

Fourth Session - Thirty-Seventh Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable George Hickes
Speaker*

Vol. LII No. 4 – 1:30 p.m., Monday, December 2, 2002

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
First Session—Thirty-Eighth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AGLUGUB, Cris	The Maples	N.D.P.
ALLAN, Nancy	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
ASPER, Linda	Riel	N.D.P.
BARRETT, Becky, Hon.	Inkster	N.D.P.
CALDWELL, Drew, Hon.	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean, Hon.	Wolseley	N.D.P.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
LOEWEN, John	Fort Whyte	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MIHYCHUK, MaryAnn, Hon.	Minto	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
MURRAY, Stuart	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PENNER, Jim	Steinbach	P.C.
PITURA, Frank	Morris	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack	Southdale	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Carman	P.C.
RONDEAU, Jim	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
SALE, Tim, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Wellington	N.D.P.
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
SMITH, Joy	Fort Garry	P.C.
SMITH, Scott, Hon.	Brandon West	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
TWEED, Mervin	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 2, 2002

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Former Manitoba MLAs Association

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), I have reviewed the petition and it complies with the rules and practices of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Clerk, please read.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): The background to this petition is as follows:

An association of former Manitoba MLAs has been formed and on September 25, 2001, at its first annual meeting it was agreed that the Manitoba Association—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? No, read, keep reading.

Madam Clerk: —(like its counterparts in the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario) be incorporated by Act of the Manitoba Legislature.

The objects of the Former Manitoba MLAs Association are:

(a) to put the knowledge and experience of its members at the service of parliamentary democracy in Manitoba and elsewhere,

(b) to serve the public interest by providing non-partisan support for the parliamentary system of government in Manitoba,

(c) to foster a spirit of community among former MLAs,

(d) to foster good relations between current and former MLAs, and

(e) to protect and promote the interests of former MLAs.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

THAT the Former Manitoba MLAs Association be incorporated by Act of the Legislature of Manitoba.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us from Machray School 36 Grades 3 and 4 students under the direction of Ms. Rose Falgui. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes).

Also in the public gallery we have from Oakenwald School 23 Grade 5 students under the direction of Mrs. Rozann Broeska. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Smith).

Also in the public gallery we have from F.W. Gilbert School 15 Grade 5 students under the direction of Mr. Devon Turner. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik).

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here today.

* (13:35)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Taxation System Reductions

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, after reading today's *Winnipeg Free Press*, it is very disheartening to learn that the Premier's advice to Manitoba's taxpayers expecting tax relief is: Do not hold your breath.

While the Doer government has no problem taking money out of hardworking Manitobans' pockets by nickel-and-diming them with tax increases, this Premier has no ability to put money back to those hardworking Manitobans. Every other province, even NDP Saskatchewan, seems to understand the importance of a competitive tax environment, but not this NDP government. Why? Why does this Premier feel that it is okay for middle-income-earning Manitobans to be the highest taxed west of Québec? Why is that?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): When we came into office the middle-income individuals of Manitoba were the highest west of Québec and east of Québec under the Tory years.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Doer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The article, I believe, states that I do not see that cutting taxes is the only virtue in a budget. That is an accurate quote.

I think you will notice in the last three years that we believe there are a number of virtues in a budget. One is rebuilding and retraining nurses. Secondly, we believe making universities and community colleges more affordable and expanding the number of courses is very important. We believe keeping our promise on the Brandon Hospital, the Health Sciences Centre, the Gimli Hospital, we also believe that is a virtue. Yes,

we have not only kept our promises on tax reductions, we have exceeded our promises on tax reductions.

I think it is important that members opposite, when they were in government and when they were in opposition, they promised they would eliminate the so-called payroll tax in four years, from 1995 to 1999. They did not do it. We would rather be honest with people and have a balanced approach to the budgets. Stay tuned.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, last week there was no mention of tax relief in the Throne Speech. Now it appears doubtful that they will be mentioned in the upcoming Budget. Instead this Premier attacks the spokesperson for the Canadian Federation of Business which represents only 4700 businesses in Manitoba. He attacks the spokesperson for the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce who represents Manitoba business and he attacks the spokesperson from the Canadian Taxpayers Federation.

The Premier has proven his contempt for Manitoba's business community. His Throne Speech had no mention of the role our private sector plays in this province and now this Premier attacks the organizations they represent. Shameful. Very shameful.

As a businessperson, I ask on behalf of all businesspeople in Manitoba: Why is he attacking the people that drive our economy?

Mr. Doer: I would remind the member opposite that we are all members who represent constituencies in this Legislature, a very important point to make to the member opposite. We all represent all the interests for all Manitobans across this province. I think it is very important.

We take no lectures from members opposite. When we came into office the corporate income tax had not been lowered since the Second World War. It was not in the so-called magical plan that was drawn up on the back of an envelope in the Tory platform, nor were there tax reductions in any one of the Tory budgets for the corporate income tax rate. We are actually doing it every year for the first two years and our next two years in our tax proposals. We need no lectures from the member opposite, and, please

remember, all of us represent all Manitobans and represent the constituents. You represent the people of Kirkfield Park, not any individual business.

* (13:40)

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, the Premier attacks the spokespeople for the CFIB, the CTF and the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce. He attacks them for not running their own businesses. Has the Premier ever run his own business? No. Has the Finance Minister (Mr. Selinger)? No. How about the Industry Minister (Ms. Mihychuk)? No. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Sale)? No. Has anyone in the Doer Cabinet run a business? I do not see any hands.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I remind all honourable members when the Speaker stands, all members should be seated and the Speaker should be heard in silence. I ask the co-operation of all honourable members, please.

Mr. Murray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week we offered to work with the Doer government to allow Manitobans timely access to quality health care. Today, with respect to the economy, we offer the same advice, to work with the Doer government. Will you make Manitoba competitive?

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the province of Manitoba is twice as competitive today as it was when you were in office. The sky-is-falling party over there fails to acknowledge that there were approximately 3000 jobs on average created every year in the 1990s. We are over double that since we have been in office in our first three years.

We have lowered taxes more than what we promised. We have lowered income taxes more in our first three years in office than they did in their last three years in office. We have more progress and success than was even recommended in the Manness report, without raising the sales tax, as the hidden agenda by members opposite. They are a one-trick pony. In fact, they are a one-trick phony pony because

they promised to reduce the payroll tax in four years. They did not do it. We keep our promises.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would like to take this opportunity to remind all honourable members that each and every member in this House is an honourable member. Please choose your words carefully.

Child and Family Services Emergency Shelters

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, on Friday we learned that extremely vulnerable and needy children were being denied counselling because there is no more money, due to government overspending. Today we have learned that Winnipeg Child and Family Services has closed 14 emergency shelters for children.

Can the Minister of Family Services tell us why 14 emergency shelters for very needy children have been closed?

* (13:45)

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Family Services and Housing): Mr. Speaker, the member was wrong on Thursday or Friday. I will table a letter with regard to the question I took under advisement.

I appreciate that the critic is quite critical. She has been quite critical on Health for a number of years now, but this record of error is really quite astonishing in this House.

With regard to the issue I am rising on, further to the item I took under advisement, I will read from Elaine Gelmon, the chief operating officer at Winnipeg Child and Family Services: "I am writing to clarify any misunderstanding that may exist regarding therapy for children," a misunderstanding propagated by the member opposite. "Therapy for children, currently in treatment under an existing Service Contract, will continue in accordance with the terms of the Service Contract."

Mr. Speaker, with regard to shelters in the province of Manitoba—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable Member for Charleswood.

Mrs. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this Minister of Family Services if the children from those 14 emergency shelters that have been shut down are now being placed in hotels.

Mr. Caldwell: I am very happy to report that hotel placements are down on an ongoing basis, way down from when members opposite were in office. The rationalization, the review of Winnipeg Child and Family Services and the efforts of this Government to bring some fiscal management as well as better program support for children is ongoing and will continue to be ongoing.

Mrs. Driedger: I would like to ask the Minister of Family Services why his Government is now accepting children being placed in hotels, because when his Premier (Mr. Doer) was in opposition he said it was absolutely unacceptable that children were in hotels and in fact he called it a disastrous policy of government. In fact, he also called it a scandal. Why is it not a scandal now that he is the Premier?

Mr. Caldwell: I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that the member missed the answer to the last question. Numbers have been reduced and we are continuing to make headway on this.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Charleswood, on a new question.

Therapy/Counselling Services

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): On a new question. Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Family Services, who runs Winnipeg Child and Family Services right out of his office since he fired the board, said he did not know Child and Family Services supervisors were told their budget was depleted and further contracts for counselling children could not be entered into.

I would like to ask the Minister of Family Services to confirm that between now and the

end of the fiscal year hundreds of extremely vulnerable children, many who have been abused, will be denied much needed counselling under his policy.

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Family Services and Housing): There is no such thing taking place. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the letter from the CEO of Child and Family Services was tabled three minutes ago and perhaps the member has not had a chance to read it yet, but this Government is committed to providing child welfare services to an extent that no other province in the country is. We are committed to early childhood initiative that addresses the needs of most vulnerable Manitobans', early childhood policies that are second to none in Canada. So this Government will continue to work on child welfare and Healthy Child initiatives.

Mrs. Driedger: I would like to table two letters. One was written on November 25 from Winnipeg Child and Family Services to supervisors under Child and Family Services saying: "We are currently attempting to clean up some existing Service Contracts in hopes of having more monies, however our budget is currently depleted."

"As of today's date we can no longer enter into further contracts for therapy."

A second letter that I will also table states: "if the service contract has ended and needs to be renewed, . . . no money is available to pay for these services, and should be terminated."

Mr. Speaker, those two letters came prior to the letter the minister just tabled. I would like to ask the minister if he is aware that a few of the children whose contracts have been terminated are actually suicidal children and should never have their contracts terminated. They need continuing care.

* (13:50)

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, of course, Winnipeg Child and Family Services has had a long and honourable record of providing child welfare services in our province. That dedication to service for children in the city of Winnipeg

continues. It continues to be supported by this Government.

Mrs. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this Minister of Family Services if he is prepared today to fight for the funds from this Premier (Mr. Doer) so that these children in Manitoba are not cut loose by a heartless government.

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's call for more public dollars in this area.

Court System Backlogs

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. In late 1998, the *Free Press* reported that the NDP came out with a list of reforms that would help ease the backlog of cases clogging the court system. On April 19, 2001, two and a half years later, in this House, the Justice Minister stated that the issue of court backlogs is a serious one. That is why we are addressing it. If the NDP has been working on reducing these backlogs for more than four years, why is Crystal Dolph, who is accused of manslaughter, who was reported in the papers recently and who was charged in 1999—why have Manitobans been waiting for more than three and a half years for a trial date which has still not been set? What will the minister do about court backlogs?

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly have the department report on what is behind this particular case. I think the member well knows that court backlogs can be the result of many factors including the timetabling available to defence counsel, the number of issues that have to be resolved before trial. Sometime it is a request by the defence, and sometimes decisions by the bench, but I will look into that particular matter for the member.

Mr. Hawranik: Mr. Speaker, why does this minister try to skate around this issue when he knows that his efforts, all his efforts that he has put forward, have failed to address the problem of increased court backlogs in this province? For four years he has had a plan which has failed to

address the problem. What will this minister do about this state of affairs?

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, the four-year number is interesting. I recall the election day still.

The challenge of court backlogs is one that is right across this country. It is one that is going to I think require a look at some systemic issues that are underlying the court system in Canada. In Manitoba, I can say we are taking initiatives. We have a number of pilots and new initiatives. In fact, one of the first things we did on coming into office was to significantly increase resources for the prosecution service, I believe a 30% increase in resources for prosecutions. We have a number of initiatives that are unfolding, a new provincial speed-up strategy, the first time that such an initiative has been launched. It cannot elicit a simple, one-line answer. The solutions will have to come from many quarters and we are prepared to provide leadership to find those solutions as we have been doing.

Mr. Hawranik: Mr. Speaker, it is nice to say that there are challenges, but you have to meet those challenges. What concrete steps, what action and what is the minister's new plan to reduce court backlogs that he can offer to ensure that justice in this province is improved, such as the suggestion that we had on this side of the House to hire private bar to do prosecutions in this province so that Manitobans can have increased confidence in this justice system? What steps will you take?

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, we have increased the number of prosecutors. We have hired managers in prosecutions. We have changed the organization of the Prosecutions branch increasing their budget by 30 percent. That suggests that the answers are not found entirely with the number or the organization in the Prosecutions Branch. I am very pleased the Opposition is raising the issue. I do not know why they did not raise this issue when they were the administration in a more serious way.

I notice that in their alternative speech from the throne they come up with some ideas and one, aside from the one mentioned by the

member opposite, would be to give social workers the ability to apply for a restraining order against pimps of children. This side of the House has a different idea about how to restrain the pimps of children. Bars. That is a good way to restrain them, not by restraining orders.

* (13:55)

Ethanol Industry Status Report

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): In last week's Throne Speech, the Government highlighted the expanded use of ethanol in Manitoba. Can the minister responsible tell this House at what stages are the proposed Russell and Dauphin-Roblin region ethanol plants?

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, you will know that the panel on ethanol recently concluded its hearings in a number of centres in Manitoba. The work on the report from that panel is very far advanced and I expect to see the report within certainly the next few weeks. We expect to make it public as quickly as we can thereafter. I can probably tell the member as well that I have had a number of meetings with ethanol producers and with promoters of ethanol production in our province. I am looking forward to the expansion of this industry in our province.

Mr. Schuler: Does the minister know that the province needs an additional 140 million litres of ethanol to meet its ethanol gasoline blend targets? Can the minister tell this House what his time frame is to meet the 140 million litre increase target?

Mr. Sale: Mr. Speaker, I think that all Manitobans who spoke to the task force made very helpful submissions in this regard recognizing that you have to have adequate supply before you can put a mandate that requires 100% mixing. On the other hand, those who are promoting the expansion of the industry need to know that there will be a mandate. So, obviously, what we need here is a phased approach where certain targets are set in the early going, reaching the final target of 100 or 90 percent. I think that Saskatchewan has 75 percent as their

final target. We need to also work with our neighbouring provinces so that our regulatory regimes are similar, or preferably identical, so that there is a level playing field. So there are a number of implementation steps. We would expect to announce how that would take place within the next few months.

Legislation

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, is it the Government's intention to mandate an ethanol gasoline blend in Manitoba and, if so, when is it the Government's intention to table that legislation?

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear part of the honourable member's question. I wonder if you would allow him to repeat part of it for me, please. I did not hear the question about the mandate time. Could he—

Mr. Speaker: Leave of the House?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Schuler: Is it the Government's intention to mandate an ethanol gasoline blend in Manitoba, and if so, when is it the Government's intention to table the legislation?

Mr. Sale: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I thank the member for repeating the question. We have already announced our intention to move towards a mandate in principle and that is why we had the ethanol task force. That is why the task force will recommend not only many things that will be helpful to the promotion of the industry but will recommend specific steps that would move us in a planned way to the implementation of that mandate. So I look forward to discussing the report with all honourable members, but it will have a timetable, a suggested process for implementation of moving towards the announced mandate that we have already in principle said we are going to do.

The actual implementation obviously has to work with industry, with producers, and with the distributors and the blenders so that we get a process that works for everybody, including consumers.

**Winnipeg Harvest Poverty Challenge
Minister's Participation**

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, on Friday the Minister of Family Services indicated that he was not a schizophrenic socialist because it is okay, if you are in his Government, to say one thing and do another. For as we know under the minister's watch those on social assistance have \$20 a week for food and entertainment. I would ask the minister and give him an opportunity to say why he did not participate in Winnipeg Harvest's poverty challenge last week to show understanding and empathy for those who are in need, those who are the poorest of the poor in this province.

* (14:00)

Hon. Drew Caldwell (Minister of Family Services and Housing): Mr. Speaker, last Question Period the member asked if I was a schizophrenic socialist on issues. This Government, again I reiterate, is dedicated to providing improvements in child welfare programs, is committed to early childhood investment, is committed to addressing the needs of all Manitobans in the most responsible manner and the most compassionate manner that we can.

Mr. Gerrard: My supplementary to the minister. I would ask the minister: When would he be prepared to take up the Winnipeg Harvest poverty challenge, as I gather Winnipeg Harvest will be ready to put the minister on the challenge as soon as he gives the word?

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work that Winnipeg Harvest does to further bring public awareness to an issue that is very important to all Manitobans. Certainly it is important to those of us on this side of the House.

I guess I am sorry that the member feels a need to use this as a political bludgeon, but I understand why he does.

I will say that we will seek to address issues broadly of social welfare for Manitobans throughout our mandate.

**Income Assistance
Rate Increase**

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): My supplementary to the Minister of Family Services. I ask the minister why there has been no increase in support for those on social assistance since he was elected, when there was a 12.6% increase in labour income during this period, when the nurses have received a hike of more than 20 percent and when MLAs have had inflation-adjusted increases. Why is this Government not paying more attention to the poorest of the poor?

Hon. Gary Doer (Premier): Mr. Speaker, in 1995 this member voted to cut the social assistance budget, which includes income support for babies, children and families. He voted to cut it 33 percent. Some members of the Liberal caucus, like Warren Holman, voted with their principles, voted for the future and did not cut it.

Since we have been in office, we have introduced the clawback for children. We have reversed. We have increased the funding for Healthy Babies in Manitoba, a program that is the first of its kind in North America. We have made significant investment for children's welfare that is under social assistance. They are completely within the social assistance areas of government. We have targeted children, babies and mothers who are pregnant in a targeted way to try to make a difference to their income, to their dignity and to their future. He cut. We are adding money for children.

Point of Order

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to be delicate about this because I know all of us in this Chamber on occasion fall into sometimes using words that are not appropriate. I have done so myself.

We have tried to come a long way in terms of mental health and acknowledging the education and the stigma of mental health in this province for some time. I am not sure if it is appropriate for a member to stand up in this Chamber and label anyone a schizophrenic in the

context of using it in a political context. It is not appropriate. It is not right. I think it is probably a slip of the tongue. I just urge all members that we do not fall into that trap.

I would just recommend that we not utilize that kind of terminology in terms of addressing anyone on any issue.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for River Heights, on the same point of order.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize if I have offended anyone and I would certainly be prepared to withdraw that.

I think if you look up in the dictionary, you would find that the word "schizophrenic" refers not only to somebody who has a mental illness but it also can be used to refer to somebody who says one thing and does another thing. It was in that context.

Mr. Speaker: Order. On the point of order raised by the honourable Minister of Health, I would like to suggest to all honourable members to choose their words and have respect for one another. Sometimes the words could be parliamentary or unparliamentary, but they could be hurtful to that person. So I would ask all honourable members just to show respect to each other and all honourable members.

Safer Communities Act Effectiveness

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. Can the Minister of Justice tell all Manitobans how effective the safer communities act has been since we know that during the dark, lean days of the Tory government in the 1990s there was an exponential increase in social problems and a great increase in the number of sniff houses, drug dens and booze cans, and the need for effective legislation? Can the minister tell us what we have done and how effective it has been?

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I think that all members of this House should be

commended for their support of that legislation which developed over a couple of administrations, actually. The legislation is innovative and I understand that in the first few months alone there have been 13 places shut down as a result of the intervention of the new strategy. We are talking about prostitution houses, drug houses, booze cans and sniff houses. I think that with that legislation and The Fortified Buildings Act, we are entering into a new era of the effective use of civil remedies in addition to the criminal law to deal with the many challenges that are being faced in too many communities.

Mr. Speaker, just to conclude, the legislation was recognized by all members of this House for the fact that sometimes it is just one house on a block that can destroy home values and the sense of security for a whole neighbourhood.

Livestock Industry Tuberculosis Control

Mr. Glen Cummings (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. The livestock industry in this province accounts for half of the gross production of the agricultural community. Currently it is understood that there is a potential reservoir of TB in Riding Mountain National Park, and I would like this Minister of Agriculture to demonstrate what it is that she is doing to try and contain and eradicate that.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I would have to agree with the member that the livestock industry is a very important industry in this province and one that continues to grow as farmers look at ways to add income to supplement their income or change their way of agriculture.

The member talks about what it is that we have done. I have to tell him that the Department of Conservation, the Department of Agriculture, Agri-Food Canada and the Riding Mountain National Park group are all working very closely together to take steps to address the whole issue of TB in the wild, but I have to also tell the member that farmers are working very aggressively and volunteering to have their herds tested to see where TB might be spread in the domestic herd and look at ways to reduce TB. I want to

commend the farmers for the steps they are taking to ensure that herds within the province are TB-free.

Mr. Cummings: On a new question to the Minister of Agriculture. We now see why this minister is known as the do-nothing Minister of Agriculture. In her answer she did not demonstrate one positive action that has been undertaken by this Government to deal with the potential spread of TB. I give her one more chance to answer the question.

Ms. Wowchuk: Well, I am afraid that the member has not been listening. If he was talking to farmers, he would know that the Manitoba Cattle Producers are involved with our Government, with the CFIA and the Riding Mountain National Park group. So it is this member that is completely out of touch with the farmers in Manitoba, because if he was in touch with them he would know that we are working with the farmers and have put in place a program to reduce the number of elk and address the issue, and we will continue to work in that vein, Mr. Speaker, along with the producers. We will review the steps that have been taken this year and will look at what other additional steps have to be taken in agriculture and in conservation in concert with all of the other people involved in this very important issue.

Elk Population Statistics

Mr. Glen Cummings (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Conservation is chirping from his seat that he has done a lot. I would like to know how many elk the hunting season has reduced around Riding Mountain Park.

* (14:10)

Hon. Steve Ashton (Minister of Conservation): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question because it is clear that the member is not aware that two levels of government, four government departments and stakeholders, including most importantly livestock owners themselves are involved in a very significant effort that is aimed at one basic principle, and that is limiting and preventing the interaction between the elk.

That includes a number of measures that have been taking place, Mr. Speaker, a target of reduction in the number of elk through increased hunting. Thirty fences have been put in place to prevent elk from coming into livestock areas in terms of feeding. There is monitoring ongoing.

Mr. Speaker, we are working with the stakeholders and all levels of government. I invite the member opposite to work with us. What we need in this case is a plan to deal with this, not political rhetoric from the member opposite.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, on a new question.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Ste. Rose, on a new question.

Mr. Cummings: When the Government accuses the Opposition of political rhetoric and gives an answer like these two ministers just gave, I am sure the public will understand that they do not have an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Conservation: Does he know how many elk have been reduced in this hunting season?

Mr. Ashton: First of all, in terms of this, the target is to reduce to 2500. The season is ongoing. Once again we talk about doing nothing. The fencing has been put in place, a commitment by the Government to work with producers in the area. I can talk about the ban of baiting that has been put in place. These are all actions, Mr. Speaker, and the ongoing monitoring that is taking place through the federal department, CFIA.

The reality is we are working on a long-term plan. I remind the member opposite that going back to 1997, when members opposite were in office, there were similar concerns. The difference is in this case we are working for a solution and I invite the member opposite to be part of that solution.

Livestock Industry Tuberculosis Control

Mr. Glen Cummings (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Ashton) is

unwilling to give a number. The Minister of Agriculture has not demonstrated any action.

Will the Minister of Agriculture now stand up and tell us: Does she support a restricted boundary around the park for the farmers who are adjacent to the park, or is she looking for something different in terms of a controlled area?

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, this was an issue that was raised at the AMM meeting. This is an issue that has been discussed for some time with producers.

I can tell the member that we have written and we do support a smaller area around the park because we believe, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government would impose a smaller area as the area designated, as we have in TB, there will be a much better chance of testing all of the herds in that area and regaining Manitoba's status as TB-free much sooner.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is the federal government that makes the decision. The federal government is responsible for reportable diseases, and it is the federal government that will decide what the area will be. Right now, it is the whole province that has been designated, and the federal government will very soon make a decision whether it is a small area or the whole province.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, the minister has somewhat cavalierly referred to a small, compact area around Riding Mountain National Park. The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers), the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach), the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) and myself all have significant numbers of stakeholders who will be damaged by that.

Now, are they entitled in the mind of this minister to some compensation for the damage that will occur?

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, the member, I am positive, knows the policy and how the compensation for TB takes place in Canada. TB is a reportable disease and should a herd have to be destroyed because it is infected with TB or

there should be an animal that has TB in that herd, it is compensation through CFIA that covers their costs.

I can tell you that my department and the veterinarians in the department are working very closely with CFIA and with producers. I want to again commend the producers in the area around Riding Mountain Park in the proactive steps they are taking to have their herds tested. Even before there is any designation of an area, they are being very proactive in having their herds tested to ensure that they are TB-free.

Livestock Industry Tuberculosis Control

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Mr. Speaker, farmers surrounding the Riding Mountain National Park are frustrated and somewhat fearful about the action this Government is taking. Right at the time when our herds are being tested for tuberculosis, this Government has chosen to move elk that may in fact be the carriers of this disease and they are moving these elk outside of the zone. These elk have been quarantined now for a number of years and could have still remained in that area for a time longer.

I want to ask the minister why it is that she has chosen to move these elk at this time, when at the very time we have three quarantined herds of cattle in that area.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely appalled that this member would take such fearmongering tactics in this House when he knows full well that those elk that have been held by the Government ever since the previous government captured them, the Government has been holding them at a huge expense. We could not move those elk until they were cleared by CFIA. CFIA has given a clear status to these animals. I said that in the House on Friday. The member knows that the elk cannot move in this province without having a clear health status, and I would ask him to quit fearmongering in this province and destroying the—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An Honourable Member: Quit your fear-mongering.

An Honourable Member: You are—

An Honourable Member: It is on your head.

An Honourable Member: Cattle killers.

An Honourable Member: Quit your fear-mongering.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An Honourable Member: It is on your head.

An Honourable Member: How many cases have you got—

An Honourable Member: No new cases.

An Honourable Member: Zero, zero.

An Honourable Member: The whole livestock industry, multi-billion-dollar industry.

An Honourable Member: Zero.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I can—

An Honourable Member: I could hear it.

An Honourable Member: Apologize.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If I can get order first.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If members wish to have a conversation, they can use the loge or have the conversation out in the hallway. I cannot continue on with the business of the House. I cannot hear. I ask the co-operation of all honourable members, please. The honourable Opposition House Leader was trying to rise on a point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Official Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Official Opposition House Leader): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I would expect a lot more from our Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), rather than having her yelling across the way liar, liar to the minister.

This member represents the riding around that part where these elk are being transported. They have some concerns and he is doing his job by bringing forward those concerns. This minister should not be shouting across the way that anybody is a liar. They are all honourable members.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader, I will have to take that under advisement because I could not hear what was going on in the House because of the noise and everything else. So I will have to take it under advisement and hopefully the mikes have picked up whatever conversation was taking place.

The honourable Member for Ste. Rose, on the point of order?

Mr. Glen Cummings (Ste. Rose): No. On a new question, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

*(14:20)

Mr. Speaker: The time for Question Period has expired. I was just going to announce it but I was dealing with a point of order.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry

Ms. Bonnie Korzeniowski (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a ceremony which I attended at the arena yesterday. Her Excellency Adrienne Clarkson, the Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada was in Winnipeg to present the Second Battalion Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry with a special unit commendation for their service in the former Yugoslavia.

She delivered an incredibly moving speech, as can be attested to by all those who attended and particularly those in uniform. Until

yesterday these soldiers had not been given any recognition for the courageous and professional execution of duty during the peacekeeping operations in the former Yugoslavia in 1993.

A quote from her speech states: The simple fact remains that very few of us as Canadians know what you did in 1993. Your actions were nothing less than heroic and yet your country did not recognize it at that time.

On September 15, 1993, the Canadian peacekeepers were ordered to create a buffer zone between the warring Croatian and Serbian forces. As the peacekeepers moved into position they came under fire from Croatian lines. The Canadians returned fire. The battle at the Medak Pocket lasted for 15 hours. The Canadian Forces held their ground, drove the Croat army back and eventually forced the surrender of the attacking Croat force.

The exemplary action of 2PPCLI caused the Croatian forces to cease their ongoing tactics of ethnic cleansing in the sector, without question saving many innocent lives. It was an honour to have been invited to attend the ceremony. I want to add my congratulations and thank the members of 2PPCLI for their exemplary service in the peacekeeping operations in 1993, led under the command of Col. T. J. Calvin.

As Her Excellency said, I hope that you will join all Canadians in celebrating what they did and what they represent and contributed to the pride we have in being Canadians. The execution of the parade was precise and a joy to watch, as was the performance of the Air Command Band. The pride on the faces of those receiving and giving the commendation was memorable. The pride in my heart was equal to theirs.

Trans Canada Trail

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, this past August, I along with more than 200 others had the distinct pleasure of attending a ceremony marking the completion of the Pinawa portion of the Trans Canada Trail. Pinawa's portion was the first leg of the trail west of Ontario to open. The trail extends from Seven Sisters Generating Station alongside the

Winnipeg River over a new suspension bridge in Pinawa and then on to the old dam at the old Pinawa Dam Provincial Park. The scenic 26 kilometre trail features coniferous boreal forest, waterfalls, rapids, granite ledges, the exposed rock of the Canadian Shield and rolling meadows complete with wildflowers.

The Pinawa Trails Association established a contract to receive assistance to fund trail improvements through the Manitoba Recreational Trails Association. Swamps were the biggest challenge facing the trail builders who had to create bridges and elevate some areas in order to allow for a dry passage by trail visitors.

The August ceremony provided an important opportunity to showcase not only the natural beauty of the community of Pinawa but also its tremendous potential for economic development. The Pinawa and Stanley trails are the first two sections in Manitoba to meet all the Trans Canada Trail standards. Fifteen other sections are currently under development. When the Trans Canada Trail is complete it will be 16 000 kilometres in length, making it the longest multi-active trail in the world, connecting three oceans.

I know that Pinawa and area residents are extremely proud to host a portion of the Trans Canada Trail. I would like to thank everyone who has been involved in seeing this important project through to fruition. Countless hours of effort went into making this trail a reality. A big thank you to all the volunteers.

Grace Hospital Auxiliary

Mr. Jim Rondeau (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring all members' attention to a very dedicated group of individuals within west Winnipeg. The Grace Hospital Auxiliary book sale committee ran their sale from September 23 to 28. During the sale, \$15,750 was raised to assist the hospital for equipment and other priority items. This project has come a long way from its humble beginnings in 1990 when the sale took place in one afternoon and raised a total of \$484.

I am particularly pleased with this project because it recycles books, raises money for a

worthwhile cause and promotes literacy, which is important in our entire society. As a footnote, the auxiliary also donated a number of books that were transported to northern communities to promote literacy after the sale. This will go a long way for other communities, too.

I would especially like to salute the core group who worked year-round to make this project possible: Phylis Ireland, the chair of the group, Ollie Bate, Vi Mills, Ann Falk, Betty Vivian, Doreen Bryant and Peggy Chapman.

I would also like to thank the dozens of other volunteers who sort, move, cashier, unpack, restock, throughout the sale. I had the pleasure of both helping out and purchasing books this year and was amazed at the dedication of this group of seven and the dozens of other people who do this project.

These efforts create a win-win situation in the community. Many thanks to those who work hard year after year to make our community a better place to live and improve it. Thank you again for making a very, very worthwhile project and a better community to live in.

Farm Family of the Year

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Charlie, Jean, Garth and Barb Elliott, who have been chosen as the West Souris River Conservation District 2002 Conservation Farm Family. The Elliots have been recognized for their efforts in promoting wise farm management and conservation practices. The Elliots' beef and crop operation is situated south of Pipestone beside Stony Creek. The farm has been in the Elliott name since 1885, and Garth is the fifth generation to farm the land. The Elliots have worked very hard to maintain their position.

Most of the pastures are rotationally grazed. To reduce soil erosion and maintain soil moisture, they have reduced tillage practices. They rotate forages with annual crops, and they plant fall-seeded crops such as rye and winter wheat.

Through the West Souris River Conservation District's forage and rotation program, Garth Elliott rotated a forage stand back to annual

cropland by spraying out the forages and zero tilling in the cereals. The Elliots have dealt with salinity problems by planting clover and spreading manure on affected areas. Part of the Elliots' farm is marshland that is a staging area for thousands of migrating ducks and geese. The waterfowl benefit from cover on the fields and pastures provided by the Elliots' farming practices of fall seeding, zero tillage and rotational grazing.

On behalf of all members of the Progressive Conservative caucus, I would like to congratulate Charlie, Jean, Garth and Barb Elliott on being named the West Souris River Conservation District 2002 Conservation Farm Family. Through your efforts you are helping to preserve your farmland and our environment for future generations.

Dr. Sybil Shack

Ms. Linda Asper (Riel): Mr. Speaker, Dr. Sybil Shack donated all her papers, including diaries, letters, manuscripts and photos to the University of Manitoba this fall. Her gift was indeed a coup for the university, as Doctor Shack's material was of great interest to us all as Manitobans, be it historians, educators, feminists or writers.

The Minister of Advanced Education and the Status of Women (Ms. McGifford) recently attended a luncheon in Doctor Shack's honour, Sybil being a long-time resident in the minister's constituency as well as her Grade 2 teacher whom she remembers fondly for poetry readings in class. Doctor Shack's papers will now be available as a public service to women's studies students, history students and many other Manitobans.

On the occasion of this gift, let us pay tribute to Dr. Sybil Shack for her contribution to our province. Born on April 1, 1911, in Winnipeg, she was awarded an Isbister entrance scholarship to the University of Manitoba at age 14, graduated with a BA in 1929 and became a teacher the next year after Normal School.

Her teaching career began in Foxwarren, Manitoba. Then she continued in Winnipeg, where she was principal of several high schools, retiring from Kelvin High in 1976. Doctor Shack

was active in the Manitoba Teachers' Society throughout her career, serving as president in 1960 to '61. She was a leading proponent for pay equity for female teachers and called for government-supported nurseries to aid working mothers.

Sybil has written several education textbooks, a book on women's roles in Canada and numerous articles.

* (14:30)

Awards such as an honorary doctorate from the University of Manitoba in 1969, the John M. Brown Award in 1976, the Order of Canada in 1984 and others illustrate the high esteem we hold for Doctor Shack. We thank Sybil Shack for her important gift to the University of Manitoba.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

House Business

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you canvass the House to determine if there is leave to rise today at five o'clock. Second of all, is there leave of the House to have private members' hours dealt with on Thursday morning, that is, two hours of private members' hours, and that will comprise the private members' hours for this pre-Christmas sitting?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to adjourn the House at five o'clock? *[Agreed]*

Also, is there agreement of the House to have the private members' hours on Thursday, December 12, between 10 a.m. and 12 a.m. instead of 5 p.m. to 6 p.m.? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, that is to confirm that that will comprise all the private members' hours for the pre-Christmas session.

Mr. Speaker: For your information, that will comprise all private members' hours, pre-Christmas session. *[Agreed]*

I am glad I was corrected because we could have had a long, long sitting. It is 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Third Day of Debate)

Mr. Speaker: Resumed debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) and the proposed motion of the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Murray) and the amendment thereto standing in the name of the honourable Member for Emerson (Mr. Jack Penner), who has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, the last time I rose to speak on this was on Friday. I had indicated that the farmers of this province were going to have to contribute \$80 million to an effort to balance this Finance Minister's Budget, \$40 million dollars in what the Keystone Agriculture Producers call the over-charge on agricultural land and education tax of \$40 million and the \$40 million that the Province has committed to under the EFP program and will not pay the farmers. That is \$80 million that the farmers will have to contribute to the balancing of this Budget that the Finance Minister is going to bring forward when we resume debate in this House on matters of interest to the people of Manitoba.

I would suggest that as well we have seen something today in the debate in Question Period which, in my view, demonstrates the irresponsibility of this Government in dealing with an industry that contributes better than a billion dollars of job opportunity, job creation, manufacturing and other primary source based industry in this province by putting in jeopardy the very health of that livestock herd that we are dependent on for thousands of jobs in this province of Manitoba.

I find it most interesting that our Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) sat in this House today and yelled across the room accusing my colleagues of being liars. Well, let me ask this House: Is it a lie that this Government is allowing elk to be taken out of the eastern part of Riding Mountain National Park by hunters and then transporting that meat and indeed the whole

animal to wherever they want to or choose to in this province? Is it factual that we now currently have at least two farms just east of the Riding Mountain National Park, in the Gilbert Plains area, under quarantine for suspected cases or verification of tuberculosis in those farm herds? One of them I believe is a hog farm.

I am told that there is another suspicious case close to the Steinbach area in a dairy herd, if that is true. Then there was another case that was identified close to the Carman area. If those are the cases, then what are we doing? We just assisted this Government, worked together with the Opposition just prior to adjourning the last session in passing legislation that would give the minister the authority to put in quarantine any area in this province that is suspected of tuberculosis. Yet today that very minister yelled across this House that we were being irresponsible in asking for her to institute and implement and put in place quarantines using her own legislation as a vehicle to ensure that no vectors or fomites would be moved out of a given quarantine area or areas adjacent to that quarantine area.

I find it absolutely, totally irresponsible that our Premier will sit there and laugh at us when we raise this issue, because we only need to look at the United Kingdom and what happened to the economy of Great Britain when they had a disease outbreak in their livestock herd. One can only imagine what would happen to the economy of this province if, in fact, the Americans and Ontario and Saskatchewan decided to close the border to all movement of animals or animal products, as was the case in the United Kingdom. I think those ministers and members of the back benches of this NDP government should think very long and very hard about the effect of what they are doing.

Then, to top it all off, to move a herd of captive elk out of that area into a totally different part of this province, and I understand that where they moved these elk is adjacent to a provincial park, the Sprucewoods Park, we know that there were two animals put down because of tuberculosis within that herd. I know the minister told us now that those elk were clean. Well, we hope so for the sake of the health of the animal herd in this province, we hope so. For the

sake of this Government and its dependence on a lively and robust economy, we hope so, because not only does our education system depend on a lively economy for funding, so does our health care system, so does our total economy and all the jobs within it.

We can only imagine what would happen if the borders of this province were closed to any movement of livestock goods or live animals outside of this province of Manitoba. I would suspect and I would hope that at least the Premier (Mr. Doer) would take action, would take action to ensure that the health of our livestock industry was maintained. It is imperative. It is absolutely imperative that this minister and the Premier of this province see to it that the disease in our livestock herd, especially our wildlife herd be eradicated once and for all.

* (14:40)

It is this Government's responsibility, and these people have a habit of pointing the finger at the federal government to cause the federal government to take responsibility for this. This is not the responsibility of the federal government. This is the responsibility of our Minister of Agriculture, our Minister of Conservation (Mr. Ashton) and our Premier of this province to ensure the health of our livestock industry and the livestock herd in this province of Manitoba.

Ms. Bonnie Korzeniowski, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

I had concluded my remarks on what the agricultural industry was contributing to balancing the Budget, and I want to talk just a wee bit about what this means and what this NDP government has attempted to do over the last three years. I know the former Minister of Education is sitting here listening to what I am about to say. He has constantly said amalgamating Manitoba's school divisions will save significant amounts of money and transfer those monies to the education of the child.

We all agree that the education of our children is of the utmost importance, and funding the education of our children is of the

utmost importance, and funding them equitably and ensuring that there will be adequate funding to educate those children on an equitable basis right across this province is imperative. However, amalgamating school divisions has nowhere proved that you can save any money by it.

I asked the school division that I represent and the two divisions that merged in their attempt to look at budgeting for next year, I asked them how much money are you going to save by merging, and the answer that I received was none. Part of the answer was it will probably cost us more than it did before, but we believe that we will be able to now provide additional programming to some parts of this division that did not have that programming before. How will it be done? At whose cost? I do not know, but I am going to ask the former minister if it was his intent to add additional monies above and beyond the \$50 that he paid to those school divisions to have them merge. One had to wonder whether there was a bit of bribery involved in that by promising them \$50 a child if they merged.

It is interesting to note that this Government has not committed any new dollars to increase an expanded educational program in my school division. I have not seen any documentation that would lead me to believe that this Government has any intention of providing further funding to ensure that all those children in that school division, that is now better than 100 miles long and about 25 to 30 miles wide are now governed by one school board. They are even having difficulty finding school board members because some of the people that have been asked to sit on the school board have told me that they do not want to drive 100 miles to a school board meeting. Think about that. Think about what we are forcing on the administration.

The administration is now talking about putting a two-way radio system in place, a communication system, that they can at least talk to each other. I think that is a demonstration of the ineptness of this Government in approaching change. I think it is absolutely—*[interjection]* The Minister of Energy and Mines says, well, there is voice over Internet. *[interjection]*. Now she talks about video conferencing. I think herein lies part of the problem, that these people

just do not understand that an education, the administration, has to be done on a child-by-child basis.

It is child by child that you deal with and that neighbours put their hands together and take care of the child, but these people think you can do it by Internet, by voice over Internet, by videos. I think therein lies part of the problem in the decision-making process of this Government. They do not understand the personal touch that is required in educating a child.

I want to spend a few minutes on health care in rural Manitoba. I want to talk for a few minutes about the intent of the previous administration to build a new health care facility in the town of Emerson. That was a commitment that it made; the budgeting was put in place. There was \$4.5 million that had been budgeted to build a new facility in Emerson. As soon as the NDPs were elected in this province, it became obvious that they would not build a new facility in Emerson. They, in fact, cancelled it almost immediately and said we will not build this facility. We will, however, spend better than a million dollars. Oh, they did not say a million dollars. They said we will spend just over \$200,000-and-some-odd in renovating the old facility, making sure that the fire hazards that were there would be taken care of and changing a nursing station that the nurses could better work together.

Well, it is my understanding now that the Government, as I had estimated, has spent better than a million dollars doing that job. If they would have added another \$2.5 million to \$3 million, they would have had a brand-new facility. What an absolute waste. What an absolute waste of money, because today the facility is functioning no better than it did before they spent a million dollars. That is indicative of how NDP administrations have governed this province, and that is indicative of how they have taken care of our health care system.

We heard during the last election campaign that this Premier (Mr. Doer) said he would fix health care. It would cost \$15 million, and he would do it within six months. He would get rid of all the people in the hallways. There would be no hallway medicine when he was the Premier,

\$15 million, six months. Now they have spent over \$500 million. They spent over \$500 million, and what do we have? We have more people in hallways today than we had three years ago. What an absolute degradation of the integrity of those that govern. What have they done to the people of Manitoba? They have indicated to them how impassionate they were in their approach to health care, absolutely not caring about rural Manitobans, rural seniors. The people in Emerson are now wondering where they are going to go next for their health care.

What do you say to an elderly lady who falls in the town of Emerson, who has to wait an hour by ambulance to get to the nearest facility? What do you say to her when the people in the city of Winnipeg here think it is too long to wait 10 minutes? What do you say to rural people? But no problem at all this NDP government has in shutting down a hospital facility.

*(14:50)

Then I heard the minister say that the revenues that they generated from American business in our health care system offset the amount we were spending when we sent people for MRIs to Grand Forks and other parts of the country. What did they say about health care and Grand Forks before they were elected to government? What did the NDP government say? Just remember what they were yelling and screaming. They said: We will shut down the American system. We will close Grafton and Grand Forks. We will close it. We will close this corridor of health care delivery to the United States.

What have they done now? What have they done? They are sending people day after day after day for MRIs and scans to the United States, and they are offsetting it by income generated from the United States. That is what the minister said here the other day. How interesting. How absolutely obscene is the approach, the misleading approach that this NDP government has used and how they have demonstrated how absolutely inept they are in solving the problems in the health care system.

Now they want to tell you that you are going to save a huge amount of money by merging

school divisions. We know that that is not going to happen. That has not happened because our school divisions that have merged are now finding out how much more money it will cost to operate a much, much larger division.

I want to spend a few minutes on an issue that was raised in this House not too long ago. It dealt with the homeowners contributing to the tax to education. I want to give you just an indication, Madam Chair, about what it truly costs, what the true costs are. There was a comment made here that you had reduced the ESL portioning by one percentage point. I think it is 1.3 percentage points. Well, do you know how much the assessment has risen on homes and farmland and farm buildings in rural Manitoba? Do you know how much the assessment has risen?

This Government is making an obscene amount of money because of the assessment increases. Then they reduce the portioning on farmland by three points, by three points. Then they increase the ESL by 1.3 points. Yet, the actual money that this NDP government raises is significantly higher than it was the year before.

Let us be honest and tell the people how much more money is being raised by local school divisions through local taxation to help offset the provincial portion in education. I know that in our area, the education support levy and the special levy costs local—[interjection] Yes, I know you were. You should have asked them. The Minister of Industry and Trade (Ms. Mihychuk) says I was in Altona last week, and I said she should have asked them what it cost them to educate their children. She would have found that better than 50 percent of the tax costs in rural Manitoba, at least in my constituency, are attributed to education. Better than 50 percent of your total tax bill, a farmer's tax bill is attributed to education. Yet, this Government puts out a news release or a newspaper article, and they get one of their backbenchers to sign it, which says they pay 73 percent of the cost.

How absolutely obscene is that, when the FRAME Report that the Minister of Education (Mr. Lemieux) published on page 40 indicates that there has been a decline in funding from the Province in total every single year that they have

been in government. Every single year you have had a decline in the total amount of revenues that you put into education. Look on page 40. Your own documents, I hope, do not lie. The FRAME Report clearly indicates that 57.5 percent of the cost of education is now borne by the total revenue-generating ability of the Province of Manitoba. The rest, the 42.5 percent, is raised by local revenues, local tax initiatives that people pay on their property taxes. Do not tell anybody in this province that it is 73 percent of the cost that you pick up, because that is not correct, and you know it.

I believe that there are a number of initiatives that we need to point out time and time again of how this Government is misleading the people of Manitoba. We have talked about balanced budget legislation—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Korzeniowski): Order. The member's time has expired.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Madam Acting Speaker, I would like to welcome the new pages to the House. I hope that you enjoy your service here. We certainly appreciate your services. I would also like to welcome the new legislative internship students who do such valuable work for both the NDP caucus and the Conservative caucus. For the last three years I have enjoyed being on the committee that interviews and chooses the students. I am going to miss that function.

I would also like to comment on the people who are not going to run in the next election: the Member for Morris (Mr. Pitura), who is one of the people that we all like and respect here; the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), who used to drive me to distraction when I was his critic; the Member for Inkster (Ms. Barrett), whom we are particularly going to miss, one of the people in our caucus whom I am fond of. I do not want to embarrass her too much, but we go back a long way, to the 1988 election, when she was my campaign manager. We were both elected as part of the class of 1990, so we have spent 12 long years here together, enjoyable years. I wish her well in her retirement and hope that she enjoys especially spending more time in Victoria with her grandchild.

The other member who is not returning is known as the dean of the Legislature, the Member for Interlake—I am sorry, the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns). I apologize to my colleague. I would not want to make that mistake, and I did, but the Member for Lakeside, I am sure, will hear lots of speeches by and about him. In fact, I represented my caucus at a tribute to the Member for Lakeside some time ago and got a lot of commendation from the Conservative caucus for sort of going into the lions' den and representing my party at a Tory fundraising event. It was a very interesting experience.

You will remember that. The tribute from the Member for Lakeside. Someone had to do it, and I was the chair of the caucus, so I did my duty. *[interjection]* Madam Acting Speaker, this debate is deteriorating into a theological discussion.

* (15:00)

I would like to address some remarks to the amendment to the Speech from the Throne, beginning with paragraph (a), which says that the Government has not fulfilled our Throne Speech promises of November 13, 2001, beginning with health care. On the contrary, we believe that we have fulfilled many promises, and we are working hard on many others. There are a lot of good things that our Government has done, beginning with reducing the waiting list for cancer care by half.

We have doubled the number of surgeries at the Pan Am Clinic, which we brought into the public system. We know that this has had many benefits. For example, we have not only doubled the number of procedures, but we have reduced the cost for things like cataract surgery from \$1,000 to \$700. There is a great deal of evidence around about the differences between services delivered in the public sector and services delivered in the for-profit private sector.

For example, in Alberta, the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) might be interested to know that the Consumers' Association of Alberta did a study comparing clinics for eye surgery in Calgary, Edmonton and, I believe it was, Lethbridge. It was a very interesting study because one of them was an entirely public

system. One was entirely private, and one was a combination of public and private services. Guess what? The waiting lists were the longest in the private system, and they were the shortest in the public system. *[interjection]*

Well, I do not remember the reason why, but I would surmise that the reason is that you have a finite number of doctors, and when the doctors get paid higher in the private clinic, they spend more time in the private clinic and less time in the public clinic, and then the waiting lists go up in the public system, whereas, if they are all working in the same system, it is more efficient and less costly for taxpayers. I will find the study from the Consumers' Association of Canada and share it with members opposite. I think they should read these evidence-based studies rather than going on statistics—*[interjection]* I told you why—rather than going on what they think is public opinion and promising to increase the private sector when the evidence goes against it. In fact, read the Romanow report. I think you will find the same thing. I think it is a very good report. I am going to refer to it later.

Let me find my notes here about the Romanow report. The Romanow report: Manitoba has led the way in priority areas identified by Romanow, for example, home care and Pharmacare. It would be a great advantage to Manitoba if the federal government was to cost-share these programs and send us money to deliver excellent programs and services that are probably far ahead of many other provinces in Canada. Also, training health care professionals to deal with staff shortages, focussing on prevention and improving access through innovation like the Pan Am Clinic.

We believe it is time for the federal government to renew the health care funding partnership. As we know, when the federal government abolished cost-sharing and brought in the Canada Health and Social Transfer, not only did they cut the amount of money transferred for social programs like social assistance and daycare, they cut funding for post-secondary education, and they reduced funding for health care.

We know that at one time health care was cost-shared on a 50-50 basis with provinces. Now it is down to about 14 cents on the dollar. That is all Manitoba gets for health care, 14 cents on the dollar. What the premiers are talking about in trying to persuade the federal government, hopefully with success, is to increase that level of funding to about 25 cents on the dollar, and that would represent millions of dollars to Manitoba.

Manitoba continues to work in co-operation with other provinces to deliver better health care by establishing regional sites of excellence such as the gamma knife. We are also working together on dealing with rising drug costs. The federal government must do better than paying 14 cents of every health care dollar. The health care system will not be sustainable without a full federal partner.

Manitoba has been singled out by medical and government leaders for its commitment to accountability. The national association of radiologists as well as the federal government have recognized our transparency and accountability on the federal equipment fund. We will continue to be accountable for health spending.

Mr. Romanow spent more than a year listening to health care experts as well as Canadians concerned about the system. He found no evidence that more for-profit care is the answer.

Well, the Member for Morris (Mr. Pitura) wants to talk about the \$15 million that it cost Romanow. I would remind him and remind the Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) that they were part of a provincial government, a Tory government in Manitoba who paid Connie Curran \$4 million as a consultant, \$4 million, which in U.S. dollars is probably about \$7 million, half the costs of the Romanow, a national Royal commission which cost \$15 million. They spent almost half that amount on Connie Curran giving them advice on cutting a thousand nurses. *[interjection]* Well, I am talking about the Canadian dollar. That was \$4 million in U.S. How much is that in Canadian funds? Probably about \$7 million to advise the provincial government to lay off a thousand nurses, advice they accepted and then, of course, they regretted.

Point of Order

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Korzeniowski): On a point of order?

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): Yes, on a point of order. This member is talking about a thousand nurses that were fired. I would like to remind him that the Doer government two years ago fired five hundred nurses at Boundary Trails. I have a letter of dismissal right here.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Korzeniowski): Order. I am sorry. It was my fault. I did not properly recognize you. Your mike's not on. The Member for Pembina, on a point of order. Would you please put it back on the record?

Mr. Dyck: I would want to draw to the attention of the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) that he was talking about the thousand nurses that had been fired by the previous administration. If that, in fact, is accurate, then the Doer government two years ago fired five hundred nurses at Boundary Trails. I have a letter on hand here which determined, in fact stated very clearly that they had been fired. So I do not think that he should be talking about something that the previous administration did when, in fact, this Government, the one that he is a part of, did very much the same thing.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Korzeniowski): On the point of order, this is not a point of order. This is a dispute of facts. I would like to remind all members that a point of order is not to be used for debate on facts.

* * *

Mr. Martindale: Well, that was an interesting intervention. I suspect that what the member is really talking about is the fact that the staff were laid off in Morden and Winkler hospitals because they built a new Boundary Trails Hospital and they were probably all rehired at Boundary Trails, but I digress.

Romanow spent more than a year listening to Canadians on health care, listening to experts as well as ordinary people, and he found no evidence that more for-profit care is the answer. We have known this and acted based on the

evidence of Manitobans and acted on the evidence. Manitobans value medicare, but they also want the system to improve. It is time to move past this debate and talk about real solutions, primary care reform, stable federal funding and a stronger commitment to prevention.

Well, that is not all. I want to go back to some of the things that we have done to improve health care in Manitoba: 500 additional training spaces for technicians, therapists, health care aides, nurses and doctors; almost three times as many nurses to graduate this year as in 1999, and 90 percent of them are staying to work in Manitoba.

So let us compare what happened under the Tory administration, what is happening under our administration.

Under their administration, nurses were laid off. Under our administration, we brought back the RN program so that we can train more nurses and hire more nurses. There are more people studying to be LPNs, registered nurses, and Bachelor of Nursing graduates. We are graduating more and we are replenishing the staffing of hospitals and other health care facilities, and they are staying in Manitoba. It is making a difference and it is going to continue to make a big difference. We have added 15 new medical school places. The number of doctors in Manitoba has grown every year since the NDP took office, a reversal of the flight of doctors in the 1990s. Now, 2122 licensed doctors are in the province, up from 2037 in 1999. Over 50 health care facilities have been expanded and modernized. We have a Telehealth system which allows doctors and patients in northern and rural Manitoba to link with clinical specialists in Winnipeg through live video and audio feed. Waiting times for cancer treatment, as I said, have been cut in half from 10 weeks to 5 weeks.

We have streamlined access to home care and long-term care, plus focussed management of emergency patients help make Manitoba a model for dealing with hallway medicine; better use of rural and northern hospitals by moving dental surgeries for northern children to Thompson and 350 general and orthopedic surgeries to Steinbach and Ste. Anne; surgeries

at not-for-profit Pan Am Clinic doubling as part of the effort to free hospital space for more complex procedures; more diagnostic tests, expanded hours of operation of diagnostic units, new and replacement diagnostic equipment such as MRIs and CT scanners.

* (15:10)

One of these new pieces of equipment is going to Brandon. For the first time ever, we are going to have one of these machines outside of Winnipeg. What a novel idea. It is going to serve all of southwest Manitoba. *[interjection]* Well, I cannot remember whether it is an MRI or a CT scanner, but one of them is going to be in Brandon, and it is going to be the first time outside of Winnipeg.

New preventative initiatives: cervical cancer screening, diabetes and stroke programs, childhood injury, well-water testing and flu vaccinations.

Here is an item that our rural members who are heckling me would be very interested in. That is 80 new ambulances funded throughout the province, 80 new ambulances, including in Selkirk, I hear.

St. Boniface and Health Sciences Centre extricated from Tories frozen food fiasco; legislative loopholes closed to prevent two-tier medicine from making inroads in Manitoba; physician profiles to be made available to the public. Those are some of our initiatives.

Here is what other people have been saying about us. Here is a private sector company, PricewaterhouseCoopers, their External Review: Emergency Department Utilization. PricewaterhouseCoopers concludes, quote: "Significant resources at a senior level have been devoted to managing Emergency Department overcrowding and this has resulted in great progress." The review found that WRHA has developed a comprehensive range of community-based programs to provide the population with alternatives to visiting the Emergency Department. This includes being at the forefront in delivering flu vaccines to vulnerable populations.

Even I had a flu vaccination this year. I would recommend it to everybody since I go to

personal care homes and hospitals to visit patients. I think it is probably something all of us should do. I got it at a public clinic. I think vaccinations are a good thing, and probably it is saving money for the taxpayers. I would not want to be responsible for bringing flu into an institution, so I got vaccinated.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers concludes: WRHA has given a high priority to eliminating Emergency Department overcrowding. The WRHA has capitalized on opportunities that arose from its creation and its responsibility for providing a broad range of health services in the city and has used the regional structure to develop a system-wide approach to Emergency Department overcrowding. This was facilitated by our merger of WHA and WLTCa which allowed for better integration of community and hospital services.

The report noted that in many areas related to emergency room overcrowding, the WRHA surpasses practices found elsewhere in the country. In some areas, the range of programs developed is more comprehensive than what is available elsewhere.

A Canadian Press story on the report by a federal agency stated: Provincial and territorial governments more than Ottawa have been shouldering the burden of a dramatic rise in health care costs, Statistics Canada said. Higher social spending by lower levels of government comes at the same time the federal government has been reducing its expenditures, the agency said. That has added fuel to arguments that Ottawa has been downloading responsibilities but not the cash or tax room needed to pay for those programs. Well, we certainly hope that changes when the Romanow report is adopted.

There is also data from the OECD. The Tories want us to adopt the French health care system. This latest OECD report found that over the past decade, 1990 to 2000, France's health care costs as a percentage of GDP is at a rate 10 times higher than that of Canada, 10.4 percent versus 1.1 percent. France also spends more on its health system as a percentage of GDP than Canada: 9.5 percent versus 9.1 percent.

The Manitoba Centre for Health Policy: Projecting Hospital Bed Needs for 2020. The

report concluded that Manitoba has enough hospital beds to meet demand projected up to 2020. The Tory Health critic, the Member for Tuxedo I think it is, saw the report as proof that her party did nothing wrong—[interjection] The Member for—no, the former critic, I am sorry, the former critic, the Member for Charleswood saw the report as proof that her party did nothing wrong when it permanently closed 1400 beds in the 1990s, *Canadian Press*, June 26, 2002.

On May 23, 2001, in Estimates, the former Health critic, described the Tory bed closures of the 1990s as a good thing. Imagine saying that closing beds was a good thing. On May 28, 2001, she called for the de-bedding of our health care system.

The WRHA is currently conducting an external review to develop strategies for achieving more efficient bed usage in Winnipeg hospitals. The Canadian Institute for Health Information, in a study called Hospital Morbidity Database 2002-2001: Manitoba's average length of hospital stay, 9.9 days, is the longest in Canada. Shorter lengths of stay are considered to be an indicator of more efficient use of hospital space. In 2000-2001, our average length of stay improved by 3.3 percent, the best improvement in Canada. In 2000-2001, Manitoba was one of only two provinces that were able to improve its average length of stay. The report identifies technological advances and more use of outpatient day surgery as ways to improve bed usage.

Manitoba is aggressively moving in these areas by doubling day surgeries in the Pan Am Clinic. Just this week, the *Toronto Star*, and this was going back a number of months, I think, June 2002. Yes, June 2002. The *Toronto Star* applauded Manitoba for its acquisition of the clinic and said it should be an example for the Ontario government, investing \$73 million in new and replacement medical equipment since taking office, and that has increased since then, ensuring that hospital upgrade projects incorporate facilities for better integration and expansion of community outpatient care options.

The recently announced redevelopment, well, now it is some months ago, of the Gimli Hospital, including added space for community

service programs such as the adult day program, mental health services, family services, and seniors resource services.

The Brandon Hospital redevelopment includes significantly expanded space for day surgery and other out-patient services. I am sure that the members for Brandon are applauding this initiative on behalf of our Government. In fact, as I recall, the previous government announced a new hospital for Brandon five times and never let the tenders, never let the contract, did not do anything about it. Our Government has not only announced it, but we are going to do it. I am sure that all residents of Brandon and the people in the surrounding areas are very pleased with our initiative, one of many initiatives to help the community of Brandon.

Another very successful one is Neighbourhoods Alive! We are renovating apartment blocks and buildings and getting people living in downtown Brandon. It has been very popular, and it has been supported by the city of Brandon and by community groups. It has been a very co-operative effort there.

The Romanow Commission. Canadians' thoughts on their health care system. Preserving the Canadian model through innovation. Eighty-eight percent of Canadians support the current Canadian model for health care. A strong national system of publicly funded health care. Now we have 88 percent of Canadians say they support a non-profit public health care system. What does the Official Opposition say? They say more private health care. I think they are on the wrong side of this issue. I think they want to help their friends in the private sector to get what they see as a piece of the pie, to line their pockets. They do not really care about providing better health care services for Manitobans or Canadians, and they are on the wrong side of public opinion.

Eighty-six percent support for universality. In other words, the Government should pay for all the people. Sixty-four percent believe privatization will erode the health care system. Sixty-seven percent believe that, once private health care services start to become widely available, it will not be long before quality public health care services are hard to find.

The Canadian Institute for Health Information, in a publication, Supply and Distribution of Registered Nurses in Canada 2001, last year saw the largest increase in the number of nurses in Manitoba since 1997. Manitoba is one of only five provinces that saw the number of nurses rise between 2000 and 2001. There are 200 more nurses working in Manitoba in 2001 compared to 2000. I really should update this. Hopefully, if we increased by 200 in that year, we increase by more than 200 in this year. *[interjection]* We increased by more than 200 in this year; 400, I am told. Thank you.

Manitoba has the highest number of RNs since 1997. This is the highest ratio in western Canada. Manitoba has the highest percentage of nurses in permanent, not casual, positions in Canada.

The Canadian Institute of Health Information, Canada's Health Care Providers. The report notes that Manitoba is one of only five provinces in which nursing students can choose a diploma program. In terms of the number of health care professionals per capita, the report notes that Manitoba ranks in the top half of all provinces in 12 of 18 health care professions. Manitoba is first in midwives, first in occupational therapists, second in RPNs, second in lab technologists, third in radiation technologists, fourth in specialists, fourth in total physicians. The report identifies fast tracking, the licensure of foreign medical graduates as a strategy for recruiting more doctors. Manitoba recently created the first such program in North America.

* (15:20)

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

I think this is one of the best things that we as a government have done. We have a lot of professionals from other countries who have immigrated to Manitoba, and they cannot practise here because of, in the case of doctors, not being able to get an internship. Many of these people are very well qualified and they are working in positions that do not recognize their qualifications.

It can be very, very difficult. I know that I befriended an immigrant from Czechoslovakia

who was a dentist. She wanted to practise as a dentist in Manitoba. She had to learn from the College of Dentistry that she would have had to go to Ottawa to take exams, that it would have cost \$15,000 in fees, and she would have had to provide her own patients. Guess what happened to this individual. She went back to the Czech Republic. Sometimes we even lose good immigrants from Manitoba because they cannot practise in their chosen profession here.

We are opening up more spots to these people. I believe that they are going to stay in Manitoba and be excellent professionals and provide much needed services. Many of them are willing to go to rural and northern Manitoba, which is a benefit to us as well.

Manitoba has the most specialists per 100 000 people of any western province, more than Alberta, more than B.C. or Saskatchewan. In terms of the number of specialists per capita, Winnipeg ranks 8th among the 63 health regions with populations over 100 000. In terms of the number of general and family practitioners per capita, Winnipeg ranks 18th among 63 health regions with populations over 100 000. In terms of per capita spending on remuneration for health care professionals, Manitoba ranks in the middle of the pack among the provinces, 4th on physicians and 5th on other health care professionals.

We have some promises from the Official Opposition about things that they would do. Actually, that is another section of their amendment. Section C says that they have not seen enough commitment for further provincial income tax reductions. We know that in the next election the Conservative Party—it is interesting they do not really want to call themselves the Conservative Party anymore. In fact, Progressive Conservative has kind of disappeared from their lexicon. I recently saw an ad, I think it was in the *MSOS Journal*, where they were advertising that they were the PC caucus. They do not want to even admit that they are a party. We are the New Democratic Party. We are proud of the fact that we are a political party, but they are now the PC caucus in their advertisements. They are no longer the Conservative Party. They are no longer the Progressive Conservative Party. They

are no longer a party. They are only a PC caucus. Rather interesting.

Point of Order

Mr. Glen Cummings (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to the speaker that he review the ads that refer to the NDP caucus and he might see some similarity.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable Member for Ste. Rose, he does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts. I would like to remind all honourable members, before the Speaker recognizes a member for any business of the House, if you want to continue speaking, please just stay standing. Otherwise, if you sit, I recognize it as concluding your speech. Just friendly advice to all members of the House.

* * *

Mr. Martindale: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the member's point of order. I will have to check my facts. So we have an opposition party that thinks, well, I believe in the next election they are probably going to run on huge tax breaks, but this is a party that wants their cake and they want to eat it too. They want to reduce taxes probably by hundreds of millions of dollars. Who knows? The last election they said \$500 million.

Everyone here remembers their billion-dollar promise. At the same time, they put out an alternative Speech from the Throne with hundreds of millions of dollars in increased spending. We have been adding it up. So far, we are at \$400 million and we are not finished yet. I am sure it is going to go over \$500 million. Who knows? Maybe it will be closer to \$1 billion of new spending if they are elected government. What they are not telling Manitobans, of course, is what they would cut in order to pay for either their tax cuts or their increased spending or both. So there is a kind of smoke and mirrors going on over there. Cut taxes, increase spending, but cut programs? Well, probably nary a word in the election about what programs they would cut.

They listed no cost estimates of any of their promises in their alternative Speech from the

Throne. They did say they would completely tear apart the tax system, but we have made some estimates. Here are some of them. Some of them are kind of hard to put a figure on.

Increasing the contracting out of surgical procedures to private clinics, that is going to have an increased cost; restore full government coverage of chiropractic services, estimated cost \$2 million; creation of an office of mental health advocate to report to the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) on the quality of mental health services, estimated cost \$567,000 based on the budget of the Children's Advocate office; establishment of an on-line waiting list registry, estimated cost \$1 million; health promotion and disease prevention strategies, estimated cost, well, we do not know, they did not tell us; safe house for child prostitutes, estimated cost approximately \$1 million; contracting with private law firms to prosecute criminal cases and reduce court backlog, estimated cost \$2 million.

The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) says these are all very modest costs, but it is the total that concerns us. We are already up to \$400 million and counting.

Education: reintroduction of standardized tests for Grades 6 and 9 as well as expanding testing to other subjects, estimated cost \$20 million; full implementation of the Nichol's report, estimated cost \$10 million; creation of a professional development fund for teachers to access additional training, estimated cost \$5 million.

What about post-secondary education and training? Enhance loans to rural and northern students, estimated cost \$500,000.

Here is a big one. Listen to this. Funding Assiniboine Community College expansion to the former BMHC site, estimated cost \$28 million; new graduate tax credit, estimated cost \$15 million, expand apprenticeship and training at an estimated \$1.5 million; tax credit for stay-at-home parents equal to the value of tax breaks for parents who put their kids in day care, estimated cost \$25 million; remove the PST from diapers and incontinence products, estimated cost \$1.5 million.

Significant reduction in property taxes, estimated cost, this is the highest one yet. Listen to this: \$100 million for a significant reduction in property taxes based on the balance of ESL commitment, but obviously the cost would go up if their promise is more specific or significant than our commitment on ESL.

Remove the PST from building materials used in farm operations, greenhouses and vegetable and raw fruit storage facilities, estimated cost \$3 million; under transportation and infrastructure, improve Winnipeg's road system, estimated cost at least \$106 million based on the City of Winnipeg's budget priorities; twin the Trans-Canada Highway from Virden to the Saskatchewan border, estimated cost \$40 million; modernize Winnipeg's water treatment system; estimated cost North End plant \$25 million; combined sewer issues \$271 million; nutrient control of Red River to clean up waste discharge from city.

Increase the number of government departments to reinstate the department of rural development. Here we are talking about a promise that they have been making for several years, estimated cost at least \$250,000 for ministerial and deputy minister office plus support. Well, we combined two departments. One only had about 15 staff. We probably saved a quarter of a million dollars when we combined two departments into rural development.

More money for roads, sewers and water treatment facilities, estimated cost, \$75 million; money for roads, sewers and water treatment facilities, estimated cost, \$75 million.

Mr. Speaker, Kyoto: Full sector-by-sector analysis on Kyoto implementation, estimated cost, \$100,000; total cost—oh, I was wrong. I said \$400 million. Now it is up to \$405 million. This does not include the cost of the Winnipeg water treatment system promised, total cost of \$567 million cost-shared over a number of years.

Well, that is pretty interesting. I would be quite happy to predict that in the next election, we will hear about promises that cost money and we will hear about tax cuts, but nothing about where they are going to find the money or what

programs that our Government introduced they are going to cut or eliminate, probably eliminate.

* (15:30)

I would be quite concerned if you cut programs that helped the inner city like Neighbourhoods Alive! I was here before when you cut programs, and there will be nothing left if your Government has to cut programs to pay for your promises.

Well, let us look at some other things. I cannot believe that the Opposition would say that we have failed to adequately promote rural economic diversification when we are talking about ethanol production. All the plants would go into rural Manitoba. I am very surprised at this Opposition, and I am disappointed that you would be opposed to Kyoto and would want to study it rather than saying, as a majority of Canadians do, that we should sign on to the accord. In fact, 79 percent of Canadians are in favour of it. The Member for Springfield (Mr. Schuler) in his debate, said it is a trivial debate. I cannot believe that someone would say that about something as important as preserving the environment and the Kyoto accord.

I think they should do a little research. I think they would find it quite interesting. We know, for example, that it is going to have an adverse effect on certain groups in Canadian society, for example indigenous people, because climate change is going to take place at a faster rate in northern Canada and will have a much greater impact on their lifestyle than on anyone else.

Another example is Prince Edward Island. There could be flooding in Prince Edward Island. We are told that St. John's, New Brunswick could have flooding. We are told that the climate change in Manitoba and on the prairies could result in the end of the boreal forest. I think that is kind of like the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik) saying I do not care about my constituents. I do not care about their jobs in Pine Falls. So what if the boreal forest disappears and there are no forestry jobs in 50 years, or in The Pas, or anywhere else where there are forestry jobs in Manitoba?

Why do you not just say that you are going to support it instead of saying that you want to study it? The right thing to do is to say there is a much bigger cost to not supporting it, and we cannot take the chance. *[interjection]* I am not talking about catastrophic effects. I am talking about the predicted effects in Manitoba and in Canada by organizations such as the International Institute for Sustainable Development right here in Winnipeg. We are talking about predicted results affecting Canada, and I have not used the word "catastrophic." But, you know, if you care about forestry jobs in your constituency, I think you should be in favour of it regardless of what your party is saying.

We know that the glaciers are melting very quickly in Alberta. I understand that about 20 percent of the water that comes to Manitoba that is used by Manitoba Hydro comes from out of province. It comes from Alberta and Saskatchewan. *[interjection]* Well, the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) wants to talk about the end of the last Ice Age and that is fine. He can talk about the end of the last Ice Age. Some people think he was there. Perhaps he should look at the cycle of ice ages. *[interjection]* Well, SUVs are part of the problem, but we will not go there.

There are other things that the members should be aware of. I think they should look at the science behind global warming and learn that CO₂ stays in the atmosphere for a hundred years. We are talking about chemical phenomena that we cannot change overnight.

I think members should look at the research and not just side with one narrow part of the business community that is tied to the oil and gas industry who might be their friends and former donors to their political party which, of course, I do not know why they would worry about that now because businesses and corporations and unions cannot donate to political parties in Manitoba anymore.

I would like to talk more about Kyoto because it is such an important issue. I would like to talk briefly about the cost of Kyoto and the cost of doing nothing, and then sit down.

An Honourable Member: In that order?

Mr. Martindale: Well, it will probably take my final six minutes to do this anyway.

We know that the cost, and this has been analyzed by the federal government, of Kyoto would amount to around a 1% reduction in growth rate for provinces. In other words, the Canadian economy, as a whole, will continue to grow 30 percent instead of 31 percent by 2012, over the next decade. Projections of modest growth reduction do not include the potential economic opportunities or the costs of doing nothing.

Let us look at the cost of doing nothing. This can be measured simply by looking at the cost of drought in central Canada last year, which cost \$5 billion in agricultural losses, and the provinces are paying out more in compensation again this year. Then there is the cost of the drought in western Canada, including parts of western Manitoba. I think this is something that rural members, who are heckling me about Kyoto, should be concerned about. It is their constituents we are talking about. They know what happened in Alberta. They know what happened in Saskatchewan. I was in Saskatchewan in August. I have never seen such short crops or so many grasshoppers. They had drought. They had grasshoppers, and then they had frogs. They had a disastrous year in Saskatchewan and parts of Alberta. There was drought in Alberta with a Tory government.

I think rural members, who pride themselves on being in touch with their rural constituents, should look at the cost of drought, which is one of the costs of doing nothing, in addition to what could happen to the boreal forest, and they should take the Kyoto accord much more seriously. They should look at the evidence. They should look at the cost of doing nothing and sign on, but, instead, they are on the wrong side of this issue. The majority of Canadians are on the right side. The majority of scientists agree that this a problem that we have to do something about on an urgent basis.

In eastern Canada, there have been some of the worst smog seasons on record. It is estimated that the implementation of Kyoto will reduce air pollution to the extent that it could save Ontario \$1 billion in related costs. We are looking at

health effects of smog as a result of global warming and the savings that could come if provinces like Ontario reduced the level of smog.

Here is an opportunity for Manitoba. If we get a national power grid or if we get a power grid connecting Manitoba and Ontario, we could be creating jobs in Manitoba. We could be exporting more Hydro to places like Ontario and helping them to reduce their levels of CO₂.

I regret that I do not have time to address all of the clauses of the Tory amendments, especially the last one, talking about the outflow of Manitobans to other provinces. We know we have made big improvements here. We have reduced the number of young people leaving Manitoba by 50 percent. Why is that? I think the Member for Tuxedo should look at the statistics coming from the Manitoba Labour Board. You do not have to believe me. Look at the labour bureau statistics. Why is that? Well, it is probably because we have increased enrolment in community colleges. We have increased enrolment in universities and post-secondary institutions in general by 19 percent. Why is that? Well, it is probably because we froze tuition and kept the freeze in place for two years, so we have made education more affordable. Not only are young people continuing with their post-secondary education, they are finding it more affordable, and when they graduate, far more of them are staying in Manitoba than left in the past because our economy is growing. We are creating more jobs, and, I believe we have kept all five of our commitments, but in that one in particular, we have restored hope to young people.

Mr. Cummings: I must admit that I am a little bit more motivated after having listened to the previous speaker because he was throwing out some interesting comments near the end of his speech, talking about cronyism, although I do not think that was the word, but he was accusing us of being concerned in terms of health care and whether or not maybe we had some corporate friends who supported the party who would, in turn, benefit from that type of opportunity being presented in this province.

Who do they think are the biggest advocates right now of the Romanow report? The very

people who expect to take money from the additional \$15 billion that will be established out there. Do they not think the doctors get paid? Do they not think the nursing profession gets paid? Do they not think the drug companies get paid? I mean, they cannot think themselves out of a wet paper bag if they want to make that kind of an analysis.

Mr. Speaker, from November 27, I see a comment here about the cost of trustees. This is another simple example of where dollars and ideas were thrown out by the then-Minister of Education about the savings that would come from amalgamation, about, you know, the only reason for change was educational and had nothing to do with the number of trustees, nothing to do with the cost of trustees, but, oh, by the way, we will have less trustees, the implication being it will cost less. Well, the first meeting, the first reading of a by-law to increase the nine trustees' basic indemnities to \$14,000 from around \$10,000, where did that happen? I think the then-Minister of Education could probably fill in the blanks. It seems to me that was out in the River East area, somewhere near there, eh? Yes. Well, it seems to me that that is probably something that is going to be repeated in a number of areas.

*(15:40)

At the same time, instead of having two superintendents, now we have a superintendent and an assistant superintendent. We have a generational change that needs to occur in these amalgamated school divisions, and there are a number of other examples out there where in terms of being able to downsize, for sure in the first year of their amalgamated condition, probably their staff costs are going to rise. I mean, that is a foregone conclusion. The real acid test, Mr. Speaker, will come if they three years hence can show some savings.

Given the history of how these things work, unless they are made for very basic management reasons where there is a supportable and obvious saving, the local representation is usually some of the most effective. I refer to my friends in the Association of Municipalities. The rural municipalities, some of them have a ratio of councillor to voters that is extremely low. On the surface, you could look at it and say, boy, maybe

we should be looking at amalgamating some of the R.M.s. Well, not even this Government would be foolish enough to go down that road because they already know that in terms of cost of service to the public, they are some of the cheapest administrative bodies in this province, and that, certainly, includes the Province itself and school boards.

I have a plethora of information here that talks about the shortfalls and/or the misdemeanours of the current government, but I do not intend to spend my entire speech on that, Mr. Speaker. After having heard the previous speaker, I am looking at a clipping out of the *Winnipeg Free Press* on November 27, another good day the 27th, I guess, the very end of the article about discussions between the Manitoba chiefs about casino operations and whether or not there is going to be appropriate management in place, appropriate provincial control.

Right at the end of the article by Dan Lett, without naming names, he refers to the operational review that was sparked by a controversy at Dakota Tipi, which has raised questions about the lack of information on how money from on-reserve gaming events is spent. The Province suspended all gaming pending an investigation into allegations that charitable gaming revenues have been misused.

Well, I would suggest to the member who spoke just ahead of me that he talk to his Premier (Mr. Doer), and, perhaps, they can do something about that, so that we do not have an ongoing saga of disagreement about that and who should be involved in helping manage these casinos.

Mr. Speaker, the last session of this House brought me to a conclusion that is a very uncomfortable one for one who plans on spending the rest of his working years working in this province and, hopefully, contributing to the management of this province as well. When I see a government that is willing to do off-the-balance-sheet accounting, I start to become extremely concerned about whether or not there is a lot more to the financing problems of this province than the public has been led to understand.

I look at a number of issues which the Government has not acknowledged. Number one, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) has not put out a press release, nor has any other ministry. Situations like first starting with the debate about whether or not should Manitoba be required to pay back an overspending by the government in Ottawa in transfer of payments for health care to this province, this Government seemed to just roll over and play dead. I still cannot understand why they did not take a more determined position about whether or not Manitoba really owed Ottawa any money.

The fact is that Ottawa carved \$600 million out of health transfers to this province during the nineties. Now they are saying that even at that, they transferred too much during those years. What was the point? Why would this Government play dead? How is it that they were not so incensed that they would not have told Ottawa, take a hike, you have carved this money out of transfer payments to this province for a decade. Now you say, by mistake, we sent you too much and we will negotiate on how much you have to pay back.

Well, I know as well as anyone that Ottawa could carve back from that future grab if they chose to, but it seems to me that this Government should have taken a much stronger stance. Now it appears that not only did they take a weak, limp-wristed approach to defending this province against Ottawa in terms of carving back that money, they now appear to have acknowledged that debt, and how have they managed it? They have just sort of lifted the page on provincial debt, just sort of added it to the provincial debt. It is not shown as a major transfer of debt. It is just added to the provincial debt.

Now, I ask anybody, and I see more than one member of Treasury Bench over there: Does that not just simply transfer into more accumulated debt for the citizens of this province? Is that not something that they should be talking about, how we have now added to the debt of every man, woman and child in this province without even having that debate in this Legislature, without acknowledging the real cost of what it is going to cost us in the future?

The provincial debt in this province has risen by over \$800 per capita, as I understand it. That is an awful lot of money, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we are not going to get press releases on this. We probably will have trouble getting a debate in this House, because I cannot see that this is a very defensible position for the Government, but as we go through that debate and try to determine what the real number is and check out the per capita costs, it is a great way of demonstrating to the public what the real costs are to them. There has been a benefit to the Government, obviously, of lower interest rates, but let us take a look.

At the same time that this is going on, we have seen debt from the provincial government, what would have shown that there was an actual deficit budget brought in for two years, that has just sort of been dragged over from Hydro, said, no, no, you can cover this deficit for us.

So there are people out there, and we see them defending this Government, and others who really have no political priority in the sense of left-right politics out there who have said, well, that is not so bad. I mean, it is a public corporation. We can collect dividends from it. They do not pay taxes the way everybody else does. They have thousands of employees who pay taxes, but, nevertheless, they do not pay the corporate taxes that everybody thinks, perhaps, would be a legitimate trade-off here.

But you see, what is so mind-numbing about this, what is so offensive about this is that it was to recover retroactively a budgetary deficit. But is anybody talking about the fact that the Manitoba Hydro debt, the debt ratio of Manitoba Hydro, is growing and growing? To pay on that will come out of the profits of Hydro, so their ability to continue to backfill for this Government will be reduced. It will be reduced for future governments.

This Government, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, refuses to take Manitoba Hydro to the Public Utilities Board to examine whether or not their rates are appropriate for the reserves or appropriate for their income. None of that has happened since this Government came to office. It is not fair to the people of this province. It smacks of the MPIC debates when they were

setting the rates at the Cabinet table and passing them off until, finally, the public stood up in 1988 and said, that is enough. This Government risks having that same kind of reaction on the way they are treating Manitoba Hydro. At the same time, it appears that MPI is starting to revert to some rather inappropriate activities as well, but let us leave that aside for a minute.

Let us talk about Manitoba Hydro. The Premier made a pretty good argument. He said, well, this is export power. This is profit. Big profit. It is a pretty positive position for Manitoba Hydro when it is able to export interruptible power to the United States at a very favourable rate, but those sales are dropping. I would bet that most of the government bench does not even know they are dropping right now. The export sales of Manitoba Hydro are dropping. That means that that golden goose that the Premier was so happy to refer to during the last two budgets is no longer going to be laying the golden eggs at the rate that it was. All of a sudden, we now have a 25 to 30% drop in export revenues for Manitoba Hydro, as I understand it.

* (15:50)

Volumes equal return in this case. All of a sudden, we have a situation where the off-the-balance-sheet accounting, a process this Government has been developing, is going to start becoming more obvious to the public. Believe me, I will do everything I can to make sure that the public does recognize and understand that. While it is nice to have a government that can respond by spending dollars in areas that are needed and maybe a few that are not and can say, well, this is not going to hurt a bit, we will just take it from over here at Hydro, that is a shell game that in a couple of years will come back to rest on the history of this Doer administration, because they cannot continue to take that kind of money retroactively out of Manitoba Hydro at the same time that Manitoba Hydro's debt ratio has gone from below 80 and heading back towards 85 percent in this debt-equity ratio.

In the main, the public is prepared to accept the concept that these major Crown industry portfolios do operate on a debt financing ratio. It is one way of reflecting the cost of doing

business, but what it should not have to do is also reflect the cost of supporting government. That is what we are doing. We are adding this debt back into Manitoba Hydro, and it is really a government support program. It will reflect in my rates down the road. We talk about Conawapa and exports to Ontario until we are blue in the face. That is not going to save my hydro rates in the next three years, because, eventually, that corporation has got to go to the PUB, and they will tell them what their debt ratio is. They will tell them whether or not they can afford to support that debt at the PUB and translate that into a rate structure that will then reflect the real cost that Hydro is being faced with by the actions of this Government.

Excuse, Mr. Speaker, I almost choked on that, but when I think about the fact that it reflects frankly on the comments of the now-Premier when he takes a run at the representatives of the—he called the Manitoba taxpayers federation, he called the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce lobby groups, I think he said, and then sort of referred to them in a derogatory manner. Well, you know, these are the very people who will be offended by what I am just talking about, because whether the Premier wants to admit it or not, it is not just the individual homeowner who has to face the cost of his hydro; it is industrial hydro costs that will start to affect the economy in this province where he wants to reap his taxes from.

The Minister of Finance acknowledges that the corporate taxes are not coming to this Government the way they should be, and we should be creating a climate. We should be creating a climate that will encourage investments. One of the cornerstones of bringing investment into this province is whether or not there are competitive hydro rates, because we have a situation where, in manufacturing, we are the furthest from most of our markets.

Now, we are relatively close to Chicago, let us say, if you take the southern route, but Manitoba has the importance of being in the centre of the continent. The geographic centre of the continent is located very close to our borders, and, therefore, when it comes to manufacturing, our transportation costs are high. So we have to maintain reasonable competitiveness in other

ways, and one of them would certainly be our hydro rates.

There is a principle, a very important principle that is involved here. The fact that the Premier (Mr. Doer) said that Shelly Wiseman of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business—you would think that they would probably use a bit of hydro—he said she has never run a business in her life. She is a spokeswoman. What does she own?

Well, as was mentioned earlier during this Question Period, I would challenge the members of the Government to stand up and defy that they are in a much better position, Mr. Speaker. I would say on this side of the House, when I look around at a number of my colleagues, there are a number of professionals, but in the main, they have made their living by agriculture, by the sweat of their brow and their wits, in that respect. For the Premier, for no apparent reason, to verbally dump on these people who represent what he considers lobby groups—

What else did he say? What company did Graham Starmer ever run? What a low miserable comment to make about the employee of the Manitoba Chamber. That is just disrespectful and uncalled for, and if that reflects on this Government, as it should, then you will probably be able to count on two hands the number of months that you are going to stay in government. Vrsnik of the Canadian Taxpayers' Federation, what has he ever done? He represents a thousand people for heaven's sake. That is a quote from our Premier.

Well, obviously, the Premier is looking for a straw man that he can bat around. If he thinks poking these three in the eye is going to do him a lot of good, then he is trying to draw a philosophical line in this province between those who are in business, those who represent business, those who are concerned about taxation, he wants them all over here on one side, so he can then say to the rest of society: But I am your champion; I will make sure that you have all of the other promises that he chooses to make.

Then he closes that comment, and, you know, I have to wonder just what aggravated the

Premier into this. I mean, was somebody standing on his foot or what? He says, and this is a direct quote: You cannot make a budget based on this sort of Pavlov's-dog kind of response to the stuff they say.

These are three of the more creditable organizations in this country and, particularly, in this province, with the Chamber of Commerce. I am going to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that every Chamber of Commerce in this province gets an opportunity to see what kind of a premier we have and what he thinks of them, because this is unacceptable when we are trying to build an economy and trying to attract investment back into this province.

I say "back into" because the investment curve in this province is starting to stall. I have remarked several times since I came into opposition from government that there are a lot of people out there who, all of a sudden, realize that one of the important aspects of creating a critical mass, an important aspect of creating a situation where people want to risk their money, in fact every aspect of their well-being and livelihood when they invest in a small business, and small businesses, for sure, historically show that there is a high failure rate, and then to turn around and criticize them in this manner from the Premier of this province when he, of all people, should be leading the attitudinal approach that needs to change in this province so that we have a can-do attitude.

Here is a premier, and there was some debate earlier today, and the Minister of Health was somewhat critical of a certain choice of words, but he ought to turn to his Premier who sits right at his elbow, the Minister of Health should turn to his Premier who sits at his right elbow, and he should say, you know, you were demonstrating that kind of an attitude. You say one thing, and you do something else. Well, maybe it is worse than that because, in this case, he is saying that he is critical of and unsatisfied with and unhappy with those who speak out on behalf of business, speak out on behalf of investment in this province. My colleagues are going to ostracize me for saying this, but I had a higher opinion of the now-Premier than to think that he would ever let something like this pass his lips. Unless he is prepared to, at some point,

apologize, I do not know how he is going to recover from having attacked the leading groups who represent a number of points of view in this province, and particularly those who are members of the Chamber. I do not know how he is going to talk his way out of this one, but it seems to me that he has made some very inappropriate comments. The only answer that I can see to causing him to go this way is that he is looking for a straw man to attack in the run up to a budget. That is unfair in my books, and it will damage, not just his political opportunity, but it will damage the approach that many people in this province take towards creating jobs, employment and risking their investment.

* (16:00)

It would be unfair of me to pass by the Romanow report without making some broader comment. I have heard both sides of the reaction. I have heard those who say, well, you have not even read Romanow yet, and you are reacting to it. I have heard on the other side, people comment, well, for a heck of a lot less money, I could have told you more money would fix the health care report. I think the Member for Broadway and I could have sat down and put together a report. We would have done it much less than that. We could have come up with the same answers because the fact is, that is a very simple approach.

I heard on the radio today that Mr. Romanow is now separating himself. He made a whole lot of comment in his report about how there was no room for private sector, but now he is separating himself from that. He is saying, well, I really did not include it as a recommendation, so those were just observations. That is not nearly what I meant. Well, I do not quite swallow that. Mr. Romanow was probably a far better politician than I am, but I will not give him any credit for being smarter than I am. I think he knows inherently that the public is reacting negatively to that approach. He is uncomfortable that that aspect of his report is being uncovered. Nevertheless, the Premier has embraced the report because this Government has, since it came to office, believed that the one way of dealing with health care was to fire more money down the tube. That started during the last campaign. What was it?

Fifteen million in six months, we can fix health care. Do it. No Problem. Need more nurses? We will hire them.

We are going to cover up the sign to the States. People will not be going to the States, but, if they have to go, we will just send them. None of that has happened. There have been a lot of people who have gone to the States to get health care. Some of them have paid out of their own pockets. Some of them have gone with the blessing, encouragement and the recommendation of health care in this province, as they should. People need timely and proper health care, and we have access to some very sophisticated health care in this province, but, unfortunately, there are some very long waiting lists.

We also have access to some very sophisticated health care south of the line. For the Government to have told the public that if they needed services they would just buy them, that was a little bit of an oversimplification and one that is now three years later not necessarily proven to be accurate. We still have significant waiting lists. We still have hallway medicine. The report on hallway medicine, I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am absolutely amazed at the ability of the current government and the ability to spin and the ability of the public to accept that spin until all of a sudden now, three years into their mandate, we are starting to see that you cannot fix a hip based on spin; you cannot replace a knee based on spin; you cannot get some extensive cancer tests done on spin. You have to have opportunity to get to a qualified specialist, to a facility where there is a significant investment in staff and technology and knowledge. You cannot really get very far unless you have that combination of three.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Romanow report, and you know I would have to say that the *Winnipeg Free Press* touched on it, you know, keep it simple. The bottom line is that people in this province are not going to believe that their health care is fixed if they cannot get access to it. That is the problem this Government is blindsided on. They are not prepared to accept the fact that there might be some modicum of private sector investment that would be beneficial to health care. You know, I cannot tell

you the percentage, but I know the larger percentage of doctors in this province are really independent contractors. They have got fee-for-service. There are a fair number who are on salary, but fee-for-service is still the predominant way that we access a doctor. That is private sector, but one payer.

We have examples around the world. We embrace our health care and we say we are the best in the world, but the World Health Organization does not see it that way. We are not number three or two or one, we are number thirty. You know, that is a bit crushing to a Canadian who has always proudly stood up and said that we have got the best health care in the world, but, you know, if you go to Sweden, which in many cases in terms of a democracy is the cradle of modern socialism, they have private contractors in their system. My goodness, folks, it relates very much to the same debate that we were having earlier about whether or not the private sector should be encouraged and embraced in the economy of this province. It should be encouraged and embraced to invest in our health care as well with one payer. Why not? Why not? You practise it, but you pick your targets. You pick your straw man, you pick the ones you want to argue with and you push them aside in the name of universal health care. What you are doing is denying my constituents and yours access to health care when they need it.

Some of the most efficient health care organizations in the world have a large percentage of private-sector initiative in them. I mean, people come home from Rochester, and I am not suggesting that we can replicate Rochester here, but let us not say that because that is private we have absolutely no interest in it. People are able to organize their appointments so that they can go to a variety of specialists the same day. They are able to organize their appointments so that people might even access emergency response if something is found to be of that nature while they are there. I personally have just seen a couple of examples of that happening, where the person went to Rochester looking to get a series of tests and visit specialists and found out that they were in such serious shape that their problem had to be dealt with today. Now, I am not advocating that we attempt to replicate that here, but why are we in

such disdain about saying that some aspects of private service within a system is wrong, because we are doing it today? The druggists are private sector. We do not own the drug companies, but we hire the service, in many cases, from the private entrepreneur, who would be the druggist.

As I mentioned, we go to doctors who operate in a private-sector fashion because of speed for service. I have a doctor who is a very good friend of mine, who has a great deal of disdain for anything other than the kind of approach that he has. What he says is, if I want to work until seven or 7:30 at night taking patients through my clinic, am I not reducing the waiting list somewhere else? I am sure he is, and what drives him? *[interjection]* Yes. Across the way they are saying money. Yes. The opportunity to increase the cash flow in his practice, but it makes it so that I can get in to see him, as my friends and neighbours and other people living in the community want to, because his office does not shut at 4:30 or 5. *[interjection]*

* (16:10)

Well, the question is: Is he making any good diagnosis? I hate to say this because I like the member from Flin Flon (Mr. Jennissen), and I respect him, but to say is this guy making any good diagnoses, you know, I could say the same thing about somebody on salary. He does not have to make a good diagnosis because he will still get his salary tomorrow. This doctor's diagnosis depends on whether or not he is right so those people will come back the next day or a month, or in the future down the road. So you can make a strong argument on both sides of the issue, and the philosophical blinders, Mr. Speaker, are not the way to approach this problem. That is why I say there is an issue around the Romanow report, and I think Mr. Romanow recognizes that he is going to get bit on the fact that he has virtually said there is no place for private entrepreneurship.

Asking a question, Mr. Speaker. If the Government spends \$5 million on a piece of equipment and then runs it for 12 hours a day or maybe 8, 10 hours a day, is that more efficient than if the private sector says, I will buy the

equipment, and I will staff it, and I will run it maybe 18 hours a day because I want return on my money, but it is not going to cost the public or the Government any more because they do not have to make the \$5-million investment in the capital in the first place?

I am utterly appalled that in this society you can get your cat X-rayed easier than you can yourself some days. You can get private-sector style of service if you are a professional athlete, but I cannot get it, and I am a professional politician, the last time I checked. I mean, what is the difference? Why do we draw those lines and say it is good for everybody? One payer and use the equipment appropriately.

I had a long discussion with a professor from the New England states who was up here studying our health care system, and he said I cannot, for the life of me, understand why we run the equipment for part days. He says it costs more money to start it up every day than what it would cost in shift costs to keep it running 24/7 and really provide service for the public.

What we have done, ladies and gentlemen, we have rationed health care. You are rationing it every day when you say that there is a limit to the amount of people we can put through the system. You are rationing it, and you are causing some people to suffer needlessly in the name of social medicine.

The biggest and one of the first well-respected social medicine systems in the world was in Great Britain. They openly admitted that, eventually, it started to collapse on itself, and the only way that they could control their health care costs was through rationing. We are, every day, this Government, same as most others across this country, probably rationing health care based on budgetary decisions, not on the needs of the public.

I say to you that is no way to run a health care system. If we cannot run it better than we are now, then I suggest you should step aside and make sure that there is an organization and leadership that will make it happen in this province, because our citizens deserve better. We need some recognition on the part of this Government, and, you know, it relates directly.

We see the Minister of Health; we see the Premier. Manitoba is going to get a windfall of money according to what Roy has suggested. That would be nice. That would elicit a smile from the Finance Minister, I am sure. The money will be useful, but it is not the only answer. It is not the only answer. To have our philosophical blinkers on at a time like this in Canadian history is a tragedy. It is an affront to the public of Manitoba and the public of Canada who want better health care to have something that still will not allow an alternative aspect to be within the system or at least preaches that they are not welcome in the system.

Why is it that we think that if we have control that we have a better health care system? We need control of the Budget, and that is why I say we are talking about rationing in order to meet some budgetary requirements. I will give an example. I am liable to offend at least one doctor but I will not use any names. The fact is, on cataract surgery where you have doctors operating in both systems, and I heard the Premier reference this awhile ago, not in the last little while, but he said, no, they will back up the patients into their private clinic.

That can be simply solved. I am not going to provide the answer to the Government. If they do not know the answer to that question, then they do not deserve to be government. You can control that waiting list because the person who would practise in the private system probably does not need a dual system in order to be able to drive them into his private clinic. There are ways of doing it that would provide more access.

I noticed the Government was bragging about how they had reduced waiting lists on some surgeries, and they were trying to say that it was because they had nationalized the Pan Am Clinic. Let us call it what it is. It is nationalization. I am not going to get into the debate about who made how much profit out of that. I am more concerned about the principle of what was done. It was nationalization and I thought that that sort of went by the way when we got into the 1950s. Is that not about when people started saying nationalization was not necessarily the way to go?

This Government, I thought that they were more the now type of people who realized that nationalization—[interjection] Oh, okay. They do put on sort of sheep's clothing at election time, but the fact is, that it would have taken a stroke of the pen by the Minister of Health (Mr. Chomiak) to increase the volume at the Pan Am Clinic. It would not have cost one cent for bricks and mortar, and the volume of surgeries would have gone up, and his biggest problem would be to make sure he did not let it get too high so he could not afford to pay it. But now we have waiting lists at the Pan Am Clinic for people who used to be able to go in and get an appointment and get quite prompt service.

Welcome to nationalization, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, the basic theme of this Member for Wellington—not Broadway, Wellington—in this year 2002, debate on the Throne Speech is the following statement.

Unless the various social and political forces and movements in the increasingly globalized world of today are enabled by enlightened political leadership based on moral principles to reconstitute themselves into legitimate social and political institutions of governance, any economic theory based on private greed rather than on public need would tend toward more political and economic inequality resulting in more political terrorism and economic chaos. By moral principle, I mean the intuitive understanding of the idea that there is a difference between right and wrong. There is a difference between what is basically good for all and what is evil.

In developing this hypothesis, this member will briefly discuss globalization of production, the globalization of finance in the context of international trade and also discuss the continuing debate among economists as to whether or not the process of economic growth should be left to the forces of the market of supply and demand or should be facilitated by government, which monitors the public sector, inasmuch as the Government rightly or wrongly is normally held accountable for economic dislocations.

* (16:20)

How does international trade take place? With the emergence of the nation-state, whenever exchange of goods, services and other value extends across the boundaries of any particular nation-state, there was a doctrine prevalent before called mercantilism, which advocates discouraging imports, encouraging exports and to take the proceeds of the export surplus in the form of gold bullion.

International trade among nations takes place when a domestic firm or citizen buys and receives foreign goods, services, and other assets like securities of stocks and bonds in exchange for which some part of such domestic currency is allowed to pass through the national boundaries into foreign hands. Since there can be no buyer without a seller, the other foreign nation necessarily exports part of its productive output of assets, receiving in exchange what to it is foreign currency. Thus the flow of commodities and the corresponding flow of money that crosses national boundaries becomes problematical. Between countries, domestic local money can be exchanged against foreign money only insofar as there is a counteroffer of foreign money in exchange.

There are two international markets or exchange mechanisms at work here: the international exchange market of commodities and the international exchange market of money or claims to money. Foreign exchange means foreign money or any cashable claim on foreign money such as a bill of exchange that is offered on the foreign exchange market where such foreign money may be bought with domestic money. Foreign exchange market refers to the complex institutional arrangements consisting of banks, specialized foreign exchange dealers, official government agencies and other participants whereby the currency of one country may be traded and sold in exchange for the currency of another country. Foreign exchange rate relates to the price in terms of one currency that is paid for another country's currency unit.

Exchange rate is the rate at which different currencies are traded in the sense of being bought and sold in the foreign exchange market. In the course of international trade exchange,

rates become necessary because the paper currency of one country is not an acceptable medium of exchange in another country.

For example, an American importer of Canadian goods must buy Canadian money so that he can pay for the Canadian goods, but before he can buy the Canadian money, he must be prepared to offer to sell or exchange U.S. dollar for Canadian dollars. For example, if it costs \$1.56 Canadian currency to buy one U.S. dollar, one Canadian dollar is worth only 64 cents in U.S. money.

Adam Smith, in his famous book entitled *The Wealth of Nations*, argued against mercantilism by stating that in a world where productive resources are scarce and where human wants are unlimited, each nation should specialize in commodities the nation is particularly well-suited to produce, and then whatever surplus there is, he can export the surplus, taking in exchange other commodities that it cannot so readily produce.

David Ricardo, another classical English economist, further developed Adam Smith's ideas into what becomes the basic foundation of international trade; that is, the theory of comparative advantage in international transactions.

What is this theory of comparative advantage, and how is it related to the economic idea of opportunity cost? Comparative advantage means the ability to produce goods or services not on the basis of input used, but in terms of lower opportunity cost. Opportunity cost is the cost that you are prepared to take in order to produce specific products. It is the cost of producing a commodity measured in terms of lost opportunity to do something else with the same resources used in the production of those specific goods.

Now, we are now said to be in a globalized economy. What does this word mean? The increasing international trade among different nation-states and their respective national economies give rise to a world-wide international economy often described as the globalized economy.

The collapse of the command economies of the Soviet bloc of nations gave pre-eminence to

the capitalist international economy. After two world wars and the great depression, the industrialized trading nations under the auspices of the United Nations met at Breton Woods, New Jersey, U.S.A., and replaced the old gold standard when they agreed to set up a new world monetary system of a relatively fixed exchange rate system of national currency whereby the par value of each nation's currency was established in terms of the U.S. dollar with a narrow range of fluctuation, initially 1 percent, later increased to 2.25 percent above or below the par value, before the concerned national government can, under the rules of the International Monetary Fund, intervene to prevent further fluctuations in exchange rates.

However, by 1980, the rules of the Breton Woods Agreement to strike a balance between a liberalized free market and nation-states' responsibility for economic growth, domestic welfare and employment against external vicissitudes of the national economy were ignored, and the currencies of the various countries were allowed to float freely according to economic influence of supply and demand for foreign exchange.

Despite proclamation of state non-intervention in the working of the market, the reality of politics and the reality of economics cannot deny the fact that market mechanism is a form of power relationship. Therefore, by entering into bilateral or multilateral agreements, the various countries, including Canada, become subject to the various international agencies of the emerging globalized economic order, such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade which is now reorganized as the World Trade Organization with respect to exchange rate stability and convertibility and to trade liberalization policies, thereby subordinating the interest of the national economies to the exigencies of the so-called globalized world economic order.

However, the continuing existence of the nation-states in the globalized international order present the paradoxical spectacle of competitive states in a largely transnationalized, interpenetrating national economic systems and markets.

A market is essentially an institutionalized economic device subject to manipulation under certain outcomes of conferring benefits and corresponding costs upon others, and, therefore, it is not unusual for certain asymmetries of power to exist as to who gets what, when and how. [*interjection*] Yes. That is exemplified by the varying disparity of exchange rates among the industrialized nations as against the developing nations, the basic cause of inequality in economic terms.

How is the governance of this globalized economy done in the absence of a world government? There is no world government, but there is a world economic order. How is this done? Governance without world government is largely the result of consensus formation in the form of guidelines and rules made through policy-making channels of national governments and multinational corporations manifested through unofficial forums like the Trilateral Commission, through official international agencies such as the United Nations Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Bank for International Settlements and the International Monetary Fund.

* (16:30)

How has globalization affected production, the process of production? From the advent of industrial revolution in England, industrial capitalist production has developed a large vertically integrated production system based on the principle of economies of scale in the mass production of undifferentiated products. The demand for mass production of commodities was stabilized, however, through the state welfare policies and the type of organized labour relations characterized by collective bargaining, which linked the level of wages with the level of productivity monitored by the industry-based unions that support elaborate job classification and pay plans based on the objective criteria of seniority. The union may or may not be institutionally linked with the managerial corporate decision making.

In contrast, what is happening now in this globalized economy? In this globalized economy of today, a new model of organizational system of production has come into being. This is based

not on the principle of economies of scale. This is based on the principle of flexibility. There is now an organizational network which consists of a small core structure of a relatively permanent set of positions handling finance, research, organization, technology and innovation. Then there is a peripheral component network of other organizational units that may be called into being when needed and disposed of or dispensed with when not needed by the small permanent core at the heart of the production process.

Such restructuring of the productive organizational arrangement was pioneered by Japan, which takes the form of what they call just-in-time assembly line, all the flexible productive systems of a network of small- and medium-sized firms. Such a pattern of productive arrangement spread out in Southeast Asia, which involved the Asian newly industrialized countries like Malaysia, Korea, Taiwan and Singapore.

While Korea maintained the large-scale vertically integrated conglomerates called chaebol, such chaebol or large conglomerates in Korea were linked forward to Japanese suppliers of key components, machineries, equipment and linked forward to some finished end-use product markets in Europe and in the United States.

The globalized production network requires geographic proximity for prompt delivery of needed semi-manufactured components, frequent exchange of personnel, facilitation of effective communication and a high level of integration of knowledge and skill within the interconnected firms.

In this flexible organizational arrangement, jobs can easily be redefined through the various ways of programming information into robotics that can be deployed. Hence, the need for manual and craft labour has decreased.

There is also the separation of high technological positions with all the know-how and the low-level skilled positions. For example, professional production engineers will have a different salary scale, have different career paths, have different status as distinguished from the production worker whose only skill is the skill required by the particular machine he operates.

The new organizational production in the globalized world of trade had—what is the effect? It had weakened the traditional power of organized labour since the employed labour force had not been segmented by ethnicity, by nationality, by gender, religion and cultural background but, on the contrary, it strengthened and empowered the management power of private business controllers of monetary capital. The new organizational arrangement in this new globalized world has also rendered government regulation of business largely ineffective. In sum, this globalized production has fundamentally altered the balance of social economic forces in our contemporary society.

What is the effect of globalization on finance, on money? Like commodities, financial papers can be traded among residents of different nation-states. Peter Drucker, for example, the management guru, in an article entitled "The Changed World Economy," *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 64, Spring '86, page 783, stated in the world economy today, the real economy of goods and services and the symbolic nominal economy of money, credit and financial capital are no longer tightly bound to each other.

When the Nixon administration decided to abandon the Breton Woods agreement that is a compromise on the mechanism of the government intervention of the monetary authorities and policy making by those monetary bodies, the autonomy of the so-called financial policy making is now freed from government intervention, the international trade in securities now is effectively privatized. The macro-policy making of individual countries is now left largely in the hands of the private owners of financial capital.

As a result of the privatization of international finance, governments began to be modeled after private corporations. We now have a bottom line. You cannot pass the budget line in government. Government, now, instead of taxing, indulging in taxation to raise revenue, will borrow money, but if the citizens are poor, they cannot issue bonds to the citizens; they have to issue the bonds outside the country. The mass media helped this political attitude by saying taxes have become intolerably high because they are, themselves, multinational

media networks of corporations. The media is a corporate entity in itself.

The political ruling parties are constantly blamed for alleged excessive public spending, deficit financing and high taxation. The people are made to believe that economic growth depends largely on business confidence to invest. The flight of financial capital away from any jurisdiction that refuses to give financial incentives such as tax exemptions, financial subsidies to large business corporations, has been a potent strategic weapon that no ruling party in government can ignore. The credit ratings assigned to governments by private, international money markets in New York, in London and elsewhere have become crucial. Any lowering of private credit means increased cost of foreign debt financing because the bonds are already held in foreign currencies.

Slowly but surely, due to this great disparity in the exchange ratio between the industrialized nations and the developing countries, there is a difference in the value of their currencies. The countries of the world have found themselves, mostly the poorer ones, debtor countries. They become accountable to international monetary institutions like the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. For example, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have recently designed what they call the Highly Indebted Poor Countries debt relief program initiative by which the poor countries can enjoy one-third reduction of their debt repayment, but only when the debtor nation will submit themselves to six years of closely monitored policy package of economic structural adjustments, including such intrusive measures as indiscriminate privatization. The labour market shall be deregulated. There should be extensive cuts in government spending, financial liberalization, the use of user fees in health care. Some of these countries, after three years, just half way, they found that they are no longer qualified. They lose eligibility because they cannot enforce all these restrictive measures.

So let us discuss how it can be avoided. The only way, when you cannot distribute the pie equally, is to grow the pie, economic growth. Economic growth is the process by which an economic system in low per capita income may

increase the production of commodities of goods and services in such a way that increases the standard of living. The increase in the material standard of living and the corresponding advance in the quality of life is what is known as economic prosperity. We are enjoying such a thing in this country of Canada.

* (16:40)

The rate of economic growth refers specifically to the long-term changes in the provincial or national income and the output associated with the changes in the productive capacity of the political system of the economy, rather than mere changes in aggregate demand.

What is this productive capacity of an economy, of an economic system? The productive capacity of a provincial economy like Manitoba refers to the gross provincial product that can be produced when all the resources of the province are fully employed, including all the people that can be employed. Even assuming full employment and all the factors of production, a part of the total provincial product that is merely due to a rise in price level has to be subtracted out because economic growth has reference to a rise in real output as mentioned in per capita income, rather than the increase in total provincial income.

The factors of production first category is land. Land broadly includes natural resources like forests, soil, minerals, other things found in nature. Second category, what they call labour, defined broadly as human resources of people and the qualities of these people, including their education, experience, training, skills. The third category is capital, which includes technology, tools, equipment, factories and other people-produced aid to production, not directly consumed, but which are used up in making other goods and commodities.

We have been talking about production. Production is simply the process of converting the natural resources, the raw resources, the scarce resources into commodities. Commodities are either goods or services, and these are the things that we consume in order that we may have satisfaction in this life. Consumption is the act of using the commodities of goods and services to satisfy our unlimited human wants.

The economic concept of income, when they say increase in real income, in the theory of economic growth, refers to the flow of material values coming from the stock of accumulated capital resource, defined broadly to include such elements like the size of the provincial population. That is why we take immigration. We cannot bring children ourselves. We take other people, the qualities of the population, like education, skills and abilities, the health condition of our people, the land that we have, the quality of those lands, whether they are fertile or not, machinery, equipment, and also, of course, technology. Technology is simply the application of knowledge that is useful for human purposes. It includes also, of course, the inventory, the stock of those finished and unfinished goods in the hands of firms and of households.

Mr. Harry Schellenberg, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

What is the primary cost of economic growth if you really analyze it? The primary cost of economic growth is the long-run accumulation of capital resources. Capital resources include advances in knowledge. That is why we have to do research in universities, in industries. Research and development is a major department of all of these organizational units. We have to apply the output of that research and that is called technology. When you apply knowledge and you produce better products, then you have technological innovation. We need inventions and we have to increase the productivity of the labour force, because if the labour force is better educated, if they have a high level of literacy, if they have improved health and they have more efficient practices and procedures, they will produce more.

That is why we are spending money as a government to promote public education and post-secondary education. We may have all the facilities, but if we do not have the people to run them, there will be no increase in production. There was a time in this province where there were scanners in hospitals, but they were in the basement because there were no trained personnel who could operate them. We need to educate those people so that they can operate those machines which results in better health care, like we are doing in this administration.

Now, the great debate among economists is this: Should the process of economic growth be left to the market forces of supply and demand as those on the right would say, or should the Government facilitate the process of economic growth? That is the great economic issue. *[interjection]* In Russia, they have a command economy. That is not a free enterprise economy. It is a command economy, long-range, 10-year, 5-year planning.

Economists are divided into two groups with respect to this issue. What we will call the economic interventionists are those economists who favour government policy to create and support general macroeconomic conditions for economic growth. This includes people such as Professor Lester Thurow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who argues that governments should support new industries with potential promise for future success.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

Let us apply this in this province. Canola is a development that has been the output of research, and now it has helped this province materially and economically. The Government should, therefore, offer favourable tax treatment to these new potential productive industries. They should also offer research grants and other forms of government encouragement to all of these industries that will increase the productive capacity of the economy.

In contrast, the other group of economists are so-called supply-side economists. They argue that private investors, not government, have a better foresight for the advancement of the productive capacity of the family, that high taxes discourage work incentives, that when you are taxed high you do not work anymore. That is their argument. They also argue that if you save, your savings should not be taxed until that savings is consumed, because if you tax the savings, it will discourage saving. When there is no saving, it is difficult to invest.

However, both the economic interventionists and the supply-side economists agree on one thing, one thing, common agreement. They agree that the Government ought to encourage technological innovation.

* (16:50)

These kinds of arguments go on forever. It depends upon your values, upon your situation in life and upon your social and economic standing. If you have lots of money to invest, of course you will be in favour of a policy that does not tax savings. But if you do not have money to save, then you are against it. The same thing in this House. If you are in the Opposition, you take a certain position. You express certain views, certain ideas according to your role as an opposition. When you are in the Government, you express other kinds of values, because you are now governing for everybody, including the Opposition.

In conclusion, let me restate the main proposition about the system I advanced at the beginning. Unless the various social and economic forces and movements in this increasingly globalized world of today are enabled by enlightened political leadership based on moral principles to reconstitute this process into a legitimate social and political institution of governance, any economic theory based on private greed rather than public need would tend toward more political terrorism and economic chaos.

That is a mouthful. But governments and semi-governmental organizations that provide essential public services like hospitals, schools for all of the people in a community, when they operate their public service type of institution, they are constrained by some moral imperatives embodied in the ethical moral code that should guide them in their decision making.

Among the basic functions of government, the provision of health services to all the people, the promotion of education to all young people, the rendering of basic social services to the needy, to the end that no one would be below the level of human decency so as to lose one's dignity as a fellow human being.

Most Christian countries, and Canada is one of them, inherited the Judeo-Christian system of beliefs embodied in the Ten Commandments given to Moses, another lawgiver in Israel. We know what these commandments are from the first to the last. I do not have to say them

because I will run out of time: Thou shalt have no other gods before me; thou shalt not make graven image; thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; remember the Sabbath day sanctified; honour thy father and thy mother; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not bear false witness; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife or his house.

Now, there are too many of them, 10. So it was summarized into two great commandments. These are the moral codes. These are the moral principles that people should live by. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all they soul and with all thy mind. That is the first one. The second one, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Tu aimeras le Seigneur ton Dieu de tout ton coeur, de toute ton âme et de toute ta pensee. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all they heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind. Tu aimeras ton prochain comme toimeme. Thou shalt love they neighbour as thyself.

These two greatest commandments have a common ground. They say love. Love God. Love neighbour. [*interjection*] Love is a many splendored thing if it is taken in a romantic sense, but love is broader than the romantic meaning of it. It is a humanitarian love. You have divine love. You have familial love. It simply means there is oneness in all of humanity. Regardless of the things that divide us like culture, languages, whatever artificial things in society, we are all one. Whether you are a man or a woman, you are one as part of humanity. So, if you love this oneness, you will not hurt your neighbour. If you love your neighbour, you will not steal from him. If you love everybody, you will not cheat on your income tax.

Amor vincent omnia. Love conquers all. Love will conquer even those who love power. The power of love will conquer even those who love power.

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to debate the Speech from the Throne today on behalf of all the residents of Lac du Bonnet constituency.

I would like to thank the efforts of all the previous pages of the Legislature and

congratulate all of the new pages on their appointments. Their job is very important, to assist members in their duties and, of course, in the process to assist democracy. I would like to also welcome the interns. I wish them well, and I hope that they have a great learning experience here at the Legislature in the next year.

I would like to thank also the Member for Morris (Mr. Pitura), the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) and the Minister of Labour and Immigration (Ms. Barrett) for their hard work and dedicated service to the people of Manitoba.

All had distinguished careers in the Legislature in our province. The Member for Morris was, of course, known mostly, I believe, for his dedicated service to his constituency and his work with the Red River flood. I think he did a fantastic job for his constituency.

The Member for Minnedosa, I know him not necessarily as a colleague, but, of course, I was just a newly elected member of the Legislature, and I knew him as the Minister of Education. He did a very capable job and, in fact, represented his constituents very well.

The Member for Lakeside, the member who is known as the dean of the Legislature, has been a member of the Legislature since 1966. He is always willing to give us a history lesson, which I appreciate. I think we can learn a lot from history, including not just this side of the House, but, obviously, the opposite side of the House as well.

The member who is the Minister of Labour and Immigration is known, I believe, for her capable handling of her portfolio. We do not always see eye to eye on different issues, but I believe that she handled her department quite capably.

For all of that, I thank them. I thank them on behalf of the residents of Lac du Bonnet constituency.

I would like to also take the opportunity to congratulate all those people who received Queen's Jubilee Awards this year and, in particular, the winners from the Lac du Bonnet

constituency. We had a number of winners of that Jubilee Award. Karen Dudeck, who is a resident of Tyndall, is a tireless volunteer. She, in fact, started the Taking Pride Days in Tyndall a number of years ago and spearheaded those festivities every year since. She has done fundraising events for the Tyndall Community Centre and, as well, has been very active in the Home and School Association in the Tyndall area.

June Kotchon, who lives in Garson, has been a tireless volunteer for the community.

Anton Ottenbreit, someone I know personally, in fact, this year turned 101 years of age. He is still a tireless volunteer for the Beausejour area. He lives in Beausejour. He is a consummate volunteer and a community pioneer. I knew him, of course, for the last 25 years as a member of the St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church. He never misses a mass. At 101 years of age, there is something to be said for that.

Carl Sabanski, who received the award, is a resident of Pinawa. He was the founder of the Pinawa suspension bridge and played a role of course in the walkways that are there as part of the walkway that is across Canada. He also volunteered to take on the Pinawa sundial project, which was completed last year and, of course, continued on with the Pinawa in Bloom festivities in Pinawa. His wife, Barb Sabanski, is also a volunteer. She is a volunteer with the Lac du Bonnet and area food bank and with many other community activities in the Pinawa and Lac du Bonnet areas.

Ken MacMaster was another recipient of the Queen's Jubilee Award. He is a resident of Lac du Bonnet, in fact is a former MLA representing Thompson a number of years ago. He is a 25-year Jubilee Award winner as well. So not only did he get the 50th Jubilee Medal, but he also had the 25th Jubilee Medal. He is a volunteer for the fire department, the Bird River Fire Department, and he did a lot of work with the Lac du Bonnet Community Centre in ensuring that the fundraising activities were done for the benefit of that community centre so it could have been constructed in the area.

Gordon Emberley, the last recipient in our area, was instrumental in establishing the Western Canadian Aviation Museum.

He works with all heritage groups in Lac du Bonnet.

Mr. Speaker: Order. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet will have 35 minutes remaining.

As previously agreed, the hour being 5 p.m. this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 2, 2002

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
		Elk Population Cummings; Ashton	101
Reading and Receiving Petitions			
Former Manitoba MLAs Association Martindale	93		
Oral Questions			
Taxation System Murray; Doer	94		
Child and Family Services Driedger; Caldwell	95, 96		
Court System Hawranik; Mackintosh	97		
Ethanol Industry Schuler; Sale	98		
Winnipeg Harvest Poverty Challenge Gerrard; Caldwell	99		
Income Assistance Gerrard; Doer	99		
Safer Communities Act Martindale; Mackintosh	100		
Livestock Industry Cummings; Wowchuk	100, 101		
Derkach; Wowchuk	102		
		Member's Statements	
		Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry Korzeniowski	103
		Trans Canada Trail Hawranik	104
		Grace Hospital Auxiliary Rondeau	104
		Farm Family of the Year Maguire	105
		Dr. Sybil Shack Asper	105
		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
		GOVERNMENT BUSINESS	
		Throne Speech Debate (Third Day of Debate)	
		Jack Penner	106
		Martindale	110
		Cummings	119
		Santos	126
		Hawranik	132