party of Manitoba. Again they were very similar. Give the breaks to

corporations, let those breaks trickle down into society, not look at the whole issue of a minimum corporate tax. In fact, I raised that issue a number of times in the election. I was told that we could not put a minimum corporate tax on a power corporation that made \$215 million last year in profits and did not pay a cent in taxes, that that would be bad for our economy.

Well, we in the New Democratic Party disagree dramatically. We believe in having the issue of taxes being the issue of tax fairness and the fact that 92,000 corporations last year did not pay any taxes on \$28 billion in profit we believe is the fundamental tax issue in this province. The Conservatives and the Liberals do not believe in taxing fairly the corporations in our society. Therefore, we have a major philosophical disagreement with the corporate philosophy of the Liberals and Conservatives. We do not believe it is in the best interests of working people. We believe that there should be a minimum corporate tax system in this country so that we can not only ensure that taxes do not go up for individuals, but that we can ensure that the revenues go back to provinces so that we can pay for the health and post-secondary programs that are so essential and that are being cut back daily by the Conservatives in Ottawa in terms of this province.

So we are proud to have an alternative vision of the economy, Mr. Speaker, an alternative vision that says that, yes, we should use the market system, but we should use the market system in partnership with the public system. The public has a right and a responsibility to be involved in the economy; the public has a responsibility to ensure that the economy is working as productively as possible for the most amount of people as possible; and we have an alternative vision to the laissez-faire, trickle-down theory of the Conservatives and Liberals. We believe that the economy should be run for the people and that the people should have a say in their economic destiny and should have a say in the quality of life in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on another major area that affects our economy and affects our quality of life in the Speech from the Throne, and that is the whole area of federal-provincial relations. This Premier has been the greatest failure of any Premier in the history of this province to deal effectively—and I would underline the word "effectively"—with the federal Government. It is not

rhetoric, you just have to look at the facts. Political parties have come and gone; Premiers have come and gone from all political parties. There have been successes and failures in federal-provincial relations, but the worst performance of any Premier and any Government dealing with federal-provincial relations is the administration opposite, and it is rather ironic when you had the Premier—
 -(interjection)- Yes, I will bring out the facts, and we will check the difference, because if one look at the facts—and I know we have touched a little bit of a raw nerve over there.

Mr. Speaker, the Member seconded Meech Lake when the Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) brought it in, recall that. -(interjection)- I think we all signed it in the end. Only Elijah Harper stopped Meech Lake. -(interjection)- What is that? -(interjection)- The Members opposite are getting a little touchy on federal-provincial relations. In the short run they have run a little bit of a public relations exercise, I might concede, but let us look at the fact of our health and post-secondary programs.

In the budget of 19—this is after the Premier said: "I just have to pick up the phone and phone Brian Mulroney. Brian and I are buddies, we just have to pick up the phone and everything just flows back to Manitoba, no problem." Well, in 1989, Michael Wilson produced the budget that cut back on \$104 million in health and post-secondary education. An NDP raised that as an issue and said that the federal Government should reinstate that money. They should go back to the old system of funding health and post-secondary education because Manitoba patients and Manitoba students and Manitoba instructors would be most vulnerable and that the Government of the Day should fight the federal Government, should take off the gloves and fight on behalf of the Province of Manitoba.

What did the Premier (Mr. Filmon) do, Mr. Speaker, what did the Premier do? He did nothing, he did absolutely nothing to reinstate \$104 million in our health and post-secondary education.

On November 7, Mr. Speaker, prior to the First Minister representing—and I use that word loosely—the Province of Manitoba at the First Ministers' meeting with the Prime Minister, we asked the First Minister to get the money reinstated for health and post secondary education and to raise the fact that we had been cut back in his presentation to the First Ministers' meeting and to again raise the fact that there were rumours in

Ottawa that the federal Government was going to go further on health and post secondary education and cut back more.

What did the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) do? He would have been better off doing nothing, Mr. Speaker, because he did worse than nothing. He went into the First Ministers' meeting and he stated that he was happy with what the federal Government had done by cutting back the \$104 million. His statement, which I have here today, to the Prime Minister stated that they were happy with the initiatives the federal Government had taken on health, post secondary education, child care, aboriginal issues and the national child care strategy. "Your Government"—Mulroney's Government—"has taken promising steps and we want to work with you to make them as effective as possible." That is what the First Minister put in his written statement.

Now if it is promising steps when he cut back \$104 million, Mr. Speaker, over five years, what was it in 1990 when Michael Wilson came back and cut \$70 million a year for health and post secondary education, and also cut back the Native Communication Program, cut back funding to aboriginal organizations, cut back funding and cut back the child care program. What was it then? A bad year, says the Member for Fort Rouge.

An Honourable Member: Crescentwood.

Mr. Doer: This is the most dismal and disgraceful display of acting on behalf of Manitobans ever in the history of this province; 120 years of history and nobody has gone to a federal-provincial meeting like Neville Chamberlain, like this Premier (Mr. Filmon), conceding peace in our time after we are cut back and get cut back another \$70 million a year.

It is a disgrace, it is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, and we are calling on the First Minister to start acting in an effective way with the federal Government, with their federal cousins in Ottawa, not continue to act in this passive, reactive way after the fact of damage control press conference after we have been cut back with feigned indignation about their federal cousins, but absolutely no pre-emptive strikes, no fight back campaign, no anticipation, no standing up on behalf of health, post secondary education and the child care and aboriginal programs in Manitoba. A total failure, Mr. Speaker, and it is clearly on the record.

The second area of failure in federal-provincial

agreements, Mr. Speaker, is the recent announcement made by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in terms of the Southern Water Agreement. It begs the question, where is the Northern Economic Development Agreement that was signed by the New Democratic Party and the federal Government when we were in office?

How can this Premier stand up with any pride at all and announce a program of \$30 million over five years from the federal Government and even begin to suggest it is equal to the Northern Economic Development Agreement of \$282 million in 1983 dollars that we arrived at with the federal Government and maintained with even the Mulroney Government when we were in office, through extensions and renegotiations? How do you defend getting \$5 million a year compared to \$60 million a year? It is one-tenth the program and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, in some of the areas of greatest economic need in our northern economic communities and some of the programs that are in greatest need in our economy and in our society are the ones that the Tories have allowed to be bargained away in the back rooms with their federal cousins.

I guarantee that we are going to be raising those access programs and northern development programs daily in this Legislature to point out to the people of Manitoba the absolute failure of the Tories in Manitoba to get agreement with the Tories in Ottawa that would protect Manitoban northern development, and jobs. They are 10 percent as good as the last Government on federal-provincial relations. They have one-tenth the agreement and they are a dismal failure when it comes to federal-provincial agreements. When one compares the federal-provincial agreements in agriculture from the grain crisis of 1986, I do not understand why these Members can even stay part of the Conservative Party of Manitoba.

* (1440)

I guess many of your colleagues and constituents are going to the Reform Party, Mr. Speaker, because you and your Party are failing agriculture in western Canada. Your federal cousins are totally shafting the farmers of western Canada and the communities of western Canada.

All of you campaigned with your federal cousins. All of you were out on the stages. All of you were out in the halls, in community halls. All of you were

across the province standing up with your federal cousins to have them re-elected in 1988 and then have them shaft Manitoba, about a week later, with some of the announcements that have been made by the Mulroney-Mazankowski federal Government that is hurting farmers and the rural way of life in western Canada. We have evidence of that every day, Mr. Speaker.

The federal Government does not go after the American Government under free trade, when George Bush comes in with his subsidies. They are letting go of the Crow rate, Mr. Speaker, without a fight from this provincial Government. They are letting our programs, our Canadian programs, of orderly marketing go without a fight.

You are allowing farmers to get \$3 a week, Mr. Speaker, without a fight from the Members opposite. These people are more worried about embarrassing their federal cousins than standing up for Manitoba farmers, and we, in the New Democratic Party, will start to stand up and continue to stand up for farmers in Manitoba right across this province.

Mr. Speaker, what are we going to see with the Core Area Agreement with their federal cousins? -(interjection)- Oh, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) raised his eyebrows. I wonder whether he has had any success in negotiating the third Core Area Agreement? You just have to pick up the phone. You just have to pick up the phone. What was on the other end of the phone?

There was not any money for northern economic development. There has not been any money for ACCESS programs. There is no money for health and post-secondary education. There is no money to maintain the infrastructure of Manitoba in the federal public service. There is no money for needed ACCESS programs in this province. There is no money for agriculture. There is no money for many of the needed agricultural infrastructure programs. Who is at the other end of the phone? Who is at the other end of the phone? Who is dialing? Is the Premier (Mr. Filmon) really calling any more or has he just given up?

Maybe that is why we found them change the name of their Party in the last election, right? They have just given up on their Conservative cousins, and we will ask more questions about the Core Area Agreement later in the agenda.

A third area, Mr. Speaker—and this goes right to the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) responsibilities because

when he swears himself in with the Lieutenant-Governor, he is the Minister responsible for federal/provincial relations—and a third failure of this Minister, this First Minister, in federal/provincial relations as how to deal with our environment particularly the Rafferty-Alameda dam.

Now there are five specific times that this Premier (Mr. Filmon) had a chance to stand up for Manitoba citizens to protect our water quality and water quantity, and he did nothing. He did nothing. After the licence was issued in June of '88, what did the Premier do? Nothing. He had the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) and the former Member from natural resources say that this was good for Manitoba. Ed Connery, or the Member for Portage la Prairie, said this is good for Manitoba. That was their first response in June of 1988 when Manitoba was denied our licensing approval process as we were promised in the House of Commons, May 18, 1988, by former Minister McMillan. Then this Government prepared a technical report to tell us how great the Rafferty-Alameda dam was for Manitoba.

The Minister came out after Question Period with a huge report and a press release. He did not want to answer questions in Question Period. The former Minister of Natural Resources came out after Question Period to try to damage control this technical report because really, in that report, there was nothing there that protected Manitoba's water quality and quantity, but what did the official line from the Tory Government of Manitoba say? Oh, the Rafferty-Alameda dam is fine for Manitoba, it will have increased benefits for Manitoba.

Read the press release that was issued on behalf of his Government. They tried to get this technical report out and say that it was good for Manitoba, therefore the project should go ahead without an environmental licence, the second time he failed the people of Manitoba.

* (1450)

On the third occasion, Mr. Speaker, he failed to join it as an intervener with the Wildlife Federation of Canada to ask for an independent environmental assessment. Why is this First Minister (Mr. Filmon) afraid of an environmental assessment of the water quality and quantity in terms of its effect on Manitoba? Why did he not intervene on the first case to go before the Wildlife Federation? So the Wildlife Federation wins the case; then the Minister sits for

two weeks in Ottawa and does not tell us what he is going to do.

This Government does not enjoin again to protect Manitoba's water. It does not enjoin again and finally the courts rule that we have to have an interim environmental assessment process. Okay, we have that, it takes six months. The interim environmental assessment process comes out and it says there are a great number of questions still to be answered in terms of Manitoba's water quality and quantity, and unanswered questions were raised in the interim report of the federal Government.

What does the Manitoba Government do? We have a press conference in Saskatchewan with Grant Devine and Lucien Bouchard saying the project will go ahead; an hour later the Challenger jet arrives in Manitoba, the Member for Ste. Rose, the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), stands in front of all Manitobans and says that he agrees that the full environmental assessment should not go ahead. He agrees with Lucien Bouchard and that Manitoba does not need a full environmental impact study in spite of the fact that the interim studies said that we should have a full and independent environmental assessment study. The fourth time that this Government sat back as a place mat for the Province of Saskatchewan and did not stand up for the water quality and quantity assessment that is absolutely required, the fourth time. So what happens?

The Wildlife Federation goes back to court, challenges it in court and the Government again does not join with the Wildlife Federation to protect Manitoba. It joins Lucien Bouchard, Grant Devine in this complicity, an accomplice to the fact that water quality and quantity would not be dealt with in terms of Manitoba. So the courts again overrule the Province of Saskatchewan and the federal Government and by definition overrule this Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) and this Premier (Mr. Filmon).

What do we do? We let the full environmental assessment process take place? No, not the fifth time. We roll over and play dead again. The bulldozers are going in Saskatchewan for the last couple of months. We raised it in July before this First Minister (Mr. Filmon) goes to the western Premiers' meeting in Lloydminster and he says he has got a co-operative arrangement with the Province of Saskatchewan. He has got a co-operative arrangement with Grant Devine. He

has got everything under control. The bulldozers are building the project contrary to the law. The bulldozers are building the project contrary to the independent assessment necessary for Manitoba and this Premier says I have everything under control.

Well, where does the buck stop, Mr. Speaker? Where does the responsibility lie? He has had three different Ministers responsible for this project that have done nothing, but the Minister responsible for federal/provincial relations to the federal Government and the Premier is the Minister responsible to the Premier of Saskatchewan and Grant Devine has walked all over our Premier. It is a disgrace in terms of the precedent established for standing up for Manitoba's rights.

What did the Premier (Mr. Filmon) say in the hallway this week or on Friday when he was asked the question about what did you do about it? Oh, I do not remember what I said at the First Minister's meeting, was the Premier's answer. I do not remember. He sounds like Ronald Reagan with Ollie North. I do not remember. I suggest that this Premier does remember. I suggest this Premier knows full well what he raised with Grant Devine at the western Premiers' meeting in July. This Premier knows full well whether he raised it or whether he did not.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence is indisputable. On five specific occasions this Government, through the First Minister, has not stood up once to protect Manitoba's water quality and quantity. Here we have even Friday while the bulldozers were rolling the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) does not ask for the licence to be withdrawn. It says please, look at this process. Well, does the law not mean anything to the Members opposite?

If it is in the best interests of Grant Devine's short-term political interests, does that mean it is in the best interests of Manitobans, the long-term best interests of Manitobans? Are we putting Grant Devine's short-term political interests ahead of 100 years of potential damage for water quality and quantity in Manitoba by not knowing before the project goes ahead?

How can we defend this? How can we explain this to our children? How can the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) stand up and say he cares about the environment, when on the biggest environmental

issue he has failed us on five occasions? Five specific occasions, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a scandal and this story is not over because we do not believe on this side that the Premier forgot whether he raised it in Saskatchewan. We do not believe that. We believe that he either raised it or he did not, and he knows that. Just like he has done in the last two years on the Rafferty-Alameda Project. Three times, on three major issues of federal-provincial relations: health and post-secondary education; federal-provincial agreements; and on the environment; we have strike one, strike two and strike three. That is why I can say, with the greatest of regret, that we have the worst federal/provincial environment through the First Minister ever in the history of Manitoba.

I have talked to a lot of people over the last few days that have worked with and covered Premiers from all different political stripes, and this is the worst performance. Ten percent of the funding from before, nothing on environmental protection and applauding the federal Government when it cuts back our health and post-secondary education in his own statement that he distributed to the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Speech from the Throne that deals with our social services. The Government clearly has a philosophical difference from what it would have with the New Democrats, and that makes sense, on social services. We believe that social services are an investment in people and an investment in our society. The Conservatives believe that social services are a cost, and that is where we have the philosophical difference with Members Opposite, and it is good to have philosophical differences. Because that is what makes the democratic process so healthy, but if you look through the words in the Speech from the Throne document, you will see the reference to cost, not investment, constantly throughout the Speech from the Throne.

We believe that programs in the social services area are investments in our society and investments in the quality of life in Manitoba, and that is why we are so different from the Members opposite when it comes to these programs. We see the subtle signposts of cutbacks and reductions and lack of support in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and we will have to check the words and the symbols in the Speech from the Throne against the budget that is expected in a couple of weeks to

see what actual support and numbers will be attached to the symbols in the Speech from the Throne.

When we look at health care, Mr. Speaker, we hope for once the Government comes forward with straightforward, honest numbers on health care in their budget. Two years now, we have had a number given to us in the budget and the Government has dishonestly underspent the amount of money voted by this Legislature for our health care system. I do not think that is good enough for the patients and workers in our health care system that we say that we are going to spend so much money and we underspend \$36 million one year and underspend \$29 million or \$27 million the other year.

There may be the odd statutory reason for some of this underspending and we will differentiate between those that are legitimately underspent, but there are other statutory provisions in the budget that there is no justification for. Why do we have waiting lists in hospitals for needed surgery while this Government is underspending? Why do we have shortages of nurses across the province while this Government is underspending? Why did the Deer Lodge Hospital sit vacant for 26 months when there were patients in the hallways, patients in the observation rooms, while this Government underspent?

Why do we have 100 less nurses in terms of the staffing to staff requirements at the Health Sciences Centre, Mr. Speaker? Why do we have the intensive care ward of Seven Oaks closed many days? Why do we have emergency wards closed or down many days? Why is our northern health care system getting stripped of their resources? Why are we underspending the health care budget, and is the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) going to take on his old colleague and ensure that we have accurate numbers in our health care system this time around, or are we going to play this dishonest game of having one number for the budget and have another number for the spending in terms of the Province of Manitoba and the patients?

* (1500)

What about the confrontational style of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard)? Now he is a great debater in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but he is not a very good manager of our health care system. He has driven out all the senior management in the health care system. He is the only Minister of Health

in the history of Manitoba to call the doctors liars publicly. He is a Minister that has taken a negotiated settlement between the nurses and health care staff and the administration of eight hospitals and unilaterally rolled it back, and he does not think he has got a battle on his hands now with the nurses coming into negotiations. He picks a fight with them a year ago, just like he picks a fight with everybody, and he wonders why we are going to have a very major set of negotiations now in our health care field that are starting off on a very, very confrontational way because the Minister has already started the confrontation.

He has already rolled back pay equity for women in the health care sector. There have been 20 Ministers that have dealt with pay equity in the provincial sector for two different Governments; there is only one Minister that has rolled back pay equity, and guess who it is, Mr. Speaker? It is the Member for Pembina, the Minister of Health, the same one that called the doctors liars. It is the same Minister that had 500 nurses in front of this Legislature some year ago because he would not put the nurses' organization on the Health Advisory Task Force, and he wonders why we have confrontation in our health care system.

The Premier should have replaced the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, not from Cabinet, but from his portfolio because he has a confrontational style and that may be appropriate. I cannot think of a ministry where it would be appropriate, maybe put him in federal-provincial relations. Maybe he will have somebody fighting on behalf of Manitoba, maybe the Premier should replace himself in federal-provincial relations with the Member for Pembina, and maybe we should have somebody with a more co-operative style to work with our health care professionals and our patients in our health care administration. Maybe that would be a better way to approach it.

Mr. Speaker, we have to reform our health care system, but we should do so from a position of co-operation with our health care professionals. We should do so from a position of co-operation with our patients. We should do so from a position of co-operation with all the public, and we should do so in a way that is honest and up front, not a way that has one number under the thimble for how much they are allegedly going to spend on the budget, and another number under a different thimble for what they are going to spend in the

budget. You cannot reform the health care system by confrontation and inaccuracy in terms of the commitments one is making for the people and patients of Manitoba.

In terms of family services, Mr. Speaker, poverty is one of the major issues in our province. A 30 percent increase in our food banks, minimum wage that has not been touched for almost, what? Since the Government came into office. The poor are getting poorer and the rich are getting richer in Canada and in Manitoba, and that is why our Family Services Department cries out for programs and supports and strategies for dealing with the people most vulnerable in the recession, and the people most vulnerable in Manitoba society.

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

I would recommend strongly, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) develop a comprehensive and cohesive strategy dealing with the whole issue of abuse and violence in our society. We were disappointed today that there was not an all-ministry answer from the First Minister dealing with this problem because it is not just in Justice. It is in Family Services, it is in Justice, it is in other portfolios, it is even in the Department of Labour in terms of people most vulnerable. Again very little on Family Services and programs for families to deal with preventative programs, core funding for shelter, day care centres and shelters in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we saw again that the province is going to undertake a full review of labour laws in this province, something that was not in the Speech from the Throne, but I guess it takes Buddy Brownstone from the Chamber of Commerce to announce the full release of labour laws in this province. No mention of the fact that Manitoba has the lowest days lost per strike of any province in Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or Madam Deputy Speaker, I am sorry. I apologize and congratulations on your appointment. -(interjection)- Not the Souris water.

We find out not in the Speech from the Throne that they are going to deal with the labour laws, we find out from the Chamber of Commerce announcements. What a way to do business, Mr. Deputy Speaker—

An Honourable Member: Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Doer: —Madam Deputy Speaker, you are

right—got to get going here. I apologize again. Madam Deputy Speaker, I apologize for that—but nothing in the Speech from the Throne dealing with the labour law review that the Government has announced over this past weekend. You have the second lowest days lost per strike anywhere in Canada and only the Conservatives, who love confrontation, who love to deal just again with the business agenda, will take away the consensus that takes place in this province and roll back the labour law protection for working people and watch the strikes and confrontation take place.

It is always the way; it was the same way under Lyon. It is going to be the same way under the sons and daughters of Sterling Lyon who sit opposite, and again it is something that we did not see in the Speech from the Throne.

What about pay equity for women? In the last Speech from the Throne we had a clear reference to the pay equity provisions for women, that the Government was going to review it. In this Speech from the Throne, now that we have a majority Government, we are seeing what a majority, a majority is going to be. They do not even refer to pay equity. They are obviously satisfied with women making 68 cents on the dollar that men are making in society. They do not care about pay equity, Madam Deputy Speaker, and now we see the true Conservative colours.

The hidden agenda is now out. They do not even mention pay equity, because they do not care about equality for women. They have shown that in their Cabinet appointments. They have shown that with their benign neglect of pay equity in the Speech from the Throne for Manitoba women.

In terms of the Constitution, Madam Deputy Speaker, we see a brief reference to the Senate and Senate reform. Do we see a court case challenge, though, to swamp the Senate? We do not see any court challenge on the swamping of the Senate. How can you have reform when you keep swamping the Senate? You know, it is Conservatives who are appointing Conservatives in the Senate of Canada. There are a lot of Liberals in that Senate too. I really got a kick—if anybody noticed the first two press conferences of the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the Conservative Party, the campaign chairperson for the Premier was Nate Nurgitz. I also think I saw Gil Molgat at the Liberal Leader's first press conference along with David Walker, and they are terrible. They are all terrible appointments.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I get a kick out of Liberals and Tories talking about Senate reform, because I have never seen a senator in Manitoba yet, a Liberal or a Conservative resign and offer up their seat for elections. What kind of sincerity or lack of sincerity is there? They are not sincere about Senate reform. They are all putting their hands up to get their appointments, and when they get them they work as sort of operatives for the two major parties of Manitoba, the Liberals and Conservatives. They become campaign managers. -(interjection)- Sorry, Harry. Could not do anything about it. Yes, that is the Senate reform. The Senate reform in this province is the hands going up from the Tories four years after the hands went up for the Liberals to get appointed—no resignations. There is not a sincere word about Senate reform from any Tory or any Liberal. There would be some sincerity if they all in Manitoba resigned and offered themselves up for an election. Pigs will fly before you will see that happen. It will not happen.

With all the challenges for aboriginal people and all the recent events of the last year, in fact the numbers of decades, and all the injustices that have taken place in our country with our Canada's first peoples, we were very disappointed—and we put this on the record when the Speech from the Throne was announced—that the Government of the Day did not choose to have as one of the terms of reference for constitutional reform, and constitutional reform and priorities, the constitutional situation of aboriginal people in Manitoba and Canada.

I want to pledge, on behalf of our Party, there will be no constitutional reform in this country with our support without meaningful and real reform of our Constitution dealing with Canada's first peoples. We cannot wait any longer, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I have talked a bit about agriculture. Other critics will talk more. The First Minister supported the—Members opposite supported the Free Trade Agreement. I hope they will be proud when Canada loses its two-price system of wheat in 1991. I hope the Members are proud when the American -(interjection)- that was with the Free Trade Agreement.

The Free Trade Agreement is not helping the farmers -(interjection)- Madam Deputy Speaker, Spot and Lassie are making too much noise across the way here.

It is clear evidence that the Free Trade Agreement, that they supported, has failed western Canadian farmers and will fail them even more in 1991. They have the audacity to applaud the Free Trade Agreement and not stand up for the farmers, in terms of Manitoba.

There is no mention of the City of Winnipeg in this document. It is no surprise, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have the elevation now—the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) does not like the City of Winnipeg. I think the City of Winnipeg and lack of any acknowledgement in the Speech from the Throne is a major omission in terms of an economic strategy from the Party.

* (1510)

I wonder where some of the Members opposite, particularly some of the new Members, were? I wonder where some of the Members opposite were? Does the Cabinet not show the caucus the Speech from the Throne before it is presented?

An Honourable Member: I guess not.

Mr. Doer: It does—well, the Member said that the Cabinet does show the Members in the caucus the Speech from the Throne. That means the Members in the caucus did not stand up for the City of Winnipeg and raise the real issues that are challenging the City of Winnipeg and the 610,000 citizens of the City of Winnipeg.

That is a shameful display, Madam Deputy Speaker, in terms of economic development. Yes, because we have representatives in rural Manitoba, northern Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg we will raise all the issues facing Manitoba's geographies, whether it is in the North, whether it is in rural Manitoba, or whether it is in the City of Winnipeg.

The education program—we continue to support private education and we continue to cut back on public education. We continue to cut back on ACCESS programs as we continue to put money into the private education system of this province.

We could go through the Speech from the Throne, line by line and point by point, but everywhere we look we see a very distinct turn to the right. This speech—and I know the Members opposite are proud of that. We see this Speech from the Throne could have been written by Michael Wilson, Brian Mulroney, Clayton Manness or the Premier of this province (Mr. Filmon). It is a Tory Speech from the Throne, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I know the Members opposite are very proud of that.

I know the October group was very happy with the Speech from the Throne now. I watch the smiles on their faces. They finally had their right-wing manifesto on the table for all Manitobans to see, and, Madam Deputy Speaker, there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne for working people; there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne for poor people; there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne for the homeless; there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne for people on minimum wage; there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne for people at the food banks; there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne for aboriginal people; there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne for working people and their families, and in conclusion, a Tory is a Tory is a Tory and a majority is a majority is a majority and a tragedy is a tragedy is a tragedy, and that is what we see with the Members opposite. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Madam Deputy Speaker, first let me congratulate you on your appointment as the Deputy Speaker, and through you to extend our very sincere congratulations to the Speaker on his reappointment as the Speaker of this Assembly. The Speaker has been in this Chamber from the same time that I arrived in this Chamber, and he was at that point in time a welcome addition to this House, and he certainly continues to be a welcome addition in the Speaker's Chair because of his fairness, because of his personality, because of his warmth, which I think generates and speaks to all of us of his fairness and his treatment of equality of all Members of this Chamber.

I want to begin, of course, by thanking the constituents of the River Heights constituency for re-electing me for the third time to serve them, the people of that community. All of us here owe our positions as Members of the Legislative Assembly to the constituents that we serve. Without them and their support we would not be here and therefore we must always remember as individual Members that that is our first line of service. That they are the people to whom we must direct our service and our contribution to this Chamber.

And a special welcome to all of the new Members. It is always an exciting first Session as you move into your places in this Chamber, as you feel a certain amount of unease and tension on those opening days. I have watched it as some of the Members have stood in their places asking their

question for the first time, but it gets easier. You can learn to relax. You have to remember that a phrase that is miss said or a word on which perhaps you stutter is a momentary lapse and no one really remembers it except you, and hopefully that will give you the confidence to continue and remain and to fully participate in this Chamber.

I am particularly pleased with the increase in the female Members, but I am equally dismayed at their lack of representation in the Cabinet. The First Minister of the province seems to have made some commitment to changing that, and we hope that that is indeed correct. That we will see more Members of the gender to which I belong present in the Cabinet, because it does not go well for the issues of particular concern to women and to families in the Province of Manitoba if you are not in the Cabinet in greater numbers than presently.

It is with sadness that I look about and do not see faces that have been here before from all Parties, some who chose not to run and others who were defeated. We certainly, in our caucus, miss our colleagues who became our good friends during the last two years. However, I will also miss Members from the other Parties, where because of the partisan nature of this Chamber, the same type of firm friendships did not develop, but I gained a great deal of respect for them, not only as human beings but as fellow parliamentarians.

I wish to congratulate the Premier upon his re-election and the Leader of the Opposition on his elevation to his new role. Elections are by their very nature always hard fought, but in the final analysis the people decide. That is the legacy of living in a democratic society, and we must be grateful to all those ancestors who fought hard to give us that legacy and to ensure the participation of people through their elected representatives in this Chamber and Chambers like this in every province, as well as in the House of Commons in Ottawa.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the first Speech from the Throne of any new majority Government is always, they tell me, a general one in that they know that they have four years in which to develop their plans, outlined on a preliminary basis during the campaign. These speeches are often referred to by the media gurus as light; however, this one was downright weightless.

Although it can be said that we live in a space age where one's weight is determined by the location in

the atmosphere, one normally expects some weight from those of us who live on Mother Earth. Obviously those who worked on the draft of this speech had their minds in other worlds because the issues of concern to the vast majority of Manitobans were simply not addressed; indeed, the only issues to which this Government appeared interested were the issues affecting business.

It is somewhat ironic that a political Party, which prides itself on a hands-off attitude to business, proceeded last Thursday to spend three-quarters of its speech dedicated to that very topic, particularly when the true purpose of government is to provide services, services to people, and those services were either barely mentioned, as in the case with Health, or totally ignored, as was the case with Family Services and Education. Together these three areas comprise some 60 percent of all Government expenditures in the Province of Manitoba, and therefore it comes with more than inordinate shock that they received scarce attention in a Speech from the Throne, and yet in all three areas we are in varying states of crises, yet our Government chose to all but ignore these issue of vital importance to Manitobans. I think it is important to take a look at the Speech from the Throne paragraph by paragraph in so much as that is possible, to show how they missed the real needs of people of the Province of Manitoba.

I begin with a quote. The quote says: "As my Government enters its second term, it remains committed to the vision it set forth when it first took office: a strong economy with new and better jobs for our young people and quality health, education and social services available to all." Well, those are lofty phrases, but certainly not ones achieved by this Government in its first mandate, and I think it is important to examine the record. The reality is there have not been better jobs for young people in the Province of Manitoba; indeed, the youth unemployment rate has gone up in just this past year alone by some 2 percent, and now is higher than the national average.

* (1520)

In addition, good jobs have not been achieved for either young, middle-aged or old. Manufacturing jobs have declined, as have jobs in the agricultural sector; so too have jobs in transportation and in finance, and in public administration. Indeed, when one checks the employment statistics, one sees that the only increase in jobs in the Province of Manitoba

falls in the service sector—the service sector which is almost always low skilled and minimum-wage paying, and this is where our young people are languishing or tragically, all too often, choosing to leave this province and go elsewhere because opportunities they feel are limited for them here in the Province of Manitoba. Despite this, the Government did not even see fit to call the committee to re-evaluate the minimum wage until more than two years had passed in their mandate.

During that first mandate, Madam Deputy Speaker, we certainly did not see an improvement in the quality of health care; indeed, we watched its erosion month by month, year by year. Nowhere is that more obvious than in the whole field of home care.

The Minister stated there was the need for declining dollars because there was fewer people who needed the care. Well, common sense would tell us alone, that in a society with an aging population, you are not going to have a decrease in the number of people who require home care.

Let the facts speak for themselves. I have recently had the opportunity to spend some time at Ten Ten Sinclair. Ten Ten Sinclair is an apartment block in which individuals who are handicapped live not on a permanent basis but ostensibly for short-term periods of time so that they can get used to living on their own in an apartment setting. The purpose of this complex is to help them then move into the community where they can lead active and full lives within the community.

In my visit there, I spoke with a young man who wants to get married and who is engaged and is ready to do it. The only thing that is stopping him, at the present time, is the fact that he cannot move out of Ten Ten Sinclair.

Why can he not move out of Ten Ten Sinclair? Well, it is not because he cannot find accommodation. He has accommodation in an apartment that has been modified for his use. What he cannot get is a commitment from the Department of Health for home care so that he can go through his wedding ceremony and move with his new wife into accommodation in the community so that he can live in the full richness to which he is entitled.

It is not just at Ten Ten Sinclair where we hear of incidents in which individuals are not able to access the home care services to which they, as citizens of this province, are all deserving. Ask individuals who

have aging parents living with them if there is adequate home care available to these people. Many of these individuals are choosing to put their aging parents on waiting lists for personal care homes, not because that is where they want them to live, but because they believe that they cannot cope without additional home care resources. They are exhausted in body and in spirit, and because the resources are not there they are struggling to find new ways to look after their loved ones.

Ask the patient, who contacted me and other politicians, at the Deer Lodge Centre who cannot return home because adequate care is not available and his wife says that she simply cannot cope if there is not adequate home care. Therefore, he must remain at Deer Lodge Centre, because if he comes home she will not be able to care for him.

How many stories are there like that in every single hospital of this province where people would like to go home, where people could go home, if there were adequate home care facilities available to them?

It is not only in home care where we see inadequacies. We have watched it in surgery waiting lists, a nine-month waiting list for cardiac surgery, 103 patients on the waiting list at St. Boniface alone, and two surgical wards closed down during the summer at the same hospital because of a lack of an anesthetist.

We are all aware of a breast cancer patient who needed to go to the press and the Opposition Caucuses in order to get a bed for essential service. We even know that in some circumstances, because some surgeries have not been available, that patients have died. We will not know whether they would have been able to survive if that surgery had taken place earlier. All we know is that they did die.

We know of 25 communities actively seeking doctors with no real help or commitment from this Government despite a practical solution proposed for the use of immigrant doctors by the Member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema).

We know of the chronic shortage of personal care beds. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) made reference to the fact that it took an election to open the Deer Lodge beds, but as of this morning they were still not opened, not open. How many more months will go by before they are open, 90 beds for people who require that kind of service?

There is a particular strain on the beds that will be available there because some of them have been designated as beds for rehabilitation. These are for seniors who can go into that situation for a month, perhaps longer, perhaps shorter, and can then be returned to the community because they can be taught coping skills. Yet without those beds operational, we deny them that opportunity. Tragically, once they have been admitted to a personal care home it is in most cases impossible to bring them back into the community if there are not rehabilitation units in those particular personal care homes. We are still short some 1,200 personal care beds in the Province of Manitoba, most of them now unfortunately in the City of Winnipeg.

Meanwhile innovations, good innovations, which could not only provide for better health care, but could provide for better health care at reduced costs are ignored. We still have no commitment to a wellness centre that can encourage individuals in this society to take better care of themselves, to provide them with the assists necessary to gain strength, to take control of their own lives from a health perspective.

We know that more day surgeries would eliminate the tremendous pressure on acute care beds and the surgical beds within those hospital units. We know that day care programs for seniors makes it possible for them to stay in their homes, but those programs are woefully inadequate. We have seen no commitment to midwifery which is becoming a choice, a wanted and desirable choice for many women who do not want an interventionist form of obstetrical delivery, who do not want to find themselves as I found myself six weeks in a hospital giving birth to my second child. No, they do not want that and being denied access to my older child during that six-week period. That is not the kind of delivery that women want, but we have to be prepared to move in innovative ways if we are going to change that system.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I was pleased at the announcement of the early detection program for breast cancer, but we made exactly the same announcement last year in the earlier Speech from the Throne, and no action took place. That is perhaps in the scare of the big C that affects us all, for women this is the one which is the most intensive, the scariest. Yet while we had an announcement, we had no action.

* (1530)

The tragedy is that the only innovative growth—if one can call it that and it is the most negative innovative growth—is the growth of private surgical centres in the Province of Manitoba. They have grown by six, six more of them since this Government took office. What has that resulted in? Well, if you are poor in the Province of Manitoba, you wait for eight months to have a cataract removed, but if you are wealthy you can go off to a private clinic, put down \$895 an eye and have that surgery looked after. That is Thatcher-type health care delivery and it is absolutely unacceptable to Canadians and to Manitobans.

Education was the topic which was so glaringly ignored in this Speech from the Throne. The province's role in providing funding to K to 12 has constantly and consistently been eroded. School divisions are required to turn more and more to the property tax base which is an unfair and inequitable tax system and recognized by many as unfair and inequitable. The Nicholls Report recommended that 90 percent of funding be received from the province. We are now well below 80 percent and some divisions find themselves with less than 70 percent of their funding coming from provincial resources. We have heard nothing from this Minister with respect to the review of school finances and, if the stories that they are telling out of school are correct, the whole review is in chaos with people resigning and not prepared to participate fully in the review.

The Premier himself has admitted that we need to review school division boundaries, but if that review was going to take place and if that review is to receive the type of participation from the public that is required in such a review, it must begin now because it will be a long-range process. It cannot take place in the short term, and yet it is nowhere on their agenda, so are we to wait four or five years before we indeed get a report that will make for that review which can ensure better quality of education for our young people? Curriculum changes are necessary. This province is one of the few in Canada that still does not have a compulsory family life education program; we do not have a compulsory drug education program; we do not have even a compulsory anti-smoke program being run in our junior high and senior high, and yet we know, as does the tobacco industry, that if a child does not smoke before the age of 18 the chances are they will not smoke. Yet the junior high students, who are the ones that are most susceptible to those

advertising programs and initiatives, are not receiving in their schools an encouragement not to smoke.

What of our post-secondary institutions where they are deteriorating not only with their lack of equipment and their poor plants and facilities but, much more important, deteriorating in the quality of teaching available to our young people?

If one takes several of the departments I think it is necessary to see what is happening. At one university alone, in Computer Science this year, they have cancelled four courses. They have had to impose enrollment limitations on introductory computer courses. Literally hundreds of students have been turned away and yet we know that in almost every field a knowledge of computer science and computer literacy is essential, and yet our young university students are not able to take advantage of those courses and, even when they are lucky enough to get into a course they are denied appropriate teaching. In a first year introductory course which has over 460 students the course has two term tests and 12 assignments, yet because of the lack of appropriate teaching assistants, two of the assignments will be marked. So 10 of the assignments given to students will not be marked. What kind of quality education is that? Well, it is not. It is an inferior education and that is not acceptable when our young people are asked to compete in a world where quality is essential.

It is not just Computer Science; it is the Department of Physics, it is the Department of Philosophy, it is the Department of Geological Sciences, it is the Department of Applied Mathematics. Every department is complaining that they cannot offer the quality of education that was available just a few short years ago, and yet more is expected in the workplace today than was expected just a few short years ago.

We have a responsibility to these young people; we have a responsibility to ensure that when they graduate, when they have a degree, that that degree guarantees that they have a competency, but they will not have that competency if they are poorly taught because of an inadequacy of appropriate instruction.

Our community colleges also suffer from poor equipment and lack of co-ordination with a marketplace, and lack of appropriate apprenticeship programs.

Our inner city children, many of them Native, continue to suffer because programs are not directed to their specific needs. At the same time students are asked to bear an ever-increasing burden of their post-secondary education costs, tuition fee increases of 10 and 11 percent at a time when they can least afford it, because they are at the stage of their lives where they tend to get the lowest paid jobs, usually minimum wage, and this Government has not increased the minimum wage.

Not only that, even those who venture to get student loans find that those student loans are based on 1984 dollars, that there has been no increase in the actual amounts made available to them in that period of time and they cannot make ends meet. So more and more of them become part-time students, and part-time students struggle daily to make it both in the marketplace and in the classroom, and they lose the whole sense of a university education in its full-rounded nature because they do not have time to participate in any extracurricular activities, whether they be drama or whether they be sport or whether they be student government.

Social service agencies in the Speech from the Throne also were badly neglected. The Child and Family Service agencies in the Province of Manitoba are being forced to make policy decisions which should not be made by the agencies. They should be made by the Province of Manitoba and the Government of the Province of Manitoba.

If this Government believes in centralization of these agencies, a backward step in our view, then they must have the courage of their convictions and not force that responsibility upon the agencies themselves. Do not ask the agencies to do your dirty work for you. Do it yourself if that is what you want to do and accept the political liability in this Chamber for doing it instead of working by the back door.

Working without appropriate consultation with agencies has been all too much the legacy of this Government. One would have thought they would have learned never again to not contact and be in touch with foster parents, but no, during the summer yet once again there was a change to the foster-parent system and with no consultation with the foster parents.

The Minister said in his speech: Oh well, we have consulted. The head of the Foster Parents'

Association said: Under no circumstances have we been consulted.

What kind of social service agencies do you run if you do not consult with those who are delivering services in the line positions, and yet this is the way in which this Government deals with the issues of social services.

Family violence is an issue that all too tragically hits us every day, and not just on Saturday when we learned of the murder of Desiree Watson. Family violence for far too many women is a frequent occasion. It happens often in our society.

If we are cognizant of it—and we know that family violence increases when the stresses in the society also increase, and we know that never in recent years will the incident of family violence be more likely to occur than this year in rural communities because the stresses on the farm have never been this high.

Yet we know that it is those shelters in rural communities that are in the greatest danger of folding. Those shelters will fold because there is no core funding or not adequate enough core funding. We know that is the problem.

Why is it that even with increases—(interjection)—and they are quite correct they have made major increases. Why is it still inadequate? It is inadequate because the dollars were not there in the first place. It does not matter whether you do increase it by 250 percent. The 250 percent is 250 percent of a very little amount. Since it is a very little amount, the necessary funding is still not available. Therefore, shelters throughout this province in rural locations are in danger of closing down.

* (1540)

It is time that we understood the needs of women who are subjected to violence in their homes, often on a daily basis. We have watched while the Government has made some noises about supporting parent-child centres in the next budget, but they are in danger of folding now. We are well into this fiscal year. If the commitment was made to a '90-91 budget, then why has the funding not been made available? That is the budget that we will be passing. The fiscal year began on April 1. If there is money put aside for those parent-child centres, then let us get it to the parent-child centres so that they can continue to operate.

The throne speech asks, what kind of Canada do we want? Well, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think

there is much question that what we do want in Canada is an open Canada, an open Canada where citizens have the ability to dialogue with their leaders on matters affecting them. Never again will Canadians accept the dreadful week in Ottawa surrounding the Meech Lake Accord. Yet, although all of the leaders said that that was it, it would never happen that way again, we watched with some horror at the closed doors of the Premiers' Conference, with Premiers unwilling to open up those sessions and dialogue directly with the people of Canada, their unwillingness to meet with the aboriginal leadership.

We watched the old boys at the Western Premiers' Conference dividing up the pie of traditional federal powers, and yet that is not what the people of Canada want. It is not what the people of Manitoba want. They want a strong central Government. They want a central Government that responds to their social and their health care needs. They want a strong system for the protection of the environment, because they do not trust individual leaders to do it for them. They believe that there is strength in having numbers.

We watch the farmers of Manitoba and the Prairies generally with bumper grain crops and unfortunately no markets. The blame for that cannot be put on this Government. What can be put as blame on this Government is that we can no longer break faith with the agricultural community. We cannot do to them, as we did in the fields of health, announce large increases in expenditure and then not spend those amounts, as we have done in two successive budgets in agriculture, where large amounts of money were kept on the table.

This Government consistently underspent during a time of crisis in agriculture. Is it no wonder that the federal Government shirks its responsibilities when provincial Governments show them the way? However, our federal Government does not need any lessons in offloading its responsibilities. They are experts in the field. It is therefore essential that our farmers also not be let down by the home team. Unfortunately, they were let down, because monies were left on the table.

In issues with respect to the environment, which is a vital issue not only for now but in the future, we have also been let down by the Province of Manitoba. Right now we have a situation in which the provincial Government should be acting on Rafferty-Alameda. They should be prepared to go

and get an injunction in the courts, because the federal Government will not do what it should do, but our Ministers refuse, our Premier refuses, just as they refused in every step of the way on the Rafferty-Alameda project. Never have they stood for the protection of the water quality in the Province of Manitoba.

Even when they are given the opportunity to provide funding for the environment, as they were in the environmental protection tax, they only spent 40 percent of it on new initiatives, and the rest they put in the consolidated revenues, because according to the Ministers there were not enough good ideas. Well, he is obviously not speaking to anyone involved in the environmental movement or to the cities and municipalities throughout this province, or indeed, even to the children who have come forward with a number of valid concepts and ideas, because there are lots of ideas as to how to generate better recycling programs, but they lack funding.

We took \$640,000 in revenues raised for it from a tax to specifically be used for these initiatives and we put it in consolidated revenues instead of putting into the programs for which the tax was designed. You had the money. You deliberately chose not to spend it, and actions speak louder than words, and your actions were that you would not give the revenues where they were required.

Perhaps the most disappointing issue in the Speech from the Throne was the lack of any reference to new directions for our aboriginal peoples in the Province of Manitoba. All summer we watched the events of Oka, we watched the peace village out here at our own Legislature, we watched as the aboriginal people joined together in the defeat of the Meech Lake Accord, and yet not a mention of new initiatives, not a mention of new strategies or new directions. When asked the question by one of our aboriginal Members on Friday about fishing and treaty rights, in which there have been court cases which show clearly that we are in the wrong in the Province of Manitoba, we have said we must study it further.

We have a Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) who knows that there is now federal Government money available for an ACCESS program at Norway House, and the University of Brandon has indicated that at least for a year they could make up the difference if only the provincial Government would give the contribution that they had given in the past, but they have not done it and they will not give

it. We know that one out of four who will enter the work force in this community by 1995 will be aboriginal, and yet they are still not graduating in sufficient numbers from high school to get the kinds of jobs that would allow them to live in dignity in our community and elsewhere throughout the province.

Those are issues that we can deal with here in the Province of Manitoba, and yet we chose not to mention them under this Government's mandate in the Speech from the Throne. You have been given a new mandate and you must be given the opportunity to work through your agenda, but we are shocked and we are saddened at the lack of plans that you have outlined in the Speech from the Throne. You cannot hide from the people of this province, even though you choose not to mention them in the Speech from the Throne, because the recession is upon us, Madam Deputy Speaker. Even if your federal cousins cannot bring themselves to mention the "r" word, it is upon us, and governments are going to be asked from one end of this nation to the other to respond to the needs of children, to the sick and to the elderly and these vulnerable people were all but ignored in your agenda as outlined in the Speech from the Throne.

* (1550)

But the problems not only will not go away. They will intensify during the tough economic times that we know that lie ahead. We need a government with its ear to the ground willing to listen to the pleas for help. We did not hear that willingness in the Speech from the Throne. So we urge the newly elected back-bench Members, the back bench in particular, to bring these messages to your caucus, because one of the dangers of a majority Government is that it is all too easy to discount the words of the opposition parties as political rhetoric. But they ignore the advice of their own Members at their peril, particularly in a House with a majority of only two when the Speaker is in the Chair.

Therefore, I urge you newly elected Members. Do not let them forget the plight of your constituents, particularly the vulnerable. Tough times lie ahead and compassion and understanding are going to be much needed. We did not see it in the Speech from the Throne, but it will be essential if the people of the Province of Manitoba are to be protected from the federal Tory mismanagement of this nation, the federal Tory disregard for the needs of the vulnerable in the Canadian society. If we do not address those issues, then those vulnerable will

become more and more vulnerable, and that, Madam Deputy Speaker, is simply not acceptable.

Mrs. Shirley Render (St. Vital): Madam Deputy Speaker, congratulations on your appointment. I would also like to congratulate the Speaker on his reappointment as Speaker, because I understand that he has established a reputation for fairness and impartiality and as a newcomer to politics I look forward to his advice and guidance on the rules and procedures of the House. My congratulations to the Leaders of the Opposition Parties and to all Members who have been elected and my sincere appreciation to those in all Parties who have welcomed me. My compliments also to the mover of the throne speech, the Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey) and also to the seconder, the Member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose) for the quality of their speeches. I would also like to congratulate the appointment of the two new Ministers of the Government.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I take this opportunity to thank the people of St. Vital for their vote of confidence. I also want to thank my campaign team for all of their hard work, and above all, my thanks to my family who so generously tolerated the fact that our home life was totally disrupted for 35 days. It is with great pride and a sense of partnership that I take a seat in this Chamber with my colleagues and the Leader of my Party. He is a man of great strength, intelligence and integrity. I consider it an honour that he has appointed me as his legislative assistant.

Mr. Speaker, in what I understand is a longstanding tradition for new Members, may I take time now to familiarize the honourable Members with the constituency that I represent. First of all, I would like to point out that it has been more than 20 years since a Conservative has been elected to represent the riding of St. Vital. Needless to say, I am very proud to be holding this urban seat for the Progressive Conservatives.

Now what are the boundaries of this riding? For the part that is sometimes called old St. Vital the northern boundary is Carriere Avenue and the southern boundary on the west is Norberry Drive as it intersects with Dunkirk Drive, and on the east side of St. Mary's Road it is Poplarwood as it intersects with St. Anne's Road. As a result of redistribution, the riding quite literally jumps the Seine River and encompasses a large portion of Windsor Park

bounded roughly by sections of Archibald, Cottonwood Road, Harper Avenue and De Bourmount Avenue.

St. Vital is a comparatively old community in terms of western Canadian history, and the first settlement of the area goes back as early as 1822, just a mere 10 years after the arrival in the Red River colony of the Selkirk Settlers. However, the name St. Vital did not make its first appearance until 1860, when Bishop Tache established a school by that name, and it is said that he chose the name for the patron saint of Justin Grandin, one of his bishops who had become well-known for his self-sacrificing work in Manitoba. I have been told that if you are subject to nightmares it is to Saint Vital, as we pronounce it, that you pray, and I hope that none of us have to resort to that.

History abounds in the riding of St. Vital, and I am sure that you are all familiar with the names Riel, Lagimodiere, Guay, Gaboury and Major. These are just a few of the first families who settled there. The Swiss mercenaries of the Des Meurons regiment who settled in Canada after the war of 1812 also lived in St. Vital and it is from them that Des Meurons takes its name.

The proud heritage that St. Vital boasts comes not just from these well-known settlers, but also from something a little more down to earth. Did you know that organized horse racing began in Manitoba right in St. Vital? The first course laid out in the early 1890s started at the mission where St. Boniface Cathedral now stands, and ended at the junction of St. Mary's and St. Anne's Road right in the heart of St. Vital. It eventually was moved to Polo Park and then to Assiniboia Downs.

Another long-standing endeavour is the Winnipeg Canoe Club which is situated in St. Vital. The Canoe Club received its charter in 1893. At that time only men were allowed to participate in its activities. Ladies were not admitted until 1931.

The English-French question was played out on a small scale in St. Vital. In 1880 the area became a municipality, and was called the R.M. of St. Boniface. At that time, the council was composed totally of French-speaking residents, and the minutes were recorded in French. However, because of the proximity of the town of St. Boniface, there was confusion over the two districts, and in 1903 the name was changed from the R.M. of St. Boniface to the R.M. of St. Vital. Shortly after this,

there was an influx of English-speaking people into the community. When the first English-speaking person was elected to the council the minutes were then recorded in both English and French. In 1910 or thereabouts, the first all-English-speaking council was elected, and that spelled the end for record-keeping in French. Thereafter, all minutes were in English. These are just a few of the examples, but as you can see St. Vital has a long and interesting history.

Today, St. Vital is a relatively stable residential area. It consists mainly of single-family dwellings, apartment houses, townhouses, side-by-sides, and seniors' residences. It has no industrial development, although commercial development occurs along some of the main thoroughfares. I should mention here that Windsor Park was also primarily a farming community. Its history is relatively recent, for major housing did not develop in that area until 1954.

As an historian, what I found particularly interesting was finding the faint remnants of the farming community that St. Vital used to be. While campaigning, I came across numerous old farmhouses, some of which had been extensively renovated. Others were almost as they had been 70 or more years ago. Along Dunkirk Drive which borders the Red River, one of the residents brought out an old map which showed how the land had originally been divided, and it had been divided in the manner of the scenery system, the narrow plots of land extending back from the river. In the case of St. Vital, they extended as far east as to what is now St. Mary's Road. As I stood outside that house with the map in my hands, I could easily imagine the original layout and I could almost visualize the ghosts of the Riel and Lagimodiere families.

* (1600)

In another part of the riding, I encountered many homes that had plots of land behind them which were still being used to provide the family with fresh produce, a reminder that dairies and market gardens used to dot much of St. Vital.

In still another section, and a large one I might add, were homes which had been totally or partially submerged in the flood of 1950, and their owners, still living there, told me stories of how the community had worked together against the ravages of that disastrous flood.

Because of the stability of the area, there is a

great sense of community and many who were born and raised there have remained there to raise their families. They have good reason. Because St. Vital has excellent schools, community centres, libraries, and active senior centres, all within a well-treed and well-serviced area. Well, that is St. Vital.

What about me, the MLA for St. Vital? I was born in Winnipeg, and my husband and I moved into St. Vital 22 years ago. We have two children, aged 16 and 21. I graduated from the University of Manitoba in 1964 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology, Sociology, History and French, and twenty years later, I returned to University and graduated in 1984 with a Master's degree in History. I specialize in aviation history.

After the birth of our first child, I left full-time work. I became active in the community as a volunteer. I was a Girl Guide leader. I helped to form a co-operative nursery school and a home and school association; and because I was concerned about the lack of public knowledge about the prevalence of child abuse—and I am talking the mid- to late '70s when I say this—I also gave audio-visual presentations on child abuse to schools throughout the city.

At that time also, along with three partners, I began a cottage industry, a food service known as The Pear Tree; and although we never made a million dollars, it gave us a good grounding on the trials and pitfalls of starting your own business.

Approximately 10 years ago, my husband decided to start his own company, and because our kitchen was for many years his office, I was inevitably drawn into it. I learned first hand how important a role Government can play in creating a good business climate, or the converse, how Government can make it difficult for small businesses to grow and thrive.

In 1974, I became a licensed pilot, and in my love of flying and history and my wish to help preserve Canada's and in particular Manitoba's remarkable aviation heritage, I joined the Western Canada Aviation Museum. I have been a volunteer with the museum since 1977, and I have been fortunate to have been in on the ground floor of its development. I have been President of the Board of Directors for the last three years, which is also a volunteer position.

Now I want to refocus again on St. Vital. It is composed of a mixture of people: single people,

young and old, young marrieds just starting out, traditional two-parent families, as well as single-parent families. There is also a large portion of the community made up of seniors, living either on their own or with families. As you can see, St. Vital is not a stagnant or a dying community; it is vibrant because it has a good balance of all age groups.

A 1990 statistical profile shows that the riding of St. Vital is composed mainly of people of British origin, followed by those of French origin and then Ukrainian. Other ethnic groups in the riding are families of German, aboriginal, Dutch, Polish, Jewish, Chinese, Italian and South Asian origins. Naturally, each group has its own needs and concerns.

However, during the course of the campaign—and I walked every street of my riding—I found that, regardless of area or the age of the person, the most common complaint that I heard was dissatisfaction with the size of City Council and the apparent inefficiency of some of the civic administration. I will not bore you by going into all the variations on that theme.

On the other side of the coin, on the plus side that is, what I heard said most often was the satisfaction the people had with the Filmon Government. More specifically, they told me that they were happy with the Government's efforts to keep Government spending under control, to make Crown corporations and other Government agencies more accountable. They liked the fact that the Conservatives had improved the business climate, because a thinking voter realizes that only with more money being generated within the province could we hope to expand and improve essential services in health, education and social services.

I had people tell me that they had never voted Progressive Conservative before, but they were going to do so this time. I could go on, but in a nutshell, people recognized that the Conservatives were the most fiscally responsible and had a proven track record in handling, with wisdom, the affairs of the province.

On that theme, I was pleased to read, in the October 6th edition of the Free Press, that the president of the recently completed expansion of Boeing Canada, the Winnipeg manufacturing facility that is, said that the expansion could lead to the creation of twice as many new jobs as originally

expected. That is the kind of thing that has been going on in this province since the Conservatives formed the Government two years ago.

This Session's Throne Speech confirms that the Conservatives intend to continue to chart a wise course. It recognizes it cannot be everything to everyone, and that it must prioritize while at the same time continue to provide and improve essential services.

I am confident that although the words recession and tightening the belt are words that all Canadians are hearing, and will be hearing more of, that this Government will maintain the kind of climate that will allow all Manitobans of whatever background the opportunity to work and achieve their goals. This Government will provide the environment that will stimulate and encourage individual initiatives and effort.

I have worked with children, families, and seniors, and I understand their needs. I have also been involved in the business community, and I know its requirements. I know that it can be difficult to strike a proper balance between the needs of numerous groups, but I will try to bring both common sense and compassion to the decision-making of which I am a part.

I think it was the Premier (Mr. Filmon) who said the role of Government is to facilitate and create a stable environment in which people can dream their dreams and pursue their excellence with pride. I agree with that explanation. I believe that this Government has a vision which will make Manitoba more dynamic, both economically and socially.

I look forward to participating with Members of this Assembly in dealing with the issues before us.

In closing, I want to say that it is with a great deal of respect and awe that I stand here today. On the official tour that all of us newcomers received, I found myself feeling almost overwhelmed with the responsibility that I had assumed, particularly when I looked at the figures and the words on the walls of this Chamber. The dome in particular caught my eye, where I saw words such as temperance, mercy, hope, charity, understanding and humanity. I hope that I will always remember those words and act in accordance with those principles.

It has been an honour to have addressed this House, and I look forward to working with Members on both sides. It is my hope that we maintain the decorum that befits the great lawmakers of earlier

centuries, such as Alfred of England or Justinian of Rome. Two out of five men represented in this Chamber, two of the names that I can see as I stand here right now. More importantly, I hope that we may each represent the electorate to the best of our ability and with integrity, so that when we leave this House we will be able to say, I have served the people well.

* (1610)

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): I would like to congratulate every Member of the Legislative Assembly here today. I particularly want to congratulate the new Members in this House who have been elected for the very first time. I also would like to congratulate my own colleagues on this side of the House, particularly the New Democratic Party Members.

I also want to say congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, for once again being appointed to be the Speaker of the House and I look forward to your advice and to your rulings. I was very fortunate of course to be part of this Legislative Assembly when I called on you to provide some advice to me personally and to the people of Manitoba. I am very grateful to have been part of that whole process.

I also would like to congratulate the Government Members who have been appointed Ministers of Cabinet and I am sure that they will do their jobs well. I look forward to debate and their Estimates in the coming few weeks. Certainly it is an honour to be part of Government, and I know when Mr. Pawley was the Premier of this province he appointed me to a Cabinet position, which I was very honoured to be part of. Of course he gave me some advice which I have always upheld. When he appointed me he told me I do not want any yes men. I have always kept that.

Also I would like to make note to the Legislative Assembly that I have accompanying me members of the aboriginal community and certainly I will enjoy the company of the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) and also the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar). We certainly look forward to debating the issues of aboriginal people in this House.

For many years I have advocated that we should be part of the democratic process and be active in it, whether it be provincial, whether it be in federal politics or urban politics, municipal politics or even

at the international level, because we as aboriginal people have to address many concerns.

I know that many of the Canadian people this past summer have been educated through the whole process. Certainly, with the demise of Meech Lake, it brought to the attention of many of the Canadian people the plight of the aboriginal people in this country. It was not easy dealing with this particular issue. There was heavy pressure on many people, many of my colleagues and certainly many of the aboriginal people played a key part in the whole process.

I was very fortunate to be able to have aboriginal leaders support me and able to provide me with advice as to the positions that we took. I would just like to explain that it was not done out of hatred or out of disregard for any group of people in this country. It was done because we felt as aboriginal people that it was time to stand up and say that we want to be part of the whole process, be part of democracy and want to have an input as to how our Constitution should be made up. Certainly we have not been recognized in the Constitution as aboriginal people.

I say that because the Constitution only recognizes two founding nations, the French and the English. The aboriginal people are not even given any recognition for the role that we have played, the positive developments that we have made in this country. I have said to many people, as I travel across the country, that it is about time that we are given the proper recognition in this country. After all, we welcomed many of the people to the shores and we have inhabited this country for thousands of years prior to the arrival of the Europeans, and certainly we shared our resources, the land and our knowledge in this country with the people, with the strangers that arrived here.

It is indeed sad to say that the supreme law, the Canadian Constitution, does not even mention aboriginal people as the founding people or even give credit as to the role that the aboriginal people played. I often say that no one group in this country can claim, as the aboriginal people, the contributions that they have made in this country. Certainly I hope, through the Constitution process, at some point we would receive that recognition we richly deserve.

We have made history as aboriginal people, and maybe in changing the course of our country. That

is a challenge that is before us, what kind of Canada we want to build, what kind of virtues or principles should we adopt that we want to see Canada become. We know that the Canadian Constitution is based on certain fundamental principles. As a matter of fact, it states it is based on the principles on the supremacy of God and the rule of law. But when your Constitution is wrong in terms of who are the founders of this country, we know it is not right not to recognize the first citizens of this country and we want to be able to rectify that.

Also we want the Constitution to adopt and recognize aboriginal people to have self-government, to have that inherent right to self-government. Many people feel that they do not understand what that means. Basically what it is is that, if I can simply put it forward so that everybody would understand it, is basically to be able to manage our own affairs, to take control of our lives, to be able to control our future and destiny. We are not asking for anything more or anything less, and if our Constitution can recognize the common law of Great Britain as part of our Constitution, then what is more Canadian than to recognize the traditions and the laws and the traditional democracies of aboriginal people in this country.

Surely people would recognize that. Reasonable people would be able to understand about self-government, be able to determine and control our lives. For far too long we have been subject to a piece of legislation that we call The Indian Act, an antiquated piece of legislation, in which we are very limited as to what Indian people, especially the people who are Treaty Indians and registered Indians functioning under the reserve system, many of the decisions or by-laws have to be approved by the Minister of Indian Affairs.

* (1620)

The bands do not have that much authority to determine what laws are passed by Cabinet or Order-in-Council as the case may be. It boils down to the approval of the Minister of Indian Affairs, so the Minister has a great power over the lives of Indian people, even on a day-to-day basis. We have to get away from that piece of legislation. We have to replace it with something totally different, not necessarily a municipal type of legislation, but rather a recognition of self-government for aboriginal people. It is not something that can be created or given by an Act of Parliament, but rather a recognition that the Indian people did have or still

have self-government. When the first Europeans arrived here, Indian people had their own system of Government to manage their resources, to manage their affairs, whether they be political or social.

Recognition has never been formally given under the Constitution. During the whole constitutional process with the First Ministers during the 1980s and up to the last one in 1987, I think the reason it failed was that many people wanted to define what exactly was meant by Indian self-government. I guess many of the Premiers, many of the people around the table wanted to know what powers they were losing or what they were losing in terms of giving control over their lives to Indian people. It seemed to me at that time that Governments had no political will to deal with that issue. Many people felt that if they did give some sort of authority, it was done under some piece of legislation that is granting them the right to govern themselves.

As aboriginal people that has never been part of any agreement. If you look at the treaties, you will find that there is no reference to Indian people giving up that right to the Governments and certainly that has been part of the stumbling blocks into achieving some understanding and be able to come into an agreement on self-government as to what it should be. I know that Governments have looked at whether it should be an Act that is created that would give some governments to some bands. I know the federal Government has developed Sioui legislation which gives a lot of power to the band, able to administer dollars and able to recede or develop their own by-laws.

I know some people have argued for a greater economy under the federal Government, or even some to a certain extent where people have spoken in terms of that they are still a sovereign people where some of the treaties do not exist, whether it be in Quebec or whether it be in B.C. where treaties have never been made, but rather through time that they were able to be part of Canada. But many outstanding issues like self-Government and the whole question of aboriginal rights has to be resolved. It becomes a little more difficult to deal with those questions, because there is no agreement in place.

I know that some key decisions have been made in respect to aboriginal rights by the Supreme Court of Canada which gives greater interpretation and also a greater recognition of aboriginal rights in this country. If I just maybe refer to the Sparrow case

where an aboriginal person in B.C. was fishing, using a certain size mesh net and was charged under certain regulations for using this certain size mesh net. He appealed it, it went all the way to the Supreme Court where his rights as an aboriginal person were upheld. So that is recognition that is going to have a tremendous impact in the future of court cases or recognition of aboriginal people.

The other case that I refer to, the recent one, is of course the Sioui case in Quebec where these aboriginal people were harvesting or using the resources within the provincial park to practise their culture, their tradition, religion. They were charged I guess under the provincial laws, but again the Supreme Court ruled in their favour and upheld the decision that their rights were recognized in 1763, the Royal Proclamation, that the lands that they were operating were never ceded and they were never made under any treaty. So that the aboriginal people throughout a short period of time—this was the recent recognition of aboriginal rights in the Canadian Constitution—have been recognized in the Canadian Constitution, but what happens is that Governments do not tend to implement some of these decisions.

I will be watching, I guess, as to what this Government will be doing to implement some of these recent court decisions with respect to the natural resources and many of the issues dealing with treaty and aboriginal rights, dealing with hunting and fishing and natural resources that do exist in this province. I will be watching what the Governments are prepared to do. I know oftentimes our trustee, the Minister of Indian Affairs or the Department of Indian Affairs, oftentimes what they do is they look at the policies or they try to interpret the decisions. You would find them at the front lines trying to appeal these decisions rather than trying to implement many of the court decisions respecting aboriginal people. So there is a lot of work that needs to be done in the area.

One of the things that I find is that as the Indian people go through the courts, through the low courts and through the Supreme Court all the way up that aboriginal people, their rights are beginning to be recognized. Although it is a long process, some of these outstanding items can be addressed through a political process.

* (1630)

I feel that some of these can be accomplished

through direct negotiations with Governments, rather than dealing with them through courts. It is costly for aboriginal people to take things to court. It takes time and many times aboriginal people do not have the money or the resources to challenge many of the court cases or to take up a case on treaty and aboriginal rights.

So there are many outstanding issues that have to be resolved and of course we deal with the question of—with other ones, like Treaty Land Entitlement. I will be asking questions later on in terms of where that is at the present time as a result of this past summer dealing with the situation in Quebec, the Oka situation. You know the situation could have been resolved a long time ago and dealing with land claims and dealing with self-government.

One of the reasons why we have not been able to deal with them is because Governments are not willing to talk, not willing to sit down with aboriginal people. It is extremely frustrating when doors are not open for discussion, and I try to emphasize that during my involvement in the whole process. As long as you keep talking, keep negotiating, we can achieve these things peacefully rather than by confrontation, and certainly I feel that many of the people would want to achieve these things peacefully. Also, you have to question the mentality, the priorities of our leaders in this country. I mean the whole situation in Kahnésatake or Oka was over a golf course so that a privileged few can chase a white ball around over Mohawk traditional lands and sacred grounds. Who would want to use force to resolve this issue? You question where we are at in our history.

It brought deep feelings when I was in Oka when I walked down behind the barricades, behind the barbed-wire fence and it felt like miles and miles with barbed wire. I would see machine guns and tanks and soldiers and feel like you were in a different country. How can this happen in Canada? Certainly Canada has to be held responsible; it has to be held accountable, particularly when the federal Government has a jurisdiction, responsibility for aboriginal people and particularly when Canada is always preaching about democracy and humanitarianism to other countries. I know their image has been tarnished, as a result of the situation this summer. I know many Canadians feel uncomfortable with the kind of image that was

projected on the screens internationally, and the world was watching how the thing may be resolved.

I believe that if Governments are willing to sit down with us and willing to deal with us sincerely and honestly, with aboriginal people, we would resolve many of these issues.

One of the reasons why Meech Lake was rejected—or the proposals sent by the Prime Minister. One of the reasons why it was rejected was that we said that we have been promised so many things, promises after promises never being carried out, and the aboriginal leadership in this province said, enough is enough. The proposals that were sent to the chiefs at that time included to review the Canada Clause, whether we should be part of Canada, or be a distinct society of Canada, or a fundamental characteristic of Canada.

As aboriginal people, why should we study ourselves? We know the recognition should be there. It is morally right, it is politically right. I mean the recognition should be automatic. Why would you want to be part of a committee that would study us when we were here first?

The other proposal included, that was sent to the chief, was to have a Royal Commission on Native affairs study us again. That itself—I mean there are studies piled after studies gathering dust and nothing is being done about it. We had a recent study dealing with comprehensive land claims or treaties. We also had an Indian self-government report that was tabled in the House of Commons in I believe it was 1984, but never really went anywhere. It was a report that was endorsed by all political Parties, a parliamentary report.

Then again you have got to question the motive of the federal Government, and why they would initiate a Royal Commission on Indian affairs during the time of the constitutional crisis.

If they were sincere in dealing with aboriginal people and Native peoples, they could have done that at any time. The Government has the authority to do so at any time to go ahead with a Royal Commission on Native issues. Even then, after the demise of Meech Lake, the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, the Assembly of First Nations, called on the Prime Minister, the federal Government, to go ahead with the Royal Commission on Native Affairs, but the federal Government refused to proceed with it.

Then you wonder why they would refuse, whether

the Government was actually sincere in offering that particular study to deal with aboriginal people.

So when we are talking about relationships with aboriginal people in this country and the Governments, obviously the Governments have failed miserably to deal with these issues. The aboriginal people have been very patient, I might add, and I am understating the fact. We have been very patient, very accommodating, in trying to resolve the issues that are still outstanding.

* (1640)

You look at the reserves, communities—what price have we paid as aboriginal people in terms of the relationship that we have? We have high unemployment rates on many of the reserves, poor housing. I mean, the conditions that exist are much worse than maybe in some Third World countries, but that has been throughout history, throughout Governments. I am not blaming any particular Government, but there has to come a time when Governments have to deal with these issues, and certainly, for the very first time in Canada, Canadian people were awakened. I know that we had constitutional conferences. It was held on national TV, but never really caught the attention of Canadian people.

What Meech Lake did was, it brought unity to aboriginal people, solidarity to aboriginal people. As I go from province to province and from community to community and reserve to reserve, I see there is a lot of interest by young people, by children, young men and women, adults, elders that has never existed before, and the kind of pride and the kind of, I guess, feeling of togetherness in common issues is bringing out people to stand up, to be concerned, to have interest in their lives, what the future holds for them.

Indeed, other Canadian people, the non-aboriginal people in this country, are beginning to question Governments. Why have not these outstanding claims or issues been resolved? There is that support, and I feel that there is expectation by the Canadian general public to deal with these issues, to be dealt with by their Governments, although they do not completely understand some of the complicated processes and the complicated issues, but they certainly would like to see their Governments resolve many of the issues.

At the same time, I was very concerned as to what was happening in Kahnésatake or in Oka, because

of the situation there which became very volatile, and also the tragic event that led to one of the police officers being shot. We do not know who shot the police officer, but there is a story that needs to be told. There are many other things associated with the whole situation at Oka. I know that for a fact because of the stone-throwing incident one of the elders who was sick got hit and eventually died in a hospital. Those kinds of things are not reported by the media, and there are other instances where children were hit by rocks. That kind of an incident is very damaging and has a tremendous impact—I guess I could call the impact between the two groups or the people that were involved in Chateauguay or Kahnawake some of those nearby communities. Relationships were strained between families, between friends, and it was an ugly situation.

They tried to figure out why the thing developed to the extent it did, and I do not think Canadians, aboriginal people or anybody, would want to leave a legacy of such—we were not able to say it to our children that we resolved these things over a political table or by negotiating, and not by force.

It is very unfortunate that it happened, but history has past now and we have to reflect as to what happened. What are we prepared to do? When you call in to question people who are responsible, or who are accountable, such as the Quebec Government, such as the SQ, the Sûreté du Québec, what role did they play, and also the federal Government? They certainly had constitutional responsibilities for aboriginal people. They certainly had statute obligations and treaty obligations for aboriginal people.

Even bringing in the army, what role did they play? Also, of course, the Mohawk people themselves be called to question. When I was involved in talking with many of the leaders and with the federal officials, federal Minister of Indian Affairs, I tried to facilitate the discussions. I felt frustrated because we were trying to resolve this thing peacefully. I know that there were certain tactics used to divide and conquer aboriginal people before and are still being used.

I think that is the challenge that is facing us today; how to deal with many of these outstanding issues? Certainly, as aboriginal people, we want to be part of the whole process. We want to be able to deal with Governments. We want to be able to resolve

many of the outstanding issues. I have said before that we want to resolve these things peacefully.

I want to conclude by saying that we look forward to working with this Government and of course look forward to better relations with the federal Government with them. I know that many of their responsibilities rest with the federal Government, but I look forward to working with some of the outstanding issues that we have with these Governments.

I know my time is running out. I know I can speak on many other issues dealing with the economy, the aboriginal people, some of the social conditions, but I think through time I will be able to. There are many other opportunities I can speak, such as education and other issues. So with those few words I would like to thank the Legislature for listening to me, and, of course, I would like to thank my constituents of Rupertsland for sending me back to the Legislature and able to represent their interests.

* (1650)

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to speak on the throne speech, but ask leave of the House, if I may ask the Member a question at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member has used his allotted time already. The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on retaining the high office that you hold. In the two and one half years that you have been there, you have always been a very capable leader in this House. I also want to compliment the Member for Seine River (Mrs. Louise Dacquay) as the Deputy Speaker, and at the same time, I want to compliment the Mover and the Seconder on their participation in the moving and seconding of the throne speech.

Also, I would like to say welcome and to congratulate all the new Members in this House. I believe, if I am correct, we have 22 new Members out of 57 that have been elected. When you consider the fact that in the last four and one half years, we have had three provincial elections. We had one in the spring of '86, we had one in the spring of '88, and then following in 1990 now. So that is

-(interjection)- It seems like we were at the polls all the time.

The thing that I would like to maybe leave with some of the new Members, the fact that dramatic changes of faces in this Legislature after each election is something that should be a little warning and a little signal for everyone of us that are here that our positions are pretty precarious here, and I will dwell on that a little further in just a moment. I would just like to indicate that October 11 was a very exciting day for myself and some of my colleagues, not just because of the fact that we had the throne speech, but my friend and colleague, the Member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey) and the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) and myself celebrated 13 years in the Legislature.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Driedger: When you consider the fact that for the new Members that the average term in this building is less than six years, then having achieved 13 years is quite an accomplishment. That, however, Mr. Speaker, is nothing compared to my colleague -(interjection)- Yes, you almost did and I will talk about that, but that is nothing compared to the time period the dean of the House has spent here, the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), who has been here 24 years. Next to him, of course, is the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard S. Evans), who we were trying to help retire earlier and he managed to still retain his position as the Member for Brandon East. He has been here 21 years.

After that, there is a considerable gap, and actually, the next three people, the seniority would then be the Member for Pembina, Arthur-Virden and myself, but in my case, it is not the riding of Emerson that I represented for almost 13 years, I had the privilege of running in a new riding called the Steinbach riding and managed to win, squeak by -(interjection)- Yes. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, during the last Session that sitting close to the then Leader of the Third Party giving him sound advice, telling him that we were hoping that he would get stronger. I know that because his ambition for being Leader of the Opposition was strong—he never viewed the possibility of getting to be Premier—but he wanted to be Leader of the Opposition so strong, and I kept giving him advice.

I said, you have to get strong because you are lagging in the polls, and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, to my surprise and somewhat disappointment, he

came through stronger than I had anticipated, but such is politics.

I want to tell especially new Members that life in this Legislature is going to be what you make of it. I have seen many Members come and go and some with a good attitude and rightfully so. I can recall back to my first Session participating in the first Throne Speech reading it and being very nervous. After a while you develop a little bit of a comfort level.

I had the misconception at the time that having won an election and participating in the Legislature here that was so very important, and it was too. I thought that my whole constituency should all realize how terribly important it was, and the work that I was doing there. I found out, to my chagrin and disappointment at one time, and I accept it now, that when I came back they would say, what are you doing? They would not realize in many cases that the Session was on. Many of them sometimes to this day feel that I am in Ottawa. I felt, man, I am doing such a great job and everybody should really realize what is happening out here, and people were not that concerned about it. The only time they seemed to catch—when they showed interest was when there was controversial issues or things that affected them personally.

Then I learned my lesson after the close call in '81 when the then Government of the Day—well, no, it was not quite that close. The Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), we called him landslide for a while, and there is a Member that has been working hard and has built up his majority and he has done a good job.

One thing is that we have to be, and I believe in that philosophy, welcoming forthright and frank with each other. I know that certain Members will proceed to get relatively aggressive and feel that if they can take and make their marks in this Legislature by trying to embarrass, and that is part of the political arena that we live in, the Government of the Day to try and see whether you can embarrass them to some degree and make brownie points for yourself.

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

I feel very fortunate that the first four years that I served under the Sterling Lyon administration, I served as a backbencher and the Chairman of Committee of Supply and various other little jobs I did and I went -(interjection)- the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says, good backbencher. I think, Mr.

Acting Speaker, that there are challenges for the backbenchers, but I always, looking back in retrospect, valued the experience that I got being there to see how Government operated, being on that Government side. I will tell you something, would still rather be a backbencher on the Government side than be a Member of the Opposition.

I had six and a half years of experience sitting in Opposition and it has its merits, because we always used the approach that when you are in Opposition you can shoot from the hip. You can say anything you like, you very seldom have to back it up, but -(interjection)- yes, my colleague from Niakwa always said, he could have it both ways. I think some of you probably remember the statements that he made. However, I think that being responsible is something that is expected.

When we were out in the hustle of things as we were just a little while ago, the reputation of politicians is not necessarily No. 1. In fact in many cases, and this is no reflection on car dealers, politicians and car dealers are sometimes viewed in the same category and that is maybe nine out of 10 or 10 out of 10. There is a reason for that I think to some degree. I think we bring it on ourselves by very often not being quite forthright. We can interpret things in different ways. I think we are entitled and should have different philosophical views, but I think there still has to be some credibility factor.

It is funny what this building does to some people, how it changes us, at least some of us. I can recall the Leader of the Opposition of the Third Party (Mrs. Carstairs), then at that time being the lone Member in the House, being very principled, not saying that she is not now, but probably a little bit more tarnished to some degree after years of exposure to this House, but always indicating at that time that, if she was there, if she had control, things would be different. What we saw during the two and a half years that they were in opposition, nothing changes that much. The circumstances are such that everybody feels they have a role to play and nobody is above the fact that you get out there and embarrass the Government of the Day, little things that happen, and I made up my mind during the course of the campaign that I would mention this.

* (1700)

The Member is not here now, but the previous Member for Assiniboia, during the course of the

campaign, in his literature indicated that he was very pleased that he had forced the Government into paving that stretch of No. 1 between the Perimeter and Headingley. I just found that really amusing because the Member was not even aware when we started the project. The reason why we moved on that project was because of the Summer Games.

With these other kind of things, we all do some of this I suppose during the course of a campaign, and we all try and make ourselves look as good as we can to our constituency. That is fair, but there has to be a certain amount of honesty and credibility in the position that we have here.

I just want to leave some of these thoughts with the new Members. It can be a good time in here. It can be a real educational experience. I maintain many times that once I feel that I cannot learn anything more, then I should get out of here. I think that applies to all of us, that we have a lot to learn from the process here. At times I think that the new Members will find it very frustrating being in here, because sometimes you feel that nothing is being accomplished, but that is the process. In spite of us criticizing the process, it is still the best process in the world as far as I am concerned.

In connection with that, I had the occasion to make some comments doing an opening on behalf of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) in Steinbach on Saturday—Linden Place. In speaking to mostly seniors at that time, I reminisced to some degree because I told them that my grandfather got to be 91 years old and my dad is 82 at the present time. When I look back over the years—sometimes they go by so fast and it makes me feel older than I am—when I look back to what circumstances were at that time in terms of the facilities for seniors or a health system, which I think is second to none in the world—I mean we can stand here and criticize the things that are happening, but just look back to where we have come from. We have programs in this country that the world envies. Everybody would like to have that kind of system.

We can say that things could still be better. I think we all have a challenge to strive for perfection, but irrespective of who the Governments in charge have been, regardless of political background, Governments have moved forward and improved the lot of Canadians. I think that is where the challenge comes in, regardless of who is in Government. At the present time it is us, and I am very happy for that, because it is much more exciting

when you are Government than when you are not. The challenge is there to try and keep on improving, at the same time being responsible in terms of what we do. That blend is something that is the challenge of Government, to make sure that we provide ongoing services, try and improve them, and at the same time trying to be accountable to the taxpayers.

It is easy enough for Members of the Opposition to keep shouting and saying you should spend more money or you should correct something here. I think that is your responsibility. At the same time I think there has to be some sense of responsibility and accountability when this criticism comes forward, and I think Government has to also be big enough to accept criticisms as they are given and try and improve on things.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I am learning all the time. When I start thinking that I have a good sense of feeling for many things, then I find out that it is not that way at all. I have to indicate that my tenure so far in this building—hopefully after having had three elections in four and a half years that this time I think the public is tired of elections. I am and look forward to the possibility of being in Government on the Government's side for the next four, four and a half years. I think that will be for myself a real challenge and exciting.

Now I would like to spend a little time, Mr. Acting Speaker, on the responsibility that I have held for two and a half years, which has been Minister of Highways and Transportation and Government Services. I want to indicate that especially in the transportation end of it that there have been many changes and challenges taking place, and that has been the area where I have probably had the most challenges for myself in terms of trying to get to understand this system and know what it is all about.

For those that are going to be critics of Highways and Transportation, I want to just indicate that when I first had the opportunity to be the Minister of Highways and Transportation that I extended an invitation to the critics to come and talk to myself and my staff, to have a better understanding of it as well, and we did that.

They availed themselves of that opportunity until they thought that they knew as much about the system as I did and then came to the House and started to try and shoot me full of holes. It sort of leaves a little bit of a not sour taste, but you sort of feel why bother. I would want to do that again.

I believe the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) is the critic of Highways and Transportation and I have to indicate that your predecessor as critic and who was the Minister for some time, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) had a pretty good understanding of it and we have had our jousts and our bouts in the House and in Debates about what should be done.

When I took over the office in that respect, there were certain things that I inherited from that Member, who was the Minister at that time, that I certainly concurred in, and I think there has to be an ongoing process. In the transportation end of it, for example, it was the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), as Minister, who signed a Memorandum of Understanding regarding deregulation of the trucking industry. When I took that office, I certainly had no arguments and I put forth Manitoba's position well. Because for those of you that do not know, Winnipeg is the exporter of transportation services. In fact, transportation services are to Manitoba what possibly oil is to Alberta, on a bigger scale for them, of course, or potash to Saskatchewan. Nine of the 14 national carriers are headquartered in Winnipeg, and the spinoff effect in terms of employment is dramatic.

At the same time, when that Memorandum of Understanding was signed -(interjection)- Well, I will touch on that as well, because I have promoted all the time on a continuing basis the importance of the transportation industry to Manitoba. You know how vital it is to Manitoba's economic well-being. In many cases when decisions were made by authorities other than the provincial one, because we have always striven for that, but especially lately, and the Member of the Opposition has indicated concerns about some of the loss of jobs in this industry. Certainly when Air Canada made a decision to make some changes rationalizing their operations and CN is doing the same thing, it is easy enough when you sit in the opposition to shoot and say, what are you doing?

I have to indicate that my position has been just very much the same as it was with the previous administration, that we have always raised the concerns. There are basically two areas that I think I have stressed all the time in my discussions in meeting with these organizations. If we talk to Air Canada, if we talk to CN, if we talk CP, then we recognize very often the current difficulties the transportation industry is facing, but I will want to

always bring forward, express our concern for the employees and families who will be affected by the cuts. We have always brought forward that position that the federal Government with these corporations when they make these kinds of cuts, there has to be provision for supplement, job training, relocation allowances for transportation sector employees displaced as a result of deregulation of the transportation industry.

I feel very strongly about that because jobs are a very important part in anybody's life. I have four children and I have in-laws. Some of them have been employed; some of them have been unemployed and know how dramatic it is when you are unemployed.

Now if somebody who has had a job for quite a number of years feels security in that, is building up security for the future, to have that disrupted, especially at a time like this where we are getting closer to the winter season and the Christmas season, I think it has a traumatic emotional effect on many people as well as economic.

* (1710)

I have said that many times, well, nobody has to starve in this country because we have programs that will not allow that. At the same time we all try and achieve a higher standard of living, and having had a certain level that we achieve, and we should always strive for a higher one, to have that degraded or downgraded has a dramatic impact on people. So that is the point that I have always stressed with these companies that there should be some provision.

I do not necessarily knock the rationalization, because we are asking these companies to be accountable, and when they do rationalize my concern always has to be that it is done in a fair way that Manitoba is not being discriminated more than anybody else, and that there is provision for these employees.

The other thing that I want to always suggest is that we want to defend and enhance Winnipeg's role as a transportation distribution centre.

In my discussions with some of these companies, Air Canada included, they gave me their assurance that Winnipeg will always be a major transportation and distribution centre, and I think rightfully so when you consider the location of our province. I think it is very important that we try and enhance that, because of the job creation from there.

However, I have to indicate that during the process of deregulation—and I want to talk about that a little bit. We are thinking year three, three and a half in that, and it was a five year—at that time, Manitoba actually brought forward the position of having a five-year legislation during which deregulation would take place. The reason for that was to allow an adjustment within the industry so that our truckers, by and large, do adjust, be able to accommodate, or be set for when deregulation finally comes into effect.

We are actually moving on a faster track than I had hoped for because—and we have had tremendous pressure from provinces that are not exporters of transportation. They deregulated overnight and then are shooting at Manitoba saying we should deregulate faster so they have opportunities to get in here. So our position has been consistent from before, the previous administration, to what it is now.

Aside from that, probably many of you are aware of the problems that the owner-operators have. They were demonstrating and blockading in some of the other provinces. I have always worked very closely with the MTA, in terms of trying to make things a little better for them. I will touch on that more under my Highways' initiatives.

The one unknown question that comes to mind is with our deregulation. When the Americans deregulated, they just deregulated, boom, and they did not have any safety net in place, and what happened is that every old clunker truck was on the road. Canadians looking at that said, when we deregulate we simultaneously will apply the National Safety Code so that we will not have that kind of impact on our trucking industry, as it happened in America.

However, as we deregulate, the one concern that I want to express, tongue in cheek a little bit, is that we will be facing more north-south traffic. Before, we had predominately east-west traffic.

With free trade coming into effect, I can indicate to you there is a dramatic escalation of truck traffic across the Port of Entry at Emerson. In fact, I believe the Port of Entry at Emerson is now the fourth highest truck Port of Entry in the country. That fits in—realizing the changes that are taking place, that is one of the rationale and reasons why we are looking at twinning Highway 75 as fast as possible,

because we have a tremendous amount of truck traffic coming down Highway 75.

The other reason of course is the tourism impact, the tourist dollars, and my colleague will probably be talking about that in his own defence, but I always feel that tourist dollars are good dollars. They are coming from somewhere else. These are dollars that we do not necessarily raise from our own people.

The impact of the potential competition from our big carriers in the States is something that our industry is nervous about, and I am nervous about it as well. The big operations that they have in the States, as compared to even our national carriers, dwarf us by comparison. I have concerns that they do not necessarily come in and start taking over satelliting into here. Whether we are in a position to take and actually avoid that or not, I am not sure, but we are certainly cognizant of that. Looking at those things, as these things unfold under deregulation, I think that is a thing that I at least want to be very careful of and I think everybody would.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I want to touch, Mr. Speaker, on the highway aspect of it a bit. We have been working and Manitoba has been a leader, especially because of my deputy, Mr. Boris Hryhorczuk, who has been chairman of RTAC where we are initiating a national highway program. We have gone through three stages of that. We are at that point where we feel that the federal Government has a responsibility to participate in a national highways program. We have identified the routes in each province. It has all been accepted by the federal Minister as well and the last stage of the study that was done indicated how much money the federal Government collected from the highways system, which is in the area between \$4 billion and \$5 billion and what they have put back into the system is in the area of 15 percent of the revenues collected off the highway.

We are the only developed country that does not have a national highway program. We have done comparisons with countries like the United States, Britain, Germany, Argentina. I would suggest possibly that Members who are interested make themselves available of the report that is out under RTAC and you will find very interesting information in there. We are probably the lowest manufacturer of benefits out of a national highway program, but have been the most stringent in terms of pushing for

it. I will continue to do so because we feel that the highway construction is of major importance and the monies that it is costing—when you compare the Manitoba highway budget compared to Alberta, it is embarrassing because they have that kind of money that they spend. Still we have moved ahead from the time that I took the responsibility of that office.

When I took over I think \$83 million was spent on highway construction, whereas in 1981 there was \$100 million already designated at one time. So in my first term we upped it to \$95 million, last year we brought it up to \$102 million, and this year we have a capital program of \$107 million. We are moving in the right direction, but from my perspective I think that we have to move even faster than that because when you consider the changes that are taking place in terms of rail line abandonment, as we shift, and even concerns that are brought forward together with my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), in terms of method of payment, are all things that have an impact on the road system, both for municipalities as well as for the province. These are things that I think are very important for us to keep in mind and be very cognizant of what is happening.

I have to indicate, of course being a little biased as Minister of Highways, that money spent on highways is money well spent because first of all you have a tremendous spin-off effect in it and when you do a project you can say now here is something that I can show for it. Everybody really feels that way and it is surprising how communities appreciate a good highway system. So we feel that we have certainly prioritized it higher than the previous administration and hopefully we can continue to do so.

I want to indicate that in the last few years we have placed a significant importance on improvements around Winnipeg: the Perimeter Highway, we have redone most of that; we are working at the overpass at No. 7 and 101. One of the things that we have concerns with and have raised with the city many times is the fact that as we are twinning highways approaching Winnipeg, once you get to the city portion of it you are getting down to a two-lane highway and that is almost a negative type of thing that happens and the same thing on Highway 75. We have finally come to an agreement with the city on that. I announced that agreement during the course of the election and nearly got my head shot off, of course, but this is something that we have been working on for almost two years together with

the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). We announced the fact that we had come to an understanding with them where the total cost of twinning the city portion of it is going to cost in the area of \$14 million. We are cost sharing that to the point where we are going to be picking up probably over half of it, but at the same time the city then has accepted the responsibility for taking over certain PRs within the city so we have tried to work that out and we feel as the province we have acted very responsibly in terms of the city in making that kind of an agreement. If somebody wants them, we can provide the details in terms of exactly the agreement that was struck. It is public information.

I am pleased that we could do that because for the kind of money we are spending on Highway 75 in twinning it and then you come to the La Salle River, all of a sudden you are into an older-type road, two lanes, and the safety factor with the impression, it is not positive leaving it the way it was, so I am looking forward to having that portion of it done as well.

I would also like to indicate that we are moving ahead on a project that should have been dealt with many, many years ago, which is the northeast Perimeter. So we are in the first stages of completing the acquisition of right-of-way and the final designing. We have hired consultants because you have to understand that on the northeast Perimeter we have three major structures that have to be dealt with. I am talking major structures because these have main-line CN going there, main-line CP, and you have Highway 15. If the Governments of the Day had seen fit to complete the Perimeter at that time, it probably would have been a lot cheaper then because right now we are looking at well in excess of \$60 million to do that. When you compare that to a budget of \$107 million, you know that you will have to do it in stages because other roads need priority as well.

So these are the challenges that are facing us. In talking with the Minister of Highways and Transportation from Alberta, they have just let their final contracts on the twinning of the Yellowhead to all of Alberta. We have not even started on that aspect of it. We are just starting to see whether we can improve it by building up the shoulders and putting better asphalt down there, but we have a lot of traffic coming through that area.

* (1720)

At the same time, under the National Safety Code we are applying certain hours of service that truckers can drive. We have had a difficult time getting agreement between the various provinces on this. We started with the eastern counterparts in saying that 13 hours of driving time, 15 hours of service because two hours for servicing the units, et cetera, was enough time for a driver and then he would have to book eight hours rest. It is nice enough to make these regulations; at the same time you also have to make some provision for these truckers to have a place where they can then stop. We are moving in that direction and we have our first tourist and truck rest stop at the Minnedosa turnoff between 16 and No. 10 and we are also trying to do the same accommodation on No. 1. If you make these kind of regulations and rules, you also have to make provision for it. Those are the challenges that we face.

I would also like to make reference to the fact that when I inherited the department we had cutbacks in some of the other programs that affected Manitoba. One was the Grant-in-Aid, which is 50-50 cost sharing which we do with villages, towns and cities on certain designated routes where we have criteria that we establish, a certain number of businesses, et cetera, then we are prepared to do the cost sharing of rebuilding those roads. We have started that to the point where—I do not think we have gone far enough in that, but as Governments have to do you prioritize where the money gets spent and those of you who have been involved with us before realize that everybody brings forward their programs and Government as a whole makes decisions as to where they have to prioritize it. We brought it back to the standard that it was at one time, which is \$1.5 million, which we then cost share which would then be a \$3 million program, but our portion is \$1.5 million. The requests that come in are two or three times what we basically have available.

We also upgraded the funding to the local government districts. For those of you who are probably urbanites, you maybe do not realize the difference between local government districts and the rural municipalities. Local government districts are the ones that by and large do not have the financial wherewithal to take and operate as a municipality, and so we have certain programs that address roads and other things within those LGDs. We have restored the funding, in fact escalated it

somewhat, marginally but somewhat, to enhance their road construction in those areas.

Another area where I feel that we have been quite positive is that we have the Grants-in-Aid program. We have the LGDs covered, but we did not have a program that affected basically municipalities, especially in bridge construction. If you look at the history, at what has happened in the municipalities years ago—of course, costs were less—but when you consider the kind of bridges that were built, a lot of them were built of wood, not necessarily to proper specs. As a result, when you consider the kind of escalation and loads at one time—and it is not that many years ago a three-ton truck was a big truck. For those of you that are on the highways, you can see the kind of feed trucks and the kind of weights that are being hauled now. Many of the roads, municipal roads, have never been structured to carry those kinds of weights, nor have the bridges been.

The challenge, of course, is to the municipalities to try and upgrade their roads to a certain standard as well, but the costs of replacing many of their structures is just horrendous. So we have developed a program, providing that the municipalities hire an engineer. The reason we do not want our people involved is that there is always criticism that the Government engineers maybe cost too much or overdesign. So they can go and hire their own engineer and he can design a bridge based to certain specifications, and the specifications we have outlined, which would be equivalent to a PR road. That would be the minimum we would allow those kinds of bridges to be built. Then we would cost share 50 percent of the engineering costs and 50 percent of the capital construction of these bridges. We are hoping that those areas where it qualifies—and not all municipalities are the same, some have a lot of bridges, others do not have as many. So, where we feel this is a positive move, we are making in that direction.

Other areas where we have tried to help the trucking industry, we have expanded the RTAC designation of certain highways which allows the maximum loading, what we call RTAC loading on certain routes. But here again before we can take and allow that to happen, we have to make sure that our structures are capable of carrying those kinds of weights. We have expanded it, so we have a network through the province. Certainly that is an

enhancement for the trucking industry. It makes it a little more economical for them to do business.

We also had the program that we called the Community Access Program where communities that are within eight kilometres with a population of 50 or more off a PTH located on a PR road that we would allow them access of PTH weights going into that community. The reasoning for that is we had 100 and some odd communities that would be affected that way, especially where you had major industry involved. Truckers would come up with a load within, let us use a figure of eight kilometres, which we use as an arbitrary figure, and then they would have to stop and either reload or else they took the chance in getting tagged for an overload on a PR road. These things have helped many of the communities, in terms of what is happening there.

I will give you an example of how you can play with figures. I want to indicate to you that we doubled the airport grants to municipalities. We doubled it. It sounds great, but when you consider that the grant itself is quite marginal, then it loses less of its meaning. We know the importance of having good airports in the municipalities as well as up North, and that falls under my category as well. It is a major challenge not only to maintain the airports that we have at the present time—I am talking of Government jurisdiction—but to upgrade them to allow different planes. The people that are serving the North up there come back to us continually asking for us to upgrade the airports. Again, these are costs and I think the services are required. I think it is justified. It is a matter of just getting the priorities to do it.

Another area, a nice little thing coming forward is that as of January 2 photo licensing will be coming in on your driver's, and for those of you, it is a stage thing and I will not go into the details. The program will be coming forward with a promotional program indicating how it is going to take place, but as of January 2, some of you that are in the right months—(interjection)—not already. Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those of you who are fortunate of the right months of the right year will be able to have your handsome and—oh, boy, I always get into to trouble with this—all your good looking faces on there. Okay, let us put it that way. Notice how I backed out of that nicely. —(interjection)— You want me to give them fire? No, that comes later.

* (1730)

The one area that I have not touched on and would really like to get into is the Port of Churchill. I have not even started on that, Mr. Speaker. There is so much good stuff that I wanted to say about this Government, and I was trying to be on the high road today and give our new Members a bit of an insight as to the challenges and experiences I am facing. Well, the reason why there has been some criticism that the things have not been included in the budget is for the simple reason that we were good Government for two and a half years and we said in the budget speech that we would continue to be good, responsible Government. That is why the people actually—anyway, I would have liked to have a bigger bulge in a majority, but we can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we will continue to give good Government to the people of Manitoba. Thank you.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): I would first like to extend my congratulations, as other Members of the House have, upon your re-election, Mr. Speaker. You were a very fair and even-handed Speaker in the last Session which was, as we all know, full of many interesting and controversial events, and I think all Members on this side of the House appreciated your actions as Speaker. I know as a new Member of the Legislative Assembly, I am looking forward to your continuing to provide us as legislators with the rulings that will help us do the necessary work of the House.

I would also like to congratulate all Members, both those who have been re-elected, but particularly, those of us whom I call the Members of the Class of '90 who are new Members to the Legislative Assembly. —(interjection)— Good class I think, I hope. I am sure we all feel nervous and a bit of tension, but a great deal of excitement as we begin this very important work of this House.

I would like to thank the Clerk of the House (Mr. William Remnant) for his provision of the new Members' orientation session for us all. It was a chance not only to get to meet the other new Members of the House, but also to learn some of the background and the basics of the Rules of the House, which I hope will enable us to be better Members of the Legislative Assembly. I would also like to put on record the record number of women in this House representing all three Parties. This is certainly a record for Manitoba. Not good enough, but a very good start. I know that we will have a very positive impact on the quality of the debate, and I am sure also on the decisions of this House.

I am not only a new Member of the Legislative Assembly, but I also represent a new constituency. The constituency of Wellington was made up of parts of four previous constituencies, Ellice, Logan, St. James and Inkster. It is a very exciting constituency to represent. It is made up of a mixture of professionals, working people, seniors, youth. They all have an excellent sense of community, particularly in the Weston-Brooklands area of the constituency. Some residents in the constituency have been in the same homes for 60 years, while others are new not only to Wellington, but to Manitoba and as well as Canada. The range of age, size and composition of families, and ethnic background make it an extremely interesting, diversified and exciting constituency to represent.

During the pre-election period and especially during the campaign itself, I raised and had raised by residents in Wellington, several very important issues: fair taxes, the maintenance of the health care system, home care, child care, support for families, job security, and last but certainly not least, accountability to the people of Wellington and the Province. I wish I could say that the Speech from the Throne addressed these issues; however, I am afraid that the people of Wellington and Manitoba will get as their single overriding impression of this throne speech, this outline of the Government plans, a reliance on outworn, outdated, and ineffective economic and social politics, the politics of Reaganomics, neo-conservatism, trickle-down effect, supply-side management which have been proven not to work.

The people of Wellington, more than this Government, understand that society has an obligation to provide essential services to all of its members: children, families, victims of violence, seniors, people with physical and mental handicaps, not just support to large corporations. The people of Wellington and Manitoba understand that Government must take a leading role in providing these essential services, and that the best way to do that is through a fair and equitable tax system. What we are seeing in Manitoba and Canada is the erosion of this principle of fair taxation. Low- and middle-income families in Manitoba and Canada are paying more and more of the tax burden, and high income and corporations are paying less and less of this tax burden, due in large part to successive Liberal and Conservative Governments which have provided enormous tax loopholes over the years.

The goods and services tax, the GST, is only the latest in a series of regressive, unfair taxation policies to come from successive federal Governments. It is no accident that Mr. Chretien refuses to categorically state that were he the Prime Minister he would repeal the goods and services tax. It is no accident that neither the Liberals nor the Conservatives want to follow even the regressive United States Government which has instituted a minimum corporate tax. It is no accident because we know that Liberals, just as Conservatives on both the federal and provincial level, are beholden to large corporations for their financial support.

The people of Wellington are also not impressed with the Speech from the Throne because of what it does not say. We all know that we are in for tough economic times; even if the federal Finance Minister, Mr. Wilson, has difficulty with the R word, we know that we are in the midst of a recession which could go on for a very long time. The throne speech does not address the needs of the people in these hard economic times.

The throne speech does not talk about the plans for insuring that women and children can be safe, not just on the streets, but in their own homes. It does not talk about providing the supports for women and children who are victims of violence. Women and children in southeastern Manitoba are still waiting for their shelter to reopen; it will be at least six weeks for that to happen. They have been without crisis service since September 21st. Other shelters throughout the province are on the verge of having to close their doors due to the lack of adequate core funding.

Parent-child centres are forced to come directly to the Legislature, even though it is very difficult for them to get into the Legislature to give yet another message to this Government, which they apparently do not want to listen to, about their funding crisis. Child and family service agencies are unable to provide even basic, mandated services because of lack of adequate funding. Support for personal-care home programs and staff, support for nurses and other health-care professionals, support for child-care programs, foster care programs, family day care programs, community living programs—none of these vital and productive services are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

There is no mention of poverty, programs to help children and working families who make up the

fastest growing segment of poor Manitobans. There is no mention of programs to provide decent, affordable housing. I am sure that The Residential Tenancies Act, which is to come before this House, will provide cold comfort to the renters of Manitoba.

There is no mention of pay equity to ensure that women do not continue, in private as well in public sectors, to receive 68 cents for every dollar that a man earns.

Nowhere is there a commitment to funding innovative programs that have made a real difference to individuals and families that are helping prevent problems from occurring.

However, over five pages of the throne speech are devoted to the needs of business, easing the tax burden on business, making Manitoba open for business. Less than one page was devoted to the social priorities, which includes the Departments of Health and Family Services, departments which are No. 1 and No. 3 in their spending Estimates in the past for this Government—less than one page.

This Government, through its lack of action over the last two and a half years, and certainly in its Speech from the Throne, is sending a very clear message to all Manitobans. Manitoba may be open for business, but it certainly is not open for services to the people of Manitoba.

* (1740)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we as legislators have a very important role to play in the lives of all Manitobans. Actions we undertake in the House and in our constituencies will have an impact for years to come. It is an awesome responsibility, and one that I willingly undertake.

I would like to thank the people of Wellington for their confidence in my ability to represent them. The people of Wellington can also be assured that I and the rest of the official Opposition will continue to speak out on their behalf, on behalf of families, women, children, working people, seniors who have given and continue to give so much to this province and who deserve and demand programs and services that will enable them to lead happy, productive lives. Thank you.

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St Norbert): Monsieur le président, permettez-moi de vous offrir mes félicitations sur votre nomination en tant que président de l'Assemblée. J'aimerais aussi féliciter ma collègue l'honorable députée de La Seine (Mrs.

Dacquay) sur sa nomination comme présidente adjointe.

Egalement, j'aimerais offrir mes salutations à notre sergent d'armes et à son adjoint pour le renouvellement de leurs nominations respectives. Aussi, je souhaite la bienvenue aux pages et j'offre mes salutations les plus distinguées à chacun et chacune.

(Translation)

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by offering my congratulations on your appointment as Speaker. I also wish to congratulate my colleague, the Honourable Member from Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) on her appointment as Deputy Speaker.

In addition, I would like to add congratulations to our Sergeant-at-Arms and his deputy on their reappointments. I would also like to welcome the new Pages and offer my personal congratulations to each of them.

(English)

As the elected representative for St. Norbert, I wish to publicly, at this time, thank the people of my constituency for their support and faith in me. I can assure them that I will do all that I can to serve them effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to be in this Chamber serving the people of St. Norbert. I can tell you that I am not here due to my efforts alone. It took a great many people dedicating a great many hours to achieve victory at the polls. I would like to thank the hard-working volunteers who gave of themselves to help to get me here.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I must thank my campaign manager. I am a lucky man, for not only did I have an excellent, confident and experienced campaign manager, but she also doubled as my friend, a teacher of my children, and my wife, Winnie. I thank her for her unending support and her generous understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to fill the shoes of a man I greatly respect and admire, Gerry Mercier, a man who shared his experience with me and provided inspiration as he told me once that a person can make a difference.

I have lived in St. Norbert all my life. My family has been in the area since the 1940s. I went to grade school and high school in the community. Growing up in St. Norbert, I watched the community evolve

from the family farm to a small town, to a vibrant part of the City of Winnipeg.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I ask all to take an artist's approach and compare St. Norbert to a mosaic. St. Norbert is made up of many cultures and ethnic backgrounds each a distinctive part of a painting, yet coming together as one work of art.

I remember as I was growing up and learning to swim in the La Salle and the Red River and playing along the riverbanks. I believe that these riverbanks are a tremendous asset and an asset worth holding on to for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, after my school years, I went to work at the local service station full time. I had worked there for my brother after school, weekends and summers during high school. Little did I know that someday I would own and operate a service station within three miles of that very spot.

In December of 1980, I opened up Fort Richmond Service. During this time, I had the opportunity to make many friends and contacts within the community of Fort Richmond. I have found that the Pawley Government, through taxation, was sending a message, the same messages that they are attempting to send today, a message that said taxing business is far removed from taxing the individual. This, we all know, is the furthest from the truth, as the end user of a goods or service pays all costs of providing that goods or service. I found this at first to be a great source of frustration, but as time went on I knew I wanted to try and do something to change things.

As I shared my thoughts with friends and customers, a common theme was echoed. The only real way to effect change was through the political arena. With this support and blessing of my family, friends, I mounted a campaign for a seat on City Council. Early in the process, I learned that the political life would mean sacrifices.

As you, my colleagues, are well aware, one does not enter public life for the great hours or the high pay. It is because we share a genuine desire to work for the betterment of our community and to serve the best interests of our constituents that we seek public office.

As a city councillor, I learned that change was possible, not always easy mind you, but possible. I learned that my first opinion was not always my final opinion. My time on City Council taught me a lot about the process of Government. I know that the

insights I gained as a councillor will benefit as an MLA, Mr. Speaker. I learned the importance of weighing all sides of an issue before making a decision. I learned that the best solution was not always the simplest or the most popular.

It was during my time on City Council that I began to receive calls encouraging me to consider provincial politics. As time passed, the encouragement grew to a point that a decision had to be made. Again I consulted my wife and my family and my friends. I made the decision to run in the provincial election.

During the campaign, I had the opportunity to meet constituents at their doors, in the malls and in coffee shops, to hear their views. I can tell you that the people of St. Norbert share many of the views of all Manitobans. When it comes to taxes, enough is enough is enough. I heard people speak out about issues such as the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Filmon Government record on the environment. You see, I believe that there is a great and growing concern about the environment. Solutions will not come from fear. We must understand and address the real issues of the environment. Many human activities produce waste that damage the environment. One priority is to control, treat and eliminate waste from industry, municipalities and agriculture. It has been claimed that we must drastically change our lifestyles to protect the environment. I believe that we can improve our standard of living, increase our economic output and still protect the environment. That is what is meant by sustainable development.

There seems to be some confusion about what Government should do to protect the environment. Government has several leading roles in the environment protection. To lead by developing policies and action programs that encourage appropriate waste treatment, that discourage the release or transport of wastes to prevent damage to the environment. To plan by requiring environmental impact studies and ensuring that the development will be sustainable rather than destructive. To monitor by using its resources to continuously measure the state of the environment and regularly report to the people. To respond by having technological expertise that can act to repair the damage and deterioration of the environment. To legislate, Mr. Speaker, by passing and strictly enforcing laws that protect the environment.

Much attention has been directed at single issues relating to the environment and on/or making symbolic gestures showing concern for the environment. I believe that we must focus and act on all aspects of protecting the environmental quality.

Mr. Speaker, many feel that the concerns for the environment began recently. The Magna Carta, the base of our present laws, written in 1215 has a clause that states, you must not defoul your neighbour's water. This should be the basic rule for the '90s and beyond. You must not defoul your neighbour's water, air or soil.

When it comes to our provincial financial well-being, I know that in my household we strive to live within our means, and I believe Government should do so as well. In Manitoba, we have been saddled with a huge debt that the NDP rang up. I was shocked to hear that we are now paying a half a billion dollars a year just to service that debt. Our Premier (Mr. Filmon) has stated on the record that our Government's desire to reduce that deficit, a desire that is backed up with a proven record of results. I know that making Manitoba strong means removing the mortgage from the future of our

children. Our children are our future. They not only need but deserve our protection and guidance. The throne speech made clear reference to protecting the family and our children from pornography and violence in videos, in dealing with drugs and substance abuse.

* (1750)

Our Government knows the value of our seniors. Just as our young are a resource to be protected, so too do our seniors need and deserve our protection. Protecting our seniors from abuse and allowing them to live with dignity, security and confidence says a lot about the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am proud to be a member of the Filmon team in Government. In representing the people who elected me, I pledge to do all I can to fairly and effectively represent my constituents in this Chamber. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? Six o'clock. The hour being 6 p.m., and according to the Rules, I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8 p.m.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Monday, October 15, 1990

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Tabling of Reports

Annual Report Elections Finances Act; Ombudsman's Report; Twentieth Annual Ombudsman's Report Rocan	28
First Quarterly Report MTS; Second Quarterly Report MTS; Three Month Report MLCC Manness	28
Annual Report MTS Findley	28
Annual Report Manitoba IT&T Department Ernst	28
Oral Question Period	
Family Violence Doer;McCrae	28
Legislative Building Barrett;Driedger	30
Parent-Child Centres Barrett;Gilleshammer	30
Family Violence Carstairs; McCrae; Gilleshammer	30

Residential Tenancies Act Martindale; Ducharme	31
Family Violence Wowchuk;Gilleshammer	32
Swan River Abuse Centre Wowchuk;Gilleshammer	32
Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Edwards;Cummings	32
Family Violence Chomiak;McCrae	33
Manitoba Telephone System Storie;Findlay	34
Income Tax Evans;Manness	36
Mining Tax Evans;Manness	36
Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project Doer;Cummings	37

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Throne Speech Debate

Doer; Carstairs; Render; Harper; Driedger; Barrett; Laurendeau	37-73
---	-------