



Fifth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(Hansard)

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



Vol. XLIII No. 7 - 10 a.m., Friday, April 15, 1994

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, April 15, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Curran Contract Cancellation and Pharmacare and Home Care Reinstatement

Mr. Clif Evans (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Jayne Ogrodnik, Gordon Ogrodnik, Brenda Otto and others requesting the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to personally step in and order the cancellation of the Connie Curran contract and consider cancelling the recent cuts to the Pharmacare and Home Care programs.

APM Incorporated Remuneration and Pharmacare and Home Care Reinstatement

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Peter Hunt, Denny Hunt, G. Kohinski and others requesting the Legislative Assembly urge the Premier to personally step in and order the repayment of the \$4 million paid to Connie Curran and her firm APM Inc. and consider cancelling the recent cuts to the Pharmacare and Home Care programs.

Curran Contract Cancellation and Pharmacare and Home Care Reinstatement

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Helen Dunthorne, Isabel Dunthorne, Susan Dunthorne and others requesting the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Premier to personally step in and order the cancellation of the Connie Curran contract and consider cancelling the recent cuts to the Pharmacare and Home Care programs.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Curran Contract Cancellation and Pharmacare and Home Care Reinstatement

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member (Mr. Plohman). It complies with the privileges and the practices of the House and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read? [agreed]

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Province of Manitoba humbly sheweth that:

WHEREAS the Manitoba government has repeatedly broken promises to support the Pharmacare program and has in fact cut benefits and increased deductibles far above the inflation rate; and

WHEREAS the Pharmacare program was brought in by the NDP as a preventative program which keeps people out of costly hospital beds and institutions; and

WHEREAS rather than cutting benefits and increasing deductibles the provincial government should be demanding the federal government cancel recent cuts to generic drugs that occurred under the Drug Patent Act; and

WHEREAS at the same time Manitoba government has also cut home care and implemented user fees; and

WHEREAS the Manitoba government is giving an American health care consultant over \$4 million to implement further cuts in health care.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly urge the Premier to personally step in and order the cancellation of the Connie Curran contract; and consider cancelling the recent cuts to the Pharmacare and Home Care programs.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the 1992-93 Annual Report of Highways and Transportation.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of Section 13 of The Trade Practices Inquiry Act and Section 114(4) of The Insurance Act.

* (1005)

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this morning, from the St. George School, forty Grade 9 students under the direction of Mr. Clint Harvey. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Unemployment Rate Manitoba Statistics

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

Over the last couple of years, the misery that people are feeling in terms of the economy has been demonstrated, I believe, to all members of this Chamber: massive increases in unemployment, major increases in welfare rolls, tremendous despair in terms of individual situation.

Today, we have had confirmed that the federal government believes that the actual unemployment rate in Canada is not the figure that has been reported in the 10 or 11 percent range but really is 17.1 percent for 1993, a tremendous statistic in terms of what that means for families and people trying to find work.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier: What is the actual unemployment rate in terms of Manitoba in terms of the challenges being dealt with by the Province of Manitoba?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, certainly like the member opposite and all members of our society, we would like to ensure that we do everything possible to keep the unemployment rates down and to lower them substantially. We are encouraged by a few things, one being that we have the highest participation rate of employment in Canada. We also have last year the third highest rate of job creation of any province in Canada.

We do, of course, have concerns that people such as New Democrats, led by the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), speak out against many legitimate investments in the economy with many jobs involved. We had last year the situation in which the member for Radisson attempted to try and destroy a major investment for Brandon with her intervention to try and stop the operation of the Ayerst PMU plant in Brandon, a thousand jobs at stake in the Manitoba economy: on the farms, in transportation, in distribution, in the plant in Brandon. She went so far as to write on her own letterhead to the University of Minnesota School of Medicine, to a doctor there, to try and find evidence that would destroy the ability of that company to operate. She continues to be involved and supportive in an organization called People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Beauchesne 417 is very clear, Mr. Speaker. "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate."

The Premier (Mr. Filmon) has broken Beauchesne's rule on all three counts. We would appreciate an answer on the very serious situation with unemployment in this province, Mr. Speaker, from the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the honourable First Minister was attempting to answer the question.

* (1010)

Mr. Filmon: I am speaking specifically about jobs in this economy, Mr. Speaker, and the direct attempts of New Democrats to destroy 1,000 jobs in our economy with the Ayerst PMU plant and, of course, the now direct attempts on her part to subvert a proper environmental assessment and review process and to prevent it from happening. She booked a news conference in 68B of this Legislature. She aligned herself with a radical group of environmentalists to try and stop 400 additional jobs at Swan Valley with Louisiana-Pacific.

That is a concern, Mr. Speaker; that is a great concern. [applause]

Mr. Doer: Well, only Tories can clap about a 17 percent unemployment rate in Canada and play petty politics in terms of what is going on in this country and in Manitoba. I asked the Premier a very serious, nonpartisan question about the real, actual unemployment rate in this province.

I would like to table a letter last year signed by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, now the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), that also indicates that the actual conventional unemployment statistics for Manitoba are significantly understated.

I would like to ask the Premier: What is the actual unemployment rate that he is operating under and his government is operating under as it prepares its very important budget for next week's presentation in the Legislature?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the only one who is playing politics with this issue and with people's lives is the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and his members opposite when they go out and try and destroy 450 jobs in the community in the valley of Swan River, where they have an opportunity that the entire community has been working towards. Before there is an opportunity for a proposal to be put forward, before there is an opportunity for them to go before a Clean Environment Commission review, they go out and they say that these jobs are not good and this company ought to be stopped.

That is playing politics with people's lives and with jobs.

I will tell the Leader of the Opposition that we, like every other province in Canada, have only one set of statistics to use, and that is provided for us by Statistics Canada. Those statistics that he is quoting are applicable to every province of Canada. If Stats Canada is understating them, then they are understating them for every jurisdiction, but they are the same ones that were used when he was in office last. The methodology has not changed.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, we were very concerned when the federal government cut UI benefits and had a lot of further job reductions in their budget, and now based on certain assumptions from Stats Canada, when we find that the unemployment rate is much higher based on the Finance department of the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, there are less people working today than six years ago in March of 1988. I would simply ask the government in terms of real and actual unemployment, are we going to see an increase in people employed? Are we going to see more people employed than when the government came into office six years ago, because there are less people working with all the selective statistics and all the politics today than when the government was elected? What is the Premier going to do about it in real terms?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, this government is committed to doing everything possible within our power to ensure that there are more people working, and we will indeed do that. We will not be like the New Democrats who are actively out there subverting investment, trying to destroy job creation, a thousand jobs with Ayerst in Brandon, 450 jobs with Louisiana-Pacific in Swan River, actively committed to stop those jobs from coming to Manitoba. The New Democrats ought to be ashamed; they ought to bury their heads in shame rather than come here and talk about job creation. They are phony, and they are two-faced. They are people who do not deserve to be in public office in this province.

Seven Oaks General Hospital Private Home Care Services

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister insisted that nothing new was happening at Seven Oaks Hospital. Today, of course, we find out of that the \$6.2-million cut that we had asked them to confirm yesterday is in fact true and is occurring at Seven Oaks Hospital.

We have also learned that for the first time probably in Canadian history, a private nursing company is undertaking nursing work on the ward of a hospital. I would like to ask the minister, is this now the government's policy to have private nursing companies undertake the work at hospitals?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's question today is actually extremely important, because what the honourable member's question does is that it brings a new dimension to the whole health care reform debate, perhaps in Canada, but certainly here in Manitoba. The honourable member's total opposition to health care reform is disturbing enough, but his question today indicates he has no interest whatsoever in the outcome, in the patient.

* (1015)

What is the best thing for the patient? The honourable member's question has nothing to do with what is the best thing for the patient. The pilot project under way at Seven Oaks Hospital respecting their release program and the use of We Care Services will be something that will be evaluated. I am going to be very interested in that evaluation because, if it demonstrates improved care for patients, I am not going to put on some hidebound mindset and old-fashioned philosophy and say, I do not care about those patients.

I am going to do what is right for the patients of Manitoba.

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that one of the major problems with private nursing companies like We Care providing the service is that after the period of time runs out that We Care provides the service, they go to the

patient and say, you pay or you are cut off? So We Care do not care if you do not pay.

Mr. McCrae: I am sure it is not deliberate, but the honourable member for Kildonan is misleading on this issue when he talks about the patient getting a bill at the end of the project. This project is paid for by Seven Oaks Hospital.

The honourable member should know that We Care and other private agencies in Manitoba employ a variety of direct service providers that includes registered nurses, registered nursing assistants, licensed practical nurses, certified health care aides and orderlies, professional nursing attendants, professional home support workers, and the professionals involved all have to answer to their regulatory agencies and bodies and observe standards that are set by those professional associations.

The honourable member's question is not grounded in any concern for our fellow citizens' care. It is grounded in a hidebound idealistic problem that New Democrats have, and they demonstrate daily in this House.

Mr. Chomiak: The minister is fully aware that we are concerned that patients come ahead of profits, Mr. Speaker.

My final supplementary to the minister is, how does this government reconcile the fact that this week they rejected the recommendations of their own work adjustment committee to retrain some of the more than 400 people who have been laid off in the health care system without work, and yet this government, through, by all things, Workforce 2000, has found money to train people at We Care Home Health Services?

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, again the honourable member's question, that his concern for union leaders by far surpasses any concern he has for his fellow citizens who need care in this province.

His question also indicates that he has confidence in Manitoba's Home Care Program. There are problems associated with our Home Care Program. The honourable member cannot have it both ways.

He brings to my attention problems with respect to the Home Care Program which I acknowledge and have undertaken to do everything in my power to fix, but then on the other hand, he says, but do not do this other pilot project which might, oh Heaven forbid, even improve services for my fellow citizens. He cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

Education System

Common Curriculum—Western Canada

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is for the Minister of Education.

Yesterday the four Atlantic Premiers in Canada proved again that they are light years ahead of the western Premiers in terms of getting together to save taxpayers' dollars and do what is right for the students of that region.

They signed an agreement whereby there would be a common curriculum by 1995 that would be fully implemented by the year 2000. That results in the elimination of duplication across that region, serving students better and also serving the taxpayer.

My question for the Minister of Education. Given that the communiqué of the Atlantic Premiers specifically indicated that this was the result of political attention and political impetus at the cabinet level, where is this minister on the issue of a common curriculum? What is he doing to forge those partnerships in this region of the country, where we need them just as badly as they do in the Atlantic region?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): I thank the member for the question. It is a question that should be discussed and debated in large measure. It has been at the Western Premiers' Conference. Certainly the western Premiers are mindful, as we are, as to some of the accords that have been reached by Atlantic provinces with respect to common curriculum.

Let me say, we are behind in western Canada, and yet we are working towards protocols that have allowed us, for instance, in the area of

mathematics, to be a very short order away from a common curriculum. We have more work to do on some of the other subjects.

* (1020)

But I should point out to the member opposite that Manitoba is pushing probably the hardest of any of the western provinces to try to work towards a common curriculum, but beyond that, I have been challenged by the member's deputy leader with respect to how it is that we are not rebuilding the Curriculum Branch within the department.

Mr. Speaker, part of the reason that we are carefully rebuilding that is trying to take into account a common accord of curriculum building for the western region.

Education System

Common Curriculum—Western Canada

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Perhaps we should have had the agreement before he cut the Curriculum Branch. There is a lot of talk, and there has been for six years, from this government about forging those prairie partnerships, yet our procurement agreement of 1989 between the western provinces still excludes education, excludes health—the two biggest departments in this government—and excludes Crown corporations.

When is this government going to put some muscle into this and show some leadership and get the changes that are necessary to serve the taxpayers in this region and do what is right for students and people all across our provinces as we seek to find ways to pay for public services that everybody wants?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the western provinces have been working on this issue for many years. There have been over 60 examples of current relationships of sharing of services and co-operation that exist today among the western provinces.

The Liberals, of course, on this issue, want to have it all ways. They were just told that the Curriculum Branch is being positioned for this, and they say—

Mr. Edwards: We have not had any curriculum development in this province for many, many years. What this is about in Atlantic Canada is rejuvenating curriculum, and every province will take a lead in a separate area. That is co-operation. That is going to give our children new curriculum. We are doing nothing, and this is a poor excuse for not doing anything to build up our Curriculum Branch here.

My final question for the Premier. Given that he talks—and the communiqués out of the Western Premiers' Conferences always do, and no doubt this one will again—about these agreements that are supposedly in place, can he today indicate when we are going to have a common agreement across the western provinces about curriculum, about developing it together and about doing what is right for the taxpayers in this province across a broad range of spectrums?

Why does Atlantic Canada have those agreements and we do not after six years of supposed work?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the western Premiers do not just talk about it; they do not just issue news releases. They issued a report last year that catalogued the more than 60 existing areas of co-operation. The member opposite may not be interested in reading it because it does not support his political point of view, but I recommend that he read it so that he has some accurate facts before he comes here just with his political grandstanding.

Workforce 2000 Abuses

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, in March 1993, we first raised the issues of the lack of monitoring the companies and trainers involved in Workforce 2000. More than a year later, this third Minister of Education now believes that there were abuses in the program and that training in some cases did not occur. He has tried to hide behind sporting analogies, onside, offside, but it will not wash.

Will the minister tell the House when he first learned of these abuses, what action he has taken, and when will he make public the evaluation of the

program that the Provincial Auditor recommended he do so in December 1993?

* (1025)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, it is the appropriate time—as you know, I was trying to gain your attention anyway. I would like in my response to this question to, of course, reply to the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), who has built a reputation of often bringing unfounded allegations to this House to have his 15 seconds of fame before the camera. I think it is important to bridge both the question put by the honourable member, plus the member for Elmwood, who yesterday drew our attention to Canadian Computer Era limited.

The member should know that in following up the training contract with respect to that company, the Workforce 2000 consultants determined that the company's offices in both Brandon and Winnipeg had been closed. Both training projects were immediately cancelled by the consultants involved, and a decommitment of the proposed provincial support through Workforce 2000 was approved by the co-ordinator of the training incentives component. As a result, Workforce 2000 did not provide any government financial support to Canadian Computer Era related to either of these two proposed initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, again, in response to both members, just a simple phone call will save that member yet again another bout of embarrassment. I ask him to resign. It is shameful how he brings it on.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I have seldom seen a more flagrant abuse of a minister. The minister, if he took as notice a question yesterday—and that is a question I would raise if he had; I do not believe he had—should have simply provided the information.

I did not rise on a point of order to raise that point. We were waiting for the information, but the kind of personal attacks that were in that particular

answer are absolutely unacceptable, and no member of the Legislature should have to put up with that kind of comment from the Minister of Education for raising legitimate matters of public interest, as did the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member does not have a point of order. [interjection] No, there is no point of order, because the honourable minister was responding to the two questions. I did see the honourable minister attempting to get the floor, and the table officers and myself are of the same opinion that the honourable minister had taken a question as notice, going to bring forward that information. [interjection] Order, please. The honourable minister did save us some time by responding to the two members.

Birchwood Auto Dealers

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is also to the Minister of Education (Mr. Manness).

Could he explain the needs assessment that was conducted in his department before granting five separate grants to the Birchwood Motors company, Birchwood Nissan \$10,000; Birchwood Pontiac Buick \$10,000; Birchwood BMW \$10,000; Birchwood Saturn Saab Isuzu \$10,000; Birchwood Honda Centre \$7,750; and Birchwood Honda Centre, a second grant of \$1,800, for a total of approximately \$50,000 to train 29 people for 15 days?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Workforce 2000 program has basically three different levels of entry, and one is the industry sector, where indeed the automobile sector has come in with a broad program and indeed the need. The question that the member asks with respect to individual applications per company, they would come under the umbrella of the request from that industry.

That is one of the areas that I am looking into for review at this point in time.

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, those are not umbrella grants; they come under the individual grants under the \$3-million program.

I would like to ask the minister again: What needs assessment was conducted in order to train in one company, under the guise of five separate grants, most of them at the maximum of \$10,000 to train—\$50,000 when he has cut public schools, when he has cut universities, when he has cut health care facilities, and he is putting \$50,000 into training 29 people for 15 days? Where is the efficiency and accountability of that?

Mr. Manness: Again, the grants were paid out individually, but the acceptance of the grants are accepted on the basis of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, what is so obvious here is that the NDP is totally opposed to market-driven training. The members want to force all of the training into the institutions, but what I find strange, and we are trying to gain greater understanding of this, but the NDP kin in Ontario, who are in government, have brought forward a program that almost mirrors identically this program. Furthermore, not at the level of \$1,300 per training need, as was factored out by this equation, but upwards of \$10,000 in the province of Ontario.

* (1030)

Point of Order

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before I ask my question, it is the minister who should be resigning, because it is his list, his information that we are going on in this House. He has provided false information to a member of this House when he gives us a list indicating these grants were given and the dates and the amounts and so on of the training.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, what the member forgets is that 24 hours make a day, and a day passes on. We had to pass on the information. Of course, they had to have a definitive time stamped on them, and they were as of March 3. That was the best knowledge at that time. But if the member, knowing that time moves on, that maybe on March 4 or 5 or 6, these companies had gone broke and the diligence of the department found that out and

did not pay the cheques out, that is not my fault; that is good government. It is his fault that he would realize the information you have might be dated.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable member for Elmwood, and I am not privy to the information the honourable member does have, but I believe the honourable Minister of Education and Training, on the point of order, has clearly indicated that there is a dispute over the facts. Therefore, the honourable member for Elmwood does not have a point of order. Now, the honourable member for Elmwood, with his question.

Workforce 2000

Trainer Information Request

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): My question is to the Minister of Education in charge of this workforce 2000 program.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen numerous examples of profitable private businesses feeding on the public trough, such as Centra Gas. We have seen a waste of public funds, such as the training of used-car salesmen at Keystone Ford. We have seen an apparent funding of a bankrupt company, but we have to accept the minister's word that they caught it in time.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more horror stories to be discovered in this Workforce 2000 program. We have asked continually for a list of the trainers in this program, and I would like now to once again ask the minister to release the list of trainers and to release us a new list of up-to-date grants.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I guess again I ask the question, why the NDP hate this program so much when it has obviously been so productive and the return has been over 80,000 people trained. It is being adopted as a tremendous training program by other provinces, including the NDP in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have the list of those training. I will attempt to provide the same for the member during Estimates. I will try and give him the detail that the course is associated with any of

his facts, as long as they are based on some substance and not just pulling a thought from the sky and trying to gain some claim to fame in this House.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, last year the former minister, the minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey) presently, while she did not know much about the program, at least gave us a list of the trainers associated with the program. We keep asking this minister for a list of the trainers, and he does not give us a list of the trainers. The reason he does not is because he knows that there are only about 30 or 40 trainers who are backing these—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Your question, please.

Mr. Maloway: My supplementary question to the minister is: Will he release us a list of the 30 or 40 trainers who are backing these thousand or more grants?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have been requested to provide that list. I was well aware that certain members opposite had requested a list of those successful applicants. I provided that to the NDP caucus, I believe, in early April or mid March. I did not know they had requested a list of the trainers. If that had been provided before, I will endeavour to provide that again.

Curriculum—Used-Car Sales

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is to the same minister.

We have been asking for a list of the curriculum that the car dealers are using to train the used-car salesmen. We would like to know on this side of the House, what sort of curriculum is this government advancing for the training of these used-car salespeople?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way in this Question Period. We started with the most serious issue of the day in Canada, and that is unemployment. We come right back down to the member for Elmwood who wants me to provide used-car salesmen curriculum. I do not know of what he speaks.

Education System Funding Formula

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, while this Minister of Education is throwing around money, taxpayers' dollars, to train used-car salesmen, he is cutting school divisions in this province two years in a row. School divisions like Transcona have been cut severely over the last two years, Lord Selkirk, Agassiz, Interlake, Evergreen, Rhineland, all of these school divisions, and he says that his system of funding, his funding formula is fair and that funding is not an issue.

I want to ask this minister today: In light of those consecutive cuts that are devastating for the children in those school divisions that I just named, what action is this minister going to take to alleviate the impact of his cuts?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, we are putting today in government \$750 million thereabouts into the public school system. On a per capita or per student basis, we are amongst the highest ranking in the land. Beyond that, we have a formula that has been in place now for three years. It attempts, in the fairest way possible, to take finite amounts of money, in this case \$750 million, and to spread it evenly across all school divisions.

This year there has been an impact of reassessment, which of course, has withheld funds from those school divisions which are deemed to be wealthier. It is the fairness model that all the members of the House supported when we brought in the reassessment act.

The formula is working. The same school divisions that the member recites have not presented themselves to government on a shortfall basis when the formula was working to their advantage, the new formula over the last two years before this. So I say, given all of these circumstances, we have no alternative but to support the formula at this point in time.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, how ludicrous can this minister be in his effort to keep this so-called formula pure when a division like Interlake, which is the fourth lowest expenditure per pupil division

in the province, is being cut two years in a row by this minister? What kind of fairness is there in this minister's formula?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, as the member would know, one of the very important variables of the formula is equalization. We have moved a considerable distance in bringing in the new formula to again adopt the equalization model and to help divisions such as the member brings forward because of the fact that they do have a low assessment per pupil.

The very basis of fairness is that you take from those that have higher assessment and you move it through the formula to those that have lower assessment. The formula does that.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that this minister is refusing to acknowledge the hardship on children, 30 staff being cut in Transcona, 47.5, nearly 10 percent of the workforce in Lord Selkirk, will this minister now, before the budget is tabled, stop wasting money on Workforce 2000, tell the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) that he has made a mistake and ask for those dollars to be reallocated to the public education system and help those children?

Mr. Manness: The member opposite has been around the cabinet table, and he knows that there are tradeoffs in decisions. What we are talking about now is putting \$5 million to \$7 million into Workforce 2000 for training.

I dare say to you that members opposite, in all of their speeches to this point on the throne speech, have all talked about training and how important it is that government have dollars in support of that, yet when we put three-quarters of a billion, \$750 million, into support of the public school system, the support of 195,000 students, the members say we are not doing a priority job of allocating our scarce resources.

* (1040)

I say we are doing a very good job of allocating our resources.

Seven Oaks General Hospital Private Home Care Services

Ms. Avis Gray (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health this morning speaks of a new dimension to the health care debate, and he talks about this new dimension going to possibly improve health care in Manitoba. Unfortunately, this new dimension will threaten patient care.

The department's own studies, specifically about personal care homes, profit versus nonprofit personal care homes, clearly show that there is higher incidence of problems in profit personal care homes. The most recent study done in December of '93 shows that.

Can the minister tell this House, given what he should know and what the department knows about profit versus nonprofit in the human services, in the health services, how can he reconcile these facts with the fact that we now have a pilot project at Seven Oaks Hospital with a profit home care service?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): In the case the honourable member refers, personal care, I do not think the issue is profit versus nonprofit. The issue is regulation and standards and making sure those standards and regulations are adhered to. That is why just a few days ago I told the honourable member that with the help of the Seniors Directorate and the Department of Family Services and my department, we are going to be examining all those issues.

You cannot conclude, if because of changes in the level of acuity in this province, questions arise about safety and those kinds of things. You cannot assume because that happens that it becomes a private versus public debate. That is the trap that the honourable member is dangerously close to falling into and falling in there with the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak).

Home Care Program Status Report

Ms. Avis Gray (Crescentwood): The rules and regulations in personal care homes, profit and nonprofit, are identical, yet the profit personal care

homes still have higher incidence and more concerns about quality of care.

But the real issue—the question is, can the minister tell us, what does he plan to do about his own Home Care Program, given that it has to be in a shambles when the Seven Oaks Hospital feels that they can more cost-efficiently hire a private group rather than relying on the home care service that the province is running? Can he tell us what he plans to do about his Home Care Program, or are we going to go the way of the former minister of Health—

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

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): I think I answered that question a little while ago, when I was responding to the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak). I have acknowledged that in the Home Care Program, there is room for improvement in the co-ordination of our services. I have come to the conclusion that we have a bureaucracy in the Department of Health that could serve the public better and could co-ordinate our services better, and so that when I attempt to make the changes and improvements in those areas of home care, I hope to do that with the co-operation of the honourable member. But unlike the honourable member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), the member for Kildonan wants to have it all ways. He wants to criticize the Home Care Program and then criticize those who try to improve on it.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Health tell us today, what specifically is he doing to look at the entire system of discharge planning in the hospitals in this province to ensure that when someone should be discharged from a hospital, there is a VON service or a home care service that is available to those individuals? What is he doing today to ensure that discharge planning happens appropriately?

Mr. Manness: Earlier, in Question Period, the honourable member for Kildonan raised the pilot project at Seven Oaks. That is an example of what we are doing to improve the discharge situation for

people getting into Home Care. I am very anxious to see the evaluation of that program, because if that is an improvement for people, we can get into more of that or we can use our own Home Care staff from the lessons we have learned from that pilot project to learn improved discharge procedures and expedited home care services being available.

I do not think the honourable member for Crescentwood is suggesting that we forget altogether about trying to learn how to improve the system, because I am very interested in improving the system, and I do not do it with a union mindset.

Infrastructure Works Agreement Transcona Flood Relief Project

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, we will all remember the horrible flooding that we suffered last summer, and I think we will also remember that no community in Winnipeg suffered more greatly than south Transcona and the hardship that this community has faced. There would be no community that is more deserving of funds under the infrastructure program than this community for flood protection.

I would like to ask the minister responsible for administering this agreement, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), if the minister can explain the procedure for how the City of Winnipeg is going to be administering funds and selecting projects under this program to receive funding so that it is based on merit and fair criteria.

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): I think most members in this Chamber know that the initial allocation of funds from the infrastructure program is on the basis of \$60 million to the City of Winnipeg for traditional municipal projects, \$60 million to rural Manitoba for traditional municipal projects and approximately \$80 million for strategic initiatives throughout all of Manitoba.

From within the municipal portions, we are relying on the municipalities themselves to bring forward what they consider the priority projects, but certainly, how we are dealing with the City of Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg is coming forward with projects under residential street renewal,

regional street renewal, sewer and water projects and so on. They obviously have the first-hand knowledge of what their greatest needs are in Winnipeg. They obviously have the data on the requirements within Winnipeg, and we are basically relying on their system to provide the recommendations of what they think are the highest priorities.

It does ultimately require approval of both levels of government, the federal government and the provincial government, so we do have a final say. By and large, we are relying on their data and their expertise.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, does the minister have any information that would explain why this particular project in south Transcona for flood relief was removed from the list of projects? Can he explain then what can be done to ensure that this project, a very deserving project, is going to receive funds in the next round of funding from the infrastructure program?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, I did have an opportunity to discuss this matter yesterday with the member for Radisson. I did suggest to her that she contact the chairman of Works and Operations for the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Terry Duguid, who is one of the councillors responsible for this initiative on behalf of the City of Winnipeg. I did also undertake that from our government, I would ask questions and inquire where that project does appear in terms of their sense of priorities and provide her with that information upon receipt.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

NONPOLITICAL STATEMENT

Manitoba Winter Games—Thompson Family Participation

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, might I have leave for a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, 1994 is the International Year of the Family. Just about two weeks ago, Thompson very successfully hosted the Manitoba Winter Games. In the runup to the Manitoba Winter Games, I had the distinct honour of attending the central region rally for participants going to Thompson for the games.

At that, since it was the International Year of the Family, I presented to a couple of families certificates for their participation, because one family in particular had four members entered into the alpine skiing event. There was the grandmother, Ann Gallie, who was in the seniors competition. Both the mother and father, Liz and Bob Moffat, were entered in the 40-plus adult class, and their daughter, Andrea, was entered in one of the junior classes of competition.

Mr. Speaker, that by itself is really, if you think about it, quite remarkable, where three generations of one family would still be actively participating as winners in their regions in Alpine skiing. I think the really good news, and where this House would want to congratulate the whole family, is their incredible success at the Thompson winter games: Ann Gallie won the gold in the senior women's alpine skiing event; Liz Moffat won the gold medal in the 40-plus women's category; her husband, Bob Moffat, won the silver; and their daughter, Andrea, won the silver in her category.

I know all members of the House would want to join in congratulating the family and their tremendous success in the Year of the Family.

* (1050)

Speaker's Statement

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Prior to Orders of the Day, I have a statement for the House. It concerns Written Questions, because today we have on the Order Paper a written question, and because our rules provide limited information about written questions and because much of how the process works depends on practice, I am making a brief statement for the record.

The MLA first files notice of a written question with the Journals Clerk. Two days later, the written question appears on the Notice Paper. Two days

after that, the written question appears on the Order Paper, and that is the point that we are at today. No action is taken by the House the day the written question appears on the Order Paper, and the minister responsible for the area which the question addresses is expected to take note of it and initiate the appropriate action. When the reply to the written question is prepared, the minister or the government House leader tables it in the House under Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. Unanswered written questions are listed on the Order Paper every two weeks. That is just for clarification.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East) -

- When did the government decide to have McKenzie Seeds enter into discussions with other companies respecting a partnership arrangement?

- Why has McKenzie Seeds received several offers at the same time?

- What are the names of the interested companies?

- Has the Minister met with any representatives of the interested companies? If so, what are their names and titles?

Is it correct that reference to a "Golden Share" provision implies that McKenzie Seeds will be in a junior position subject to the decisions of the senior partner?

- When will the proposed partnership deal or arrangement be completed?

- What parameters of negotiation has the minister given to the Board of McKenzie Seeds?

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(Sixth Day of Debate)

Mr. Speaker: The adjourned debate, the sixth day of debate, on the proposed motion of the honourable member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine), for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, in answer to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed motion of the honourable Leader of the official

opposition (Mr. Doer) in amendment thereto as follows, the matter is open.

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to have the opportunity to respond to the throne speech. It is again a pleasure to welcome you back. I always look forward to your guidance, and, in particular, I must say I welcome the opportunity to work with you in my role as Deputy Speaker. I would also extend my sincere appreciation to your office, the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk and all of the staff of the Clerk's Office, Hansard staff, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms for their assistance and co-operation extended to me during my role as Deputy Speaker.

I would like to welcome all the honourable members back to the Chamber and particularly extend a sincere welcome to our five new members: the honourable member for Osborne (Ms. McCormick), the honourable member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg), the honourable member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski), the honourable member for St. Johns (Mr. Macintosh) and the honourable member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson).

I would also like to welcome the six young people who have been selected as Pages during this session of the Legislature. I sincerely appreciate your assistance and co-operation and hope that the time you spend in this Chamber indeed will be a valuable learning experience for you.

As always it is a pleasure to speak on behalf of the constituents of Seine River, for without their support I would not be here today. During the past three and a half years, I have greatly valued the input they have given me on a vast array of issues, and I have used this role to guide me in my role as their representative.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention, as I am sure it has to all honourable members in this Chamber, that one of the serious problems faced by all governments is the massive debts that have been compounding and compounding. If our provincial debt today was split up equally between

each citizen of our province, each person would owe more than \$5,500, and that is not a very good legacy to be leaving to our children and our grandchildren.

In a large part, this wasteful and irresponsible spending was a direct result of successive NDP administrations during the 1980s. Even during those years, when the revenue growth in our province reached a high of 16 to 17 percent, the NDP governments of the day still managed to spend more than they received in revenue. Ironically, the deficit actually increased during those years.

Government simply cannot afford all of the programs which it became involved in during the times when they were beneficiaries of higher revenues. As the government dollar becomes even tighter, pressure on all governments grows to continue to provide all the services which began in a different era, one we can all remember when money was easier to come by.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the discomforts associated with government belt tightening in these tough economic times. I would like to share with the House some of the benefits Manitoba is beginning to experience as a result of this government's fiscally responsible economic management.

Throughout this period, when governments across this country responded to their own fiscal woes by dipping the grisly hand of government even deeper into the pockets of its citizens, this government has stood alone in freezing taxes for six straight years. Prosperity is not created by government; it can only be taxed away by government. My constituents continually tell me that they cannot afford to pay anymore.

A far more proactive role for government to play in these times is to create a positive environment for prosperity to exist. The first and foremost rule in doing this is to hold the line on taxes. By putting money back into the taxpayers of Manitoba, the citizens of this province are showing their confidence in this government and the economy

and are proving it through their willingness to invest their own money here.

I read this morning, and I heard on a news broadcast this morning, that indeed the real estate business is once again booming in Manitoba. I suggest to you that that, once again, is a level of confidence that both homeowners and the real estate industry have in our Manitoban economy.

In assessments by national investing agencies, Manitoba is the place to be when it comes to job creation and economic growth, due in large part to the favourable business climate that this government has created in this province. This government leads the nation when it comes to creating the conditions for economic growth, both through holding the line on taxes and through very successful job creation programs, contrary to what the opposition is trying to apply. Some of these programs include Grow Bonds, REDI, Workforce 2000. In fact, I have had very positive calls from a number of employers who have said that they think the Workforce 2000 program has been more than beneficial, and they indeed have been able to hire more employees as a direct result of this program.

Investors are also returning to Manitoba. Last year, capital investment and manufacturing grew by 40.3 percent, and Manitoba is leading the way to recovery. Under the steady direction of our Premier, this government has created a healthy business and social environment that has laid the basis for continued growth in the future.

Mr. Speaker, though I do not deny that many challenges remain for us as a province and as a government, I am proud of the accomplishments of this government. When first elected, this government set some very lofty goals for itself, to create a more favourable climate for business, to create a leaner and more responsive government, and to give Manitobans the confidence in themselves to build this province to its potential. By freezing taxes through six consecutive budgets and setting an example through careful attention to government expenditure, this government indeed has set Manitoba on the road to long-term prosperity.

In the past year I have had the opportunity to visit a number of schools in my constituency, and this opportunity provided me a lot of insight. I spoke to teachers, parents and students, and I listened to their concerns about the education system in general. As a former educator and a proud grandmother of four preschool boys, I am deeply concerned about education. My constituency is comprised primarily of young families who have children in the public school system.

The parents in my constituency continually tell me that they want quality education for their children and they want changes to the current educational system. I also have parents in my constituency who have children in the independent school system, and they, too, know that a lot of the criticism received is indeed not true.

* (1100)

I would like to share with the House some excerpts from a letter I received from a constituent who has children in the independent school system, and I quote:

I take great exception to comments by Mr. Ron Banister, president-designate of the Manitoba Teachers' Society. Mr. Banister commented that this increase in funding is gutting the public school system, then turning around and using that money to fund elitist private schools.

Mr. Banister should take a stroll down the halls of Christ The King School, and I would suggest that his opinion of our elitist school would be changed dramatically. A stroll through Holy Cross, St. John Brebeuf or St. Emile's will also be eye openers to the modest surroundings of these so-called elitist schools.

The halls of Christ The King are ones that were painted by parents who gave of their time and efforts the entire last summer. Our ventilation system is constantly being repaired by other committed parents. We have a part-time caretaker, and all other janitorial work is carried out by the parents. Our parent association held monthly fund raisers last year that allowed us to replace our only television that required a screwdriver to turn it on.

We have one outdated computer shared among 160 students. Our library is old and sparse, and we are continually attempting to update it.

Most disturbing of all, however, is the fact that our seven teachers have not received a pay increase in three years due to lack of funds. The teachers' personal commitment to their students continues despite their financial sacrifice. The ongoing financial support from Christ The King Parish and the Lennox Club are what allow our school to survive yet still operate at a near deficit position.

It may be argued by Mr. Banister and others that it was our decision to send our child to an independent school, and this is true. However, the fact remains that some 11,450 students in the independent schools would then be in the public school system. This would, in fact, cost taxpayers additional expenditures for more schools, more teachers, more textbooks, busses, librarians and custodians, et cetera. It would cost the public school system an additional public school funding amount of \$1,205 per student or \$13.7 million that is currently the public schools' windfall.

As a taxpayer, this funding inequity has always disturbed me. We are the public, and we are taxpayers too. We are outraged that our neighbours' children reap the full benefits of their educational and bussing tax dollars, yet we only reap 63.5 percent. We pay the same taxes plus tuition and bussing and follow the same educational standards set forth by the government. If fairness and equity are the issues, then independent school taxpayers should in reality be reimbursed for their portion of public school taxes that they are not using.

Our primary concern above all is our children's education and future. We have chosen a school whose reputation for their commitment to academics and Christian values appeals to us. Elitist, we are not.

I think it was important, Mr. Speaker, that I share excerpts from this letter with the members of this Chamber to show that there are two sides to this very important issue. Above all, I personally

believe that all parents have the right to be able to make a choice and that choice should be solely theirs.

As a former educator in the public school system and the mother of two sons who were educated in the public school system, and I have frequent contact with former colleagues of mine, I know that changes must be made to improve the current education system. The parents that I have spoken to want input, they want change, and our government is providing them with that opportunity.

I would like to speak for a few moments now on a subject that is very important to many people in Winnipeg and throughout Manitoba, and that is youth violence. Recently, in a meeting with my constituents, I was made aware that the River Park South area of my constituency has experienced a substantial increase in vandalism and property crimes. My residents have worked hard to be able to acquire what is, in numerous instances, their first home, and the loss of their private possessions they have worked so hard to acquire has been very traumatic.

The police have indicated that most of these crimes have been perpetrated by youth. I am pleased, as are my constituents, that this government is taking a positive, proactive position on youth crime. A number of my constituents attended that youth crime forum and expressed their sentiments in terms of wanting governments to ensure that young offenders indeed were better dealt with.

Increasing violence on the streets of our province does not have to be a problem. Our government realizes this and is taking action to help eliminate that violence. All Manitobans place a high value on the safety and security of their homes. They have every right to expect their government to take a strong stand against those whose actions threaten public safety and make some Manitobans afraid to venture out onto our streets. We have all been paying for crime for far too long.

The government is going to see young offenders become more responsible for their actions. One way of achieving this objective is to deny driver's licences to individuals under the age of eighteen who have had numerous convictions. I am also encouraged that our government has continued to press the federal government to strengthen the Young Offenders Act, with emphasis on parental responsibility because safety and respect start in the home.

The antiviolence message is now being taken into the schools to complement education received in the home. It is unfortunate that some young offenders have not had the benefit of an environment in which values and respect are part of daily life. With this in mind, our government established a plan to redefine these values by the utilization of wilderness camps designed specifically for these young offenders.

I believe that if we work together we can put an end to the cycle of violence. Safety, value and respect begin at home. What we learn at home is carried out onto the streets. Soon, hopefully, antiviolence and anticrime will be a way of life for Manitobans.

Over the weekend I had the opportunity to work together with a number of my constituents on my annual spring fashion show and brunch. In keeping with 1994 being the International Year of the Family, the theme of this year's show was Taking the Family to Heart. This year's recipient of the entire net proceeds is the Manitoba Heart and Stroke Foundation. With the help of so many, including a number of members of my government and their families, the event was again a great success and in support of a very good cause.

We were fortunate this year to have as one of our celebrity models, Maureen Baraneiski, Manitoba's first heart transplant recipient. In fact, Sunday was, to the exact day, the 11th day of the anniversary of her having received her heart transplant. The excitement she shows towards life and the positive attitude she brings to everything she does should serve as an example to all of us. It was a pleasure for me to have been able to work with Maureen and so many other committed volunteers to

achieve a common and worthwhile goal which benefits so many in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to make some comments about International Year of the Family, which is, as most of you know, very dear to my heart.

* (1110)

I have had the chance to work with many hardworking and dedicated Manitobans in my position as chair of the Ambassador Committee of the Premier's Family Year '94 Volunteer Council. Through this initiative we are seeking to involve as many people as possible in projects which augment the priority to which family issues are given and to help address some of the problems which families encounter in the 1990s. It is especially important now in light of the changing role of the family and all of the pressures that are impinging on the ability of families to function in these changing times.

What I have seen so far in working with and talking to families throughout this province is that there exists an eagerness among so many in our society to put increased emphasis on the family.

The United Nations designated 1994 as the International Year of the Family in response to worldwide representation led by the International Federation for Home Economists. As is customary, the United Nations invited member nations to participate in the year. Nations were encouraged to celebrate the strength that we derive from our families. To examine the role of all families in our world, Canada as a U.N. member accepted that invitation. There are two vehicles for promoting the involvement of our country in the International Year of the Family, and it is regrettable that the Liberal Leader is not in the House at this particular point in time, but I hope he is listening intently. [interjection] I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) is indeed listening to this explanation of International Year of the Family. I wonder if he is aware that the federal government has provided \$2.1 million in grant funding to the Canada committee for International Year of the

Family. A federal co-ordinating office within Health Canada encourages government participation and support. The Canada committee for IYF works with national nonprofit organizations and corporations promoting partnerships to deliver conferences, raise awareness and publish discussion materials.

Canada also invited each province to develop their own plans and participate in IYF. Alberta, building on their existing Premier's council in support of Alberta families, are focusing on an 18-region series of forums; registered events and activities cover a wide spectrum of sectors and interests. British Columbia, through support to the B.C. council on the family, is involving the entire west coast in IYF activities. The remaining provinces are also involved. I believe Quebec also has an IYF secretariat and has designated considerable dollars to promoting IYF.

The remaining provinces are all involved at both the government and at the community level. Municipalities throughout Canada have focused on how to make our cities more family friendly. Manitoba, in particular, has responded to the U.N. invitation to honour and recognize the important role of family in our lives. Our involvement is distinctive in a number of respects.

I was very disappointed that the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) was so critical of the International Year of the Family initiative. I, for one, know that one member of his own caucus does not necessarily share those views. The honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) has been very co-operative and supportive. His constituency, the St. Boniface community, not only requested and was granted strong representation on our volunteer council, but the honourable member for St. Boniface himself has actively participated in promoting Family Year '94.

I also want to express my appreciation to the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) and the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) for their very positive comments regarding the International Year of the Family. The member for Swan River made a very valid

point regarding the sacrifices that members of this House have to make in terms of having quality time to spend with members of their own families.

I was equally disappointed when the Liberal Leader implied that the only information he has received from me was a list to purchase materials—not true. I have supplied him with volumes of information and all of the explanations and ideas and suggestions, in fact including a list of the community events that are taking place in his own constituency and who have all themed them after International Year of the Family and focused on the family.

I would also like to explain to the honourable member for St. James, with reference to his comments about a list to acquire supplies, the reason our volunteer council established a merchandise program, one of our nation's obligations to the United Nations is to contribute to the International Year of the Family Voluntary Fund. As a nation and a province, we face our own economic challenges. Our situation, however, pales in comparison to many other regions.

There are emerging nations that do not have the contributors or the volunteer infrastructures that we have to rely on. The Family Year '94 Merchandise Program was established to honour our obligation to the U.N. Voluntary Fund and utilize remaining revenues for family supportive endeavours in our own province. A percentage of all funds raised will indeed be going back to the United Nations International Year of the Family Voluntary Fund. Many nonprofit organizations are involved in fundraising, and they may use this merchandising vehicle to support their own individual voluntary efforts.

Just a comment with relation to regarding grants. Very few jurisdictions are providing grants. International Youth Year itself, which is the federal program, indeed does have a large grant program. In Manitoba, Family Year does not provide grants for involvement. Communities and organizations are asked to incorporate their commitment to Family Year '94 within their customary events, activities, festivals, fairs and forums.

I also take strong exception to the Liberal Leader's comments when referring to my family, and I quote: "The Conservative family, Madam Deputy Speaker, obviously means you have to be perfectly healthy and you got to have lots of money and if you are lucky your kids are in private school,"

An Honourable Member: Did he say that?

Mrs. Dacquay: He said that, and I am quoting right from Hansard.

I am a Conservative, and I am proud to be a Conservative. My family is the most important thing in my life. We have not always enjoyed perfect health; we do not have lots of money; and both my husband and I have worked for over 30 years to raise and educate two sons through the public education school system. We have lived in the same modest home, 1,100 square-foot home, for over 20 years, and prior to that we rented a home because we did not have adequate funds for a down payment on a home.

My concerns, however, go beyond my immediate family. That is why I willingly became involved in the International Year of the Family '94. The extensive work of involving the entire province in Family Year has been achieved through the volunteer efforts of 18 Family Year '94 council members and their 11 volunteer committees. The tremendous volunteer networks in Manitoba have been the key catalyst in involving an entire province. Home economists, recreation directors, faith communities, 4-H clubs, multicultural communities, seniors clubs, independent living organizations, corporations and the media have all partnered to reaffirm our province's commitment to family during 1994.

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

As ambassadors, a number of members of this Chamber have made contributions to Family Year '94, and for that contribution I thank them. We have distributed information; we have built awareness through our speaking engagements and opportunities; we have worked alongside our communities as they developed their own plans.

Some of our offices have helped assist by being utilized as material depots so that people in the community do not always have to come down to the Legislature to pick up their supplies and materials to which they have ready access through the Family Year Secretariat.

*(1120)

Throughout Manitoba countless innovative and thoughtful involvements in Family Year '94 are underway. Manitobans, their communities and organizations are celebrating the accomplishments we have achieved for our own families and those families in need of a hand. In responding to the challenges facing families, Manitobans on all fronts are seeking new pathways. The outcome of the discussions, debates and exchanges will guide the course for families as we look beyond 1994. To date over 25 different forums have examined a wide range of topics and issues facing our families. Our efforts during 1994 serve to re-energize our commitment to strengthening the foundation of our families, the well-being of our communities and the future for our province.

Manitoba was built by the hard work and the dedication of our pioneers. Clearly that spirit still exists in our province and I am proud to say especially in the Seine River constituency.

I commend the Seine River residents for making our community such a great place to live and raise a family. I believe that through a commitment to these values and the determination to see it through, the residents of Seine River and all of Manitoba hold the key to making our province great.

It has been a pleasure to serve the residents of Seine River in this House, and on behalf of my constituents I look forward to the continuing opportunities to listen to the concerns of my people and work diligently to see that these concerns are addressed. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Harry Schellenberg (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, it is with great honour that I rise to speak on the throne speech. Few Manitobans get the opportunity to represent and serve their fellow

Manitobans in the Chamber. I am privileged to serve the people of Rossmere and will continue to work with them and for them.

I would like to thank you for being very personable and giving new members such a warm welcome to the Legislature. You and other members from both sides of the House have been of great assistance and have made me feel very welcome in this short time.

I have learned from my colleagues that you have shown fairness in chairing the debates of this House. I look forward to working with you, and I thank you for your guidance and patience with new members.

I would also like to draw your attention to the Pages of the House. I congratulate them for their appointments. I hope that your duties will be a great experience for you.

I must give special attention to the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), our Leader on this side of the House. I personally thank him for making me feel part of his team and for the personal assistance he has provided to me. I am deeply honoured to be part of the official opposition.

I must acknowledge the support of my family in my new career. I thank my wife and my teen-age son and daughter for all their support which has made the transition to a new career possible. I must also thank the hundreds of Rossmere residents from all walks of life who worked so hard for me in the by-election.

I would also like to welcome all the new members, and I look forward to their contribution to the debate of this Assembly. I would like to welcome the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson), the members for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh), Osborne (Ms. McCormick) and The Maples (Mr. Kowalski).

Being a member of the Manitoba Legislature was not something I ever thought about in my youth. My parents emigrated to Canada in 1930 from Europe and settled on a family farm near Boissevain in the southwestern region of Manitoba. I grew up on the family farm and after

completing high school, I began my teaching career in a one-room school near Carman. After five years of teaching in a one-room school, I taught in Carman, Melita and Morden before I began teaching at River East Collegiate in '69 until the present.

I am very proud of my long teaching career. The teaching profession is a fine profession which I certainly enjoyed over the years. I will remember the many friendships which developed with teachers and students.

I realize that there are several members of this House besides myself who have been and still are a part of this profession. I must take this opportunity to point out that the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) was a student in my history class at the River East Collegiate. I am proud of the fact that an MLA graduated from River East Collegiate. The honourable member was a strong academic student who excelled in athletics, and I look forward to working with the member for Radisson in this Assembly.

I must also point out that the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) was my professor in postgraduate studies at the University of Manitoba some years ago. I appreciate working with the member for Wolseley in this House.

I should also make note of some of the distinguished predecessors in Rossmere. The Honourable Edward Schreyer was the first NDP Premier and later served as Governor-General and continues to serve this province and this country in a number of functions. Vic Schroeder served as Finance minister and Trade minister. Harold Neufeld was also a cabinet minister and a distinguished cabinet minister.

All of these MLAs have represented the constituency of Rossmere very well. All my predecessors were dedicated to serving the people of Rossmere.

As an MLA, I hope to represent and serve the people of Rossmere with the same dedication and integrity as my predecessors. There is always a danger that we might forget certain people when

we get elected. I would like to say I will not favour one group over another.

The social and economic problems of society manifest themselves in today's classrooms. As a teacher, I know firsthand the challenges teachers and students face these days. I have made a pledge that I would not forget my colleagues in the classroom and therefore look forward to working with you to provide better working conditions for teachers across this province so our students will not be shortchanged.

One question that has been asked many times since I have been elected is, why did you run for public office? As a teacher of Canadian history for many years, I was constantly in contact with the provincial and national affairs, and many discussions with students and colleagues kept me in tune with current issues. My personal interest in how government works drew me closer to political life.

Pioneers of our movement such as J.S. Woodsworth, Tommy Douglas, Stanley Knowles were an inspiration to me from a young age. The values and beliefs of these pioneers ran parallel to the values of my own upbringing and cultural background. The movement of Woodsworth and Douglas which was passed on to later generations had a direct impact on the development of this province and this country.

As new immigrants at the beginning of the Depression, my parents had a difficult time supporting a large family. Programs such as medicare, pensions, Pharmacare were very important to people like my parents in retirement. The work of Woodsworth and Douglas has touched many people in many ways in this province and in this country. The community, church and family had always taught me to show compassion to the less fortunate. In my youth I was taught that everyone was my neighbour and that thinking began to manifest itself in my political thinking. I began to accept the view of Ed Schreyer that government was an instrument used to improve the quality of life of our citizens. He believed the government should play a role in the

economy of this province and bring about more equity amongst Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I want to make is that the work of Woodsworth, Douglas, Knowles, Schreyer is gradually being eroded or dismantled when one looks at what is happening to our health care system, Pharmacare, workers' compensation, pensions and so on.

* (1130)

It is for this reason that I agreed to run for office. We must protect the great work of these pioneers and not let their great works disappear. One only has to read the headlines to know that this is happening. Just this morning's newspaper is saying that home care is being privatized. Over the last ten years or so the neo-conservative forces have led us to believe that there is no other choice than to dismantle the safety net. Today it seems that governments are doing things to us and not for us. It is for this reason that many people are becoming disillusioned with government. We as a society are judged by how we treat others. Therefore we must develop a vision of a more compassionate society and not forget our neighbours.

I would now like to speak about Rossmere constituency which supported me in the last election. Rossmere is basically located in north-east Winnipeg along the Red River. Rossmere is a multicultural constituency that has people from many nations of the world. The largest group is of British stock, but it is also known for its heavy concentration of Ukrainian and Mennonite people. North Kildonan is known for its settlement of Mennonites who began to arrive in the 1930s.

The constituency is also known for many new immigrants in the last 20 years. The new immigrants come from such places as El Salvador, Guatemala, Chile, Poland, Russia, Germany, Hong Kong, Trinidad, Jamaica, India, Philippines, Italy, Paraguay, Portugal and many others. But, if one drives through North and East Kildonan, one also sees place names of the Selkirk settlers, who were the first permanent settlers in what is today Manitoba. Names such as Kildonan Drive,

Douglas Avenue, Dunrobin Avenue, Miles Macdonell Collegiate are Scottish names from Scotland. But, as one mentions Miles Macdonell, who was the first governor of the Selkirk settlement, we must also recognize Chief Peguis, who has a school named in his honour. It was Chief Peguis and his people who assisted the first settlers with food, shelter, and sanctuary during their early years, which were difficult. So today native place names are seen in North Kildonan in recognition of their contribution to people in the area. First Nation people and Metis continue to live and participate in the life of the community today.

Our caucus is a reflection of the cultural make-up of Manitoba. Our caucus is truly enriched by the diversity of people from all over Manitoba, which includes northern, rural and urban MLAs. The relationship, however, amongst these people of various backgrounds is outstanding. The schools of the River East School Division are just an example of the racial harmony that exists. Languages other than the two official languages, such as Ukrainian and German, have been well received, and French immersion has also been accepted in the schools quite readily.

Probably the best example of racial harmony is acceptance and respect shown to Japanese-Canadians during and after World War II. We all know the history of the Japanese-Canadians during these difficult years. After World War II, many Japanese-Canadians remained in North Kildonan because they felt accepted and well treated by their neighbours. As a result of this, several families have remained in North Kildonan and have made this their home. This is truly a respect for the diversity of Manitoba right in North Kildonan.

Rossmere is basically composed of hardworking middle class neighbourhoods. Most of Rossmere was developed at least 25 years ago and, therefore, is not a new suburb. A large number of senior citizens live in Rossmere, and senior citizens and senior apartment blocks are increasing across the constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out some of the concerns of the people of Rossmere. It

certainly was more evident in the last by-election that health care was, and is, the major concern of the people of Rossmere. Concordia Hospital was front and centre throughout the by-election campaign. The use of the CAT scan and the closing of the emergency department were topics at the doorstep. Despite promising last August to finally open the CAT scan at Concordia Hospital, the government has only recently allowed greater use of it for inpatient use only. There have been no announcements on the status of the emergency department. Even a change in Health ministers has not changed the direction of health care.

Pharmacare is just another concern for senior citizens, but the cuts to Home Care remain the greatest concern. The \$3 million cut to Home Care eroded vital health care services to the elderly and disabled.

The NDP started Home Care because it is cost-efficient, allows people to live independently and with dignity. Manitobans fear that the health care system will be Americanized and privatized. The bed closures, budget cuts, staff layoffs and privatizing our personal care homes for profits all point to the Americanization of our health care system.

Manitobans value good quality health care. The work done by the pioneers of our movement could be wiped out in a few short years if we do not speak out on behalf of Manitobans. As you all know this is the International Year of the Family and various public events have taken place where brochures, ribbons and buttons have been handed out in support of the family.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud these efforts, but there is another issue that runs counter to the family and that is the gambling policy of this government, a policy which undermines the family.

There seems to be a contradiction in policy here. The people of Rossmere have great concerns about the direction of gambling in this province. I received many phone calls at my constituency office on this issue. VLTs have penetrated our residential neighbourhoods, and there seems to be no end to this expansion.

The government has not allowed people to have input into the expansion policies of gambling. The government is also withholding information from the public regarding the five-year plan for expansion and gambling addiction reports. The gambling policies are attacking the very fabric of our society, the family. The family is the basic unit of society which provides love, care, social and economic support to one another.

Gambling can erode one of the most important institutions in our society. We have all heard tragic stories of people who have lost their possessions, their families, their jobs due to gambling addiction.

Another very important institution that is under great stress and difficulty is the educational system. Over the years our public school system has served our society very well, but today the schools are facing many of the same problems that manifest themselves in the rest of society. We must realize that the economic and social conditions of the 1990s are different than the 1960s and '70s, and this in turn has created problems for teachers and students in the classrooms.

Teachers across this province are having a very difficult time coping with all the problems that they must deal with in the classroom. Just recently an arbitration board chairperson in an arbitration award stated more than any other profession teachers have the ability to shape the future.

As society has changed and traditional values and families have been eroded or altered, teachers have taken up a social burden which is often in conflict with their academic duties. This work is no longer defined by curriculum. Stress is manifestly a problem. Burnout is a reality confirmed by the early retirement figures. Also in the award a statement of principle has been asserted, saying schools need to have a working environment free from physical violence, verbal abuse or the threat of physical assault.

* (1140)

Mr. Speaker, this award is a good indication of the state of our schools and what teachers are facing in the classroom. We must address the problems in the classroom before we do anything

else. The schools in the past have done very well and have been pillars that our society was built upon.

Often we look for complex solutions to our problems, and often the answers are right within our own communities. School authorities and the government of the day must work with parents and teachers to solve these problems, because our children are being shortchanged. The focus must be on strong educational leadership in our schools. New programs or new technology is not the whole answer to the crisis in the classroom. We must support the classroom teachers so that they can carry out their professional duties. Often classroom teachers feel that school authorities and the government do not understand and appreciate the difficult tasks they face and, as a result, feel frustrated and defeated.

To compound the problem in the classroom, Bill 22 and the cutbacks have given teachers more classes and larger classes. As a result of the cutbacks and working conditions, schools are losing some of the extracurricular activities that are of great importance to students. Sport teams such as soccer, track and field, fastball, hockey as well as drama, music and many clubs that teachers are involved in are slowly being eroded. As these activities decline, the general life of the school deteriorates, and the morale of teachers and students is adversely affected. It is the extracurricular activities that help create school life and a sense of community to a school.

It is important that all stakeholders are part of the decision-making process so that our schools can be revitalized and a sense of direction created. Parents, teachers and students are waiting for some clear directions from the government of the day and the local school authorities.

As Urban Affairs critic of the official opposition, I am concerned about the city of Winnipeg. Before I comment on the urban affairs, I see six former city councillors on the government side. The members for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon), Riel (Mr. Ducharme), Charleswood (Mr. Ernst), Kirkfield (Mr. Stefanson), St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) have all

been city councillors. I just wonder why one of these former councillors is not the Minister of Urban Affairs. You would think one of these people would be chosen for the experience or understanding of urban affairs. You would also think that as a result of all these ex-councillors a good relationship would exist. However, the long-standing practice of the city to talk with the province through the official channel does not seem to exist. All real communication seems to have broken down. Before any progress can be made, a good relationship with the city must be restored.

The need for better co-ordination within the city and province was evident this week with the tragic death of a young boy on Pembina Highway. Area councillor, Glen Murray, and residents wrote to the Minister of Highways a year ago asking for a traffic light to be installed at that exact spot. Regrettably, nothing happened on this request. My colleagues and I will be following up on getting better information on this matter.

Handi-Transit is just another example of how the province totally ignores the city. The government has refused to send a representative to sit on the Handi-Transit Task Force Committee and develop a long term plan to maintain Handi-Transit and ensure that disabled Manitobans will continue to have access to the Handi-Transit service.

We must remember that the Schreyer government in 1977 first introduced Handi-Transit, which has proved very successful in providing service for handicapped people in this province. Obviously, that government had a very different view of disabled people than the present government. The present government is not supporting the city in providing support for the cost-sharing program that the present government has withdrawn from. The overall grant to the city, excluding welfare, has been reduced to 11 percent of the total budget, as opposed to 14 percent in 1984. All this offloading on the city has had a real impact on providing services and forces the city to rely on property tax. The city still pays a portion of

social assistance. This is not done in many provinces.

The sluggish economy of the province has added to city problems. When the city does its budget, it is always in crisis. The city faces many social and economic problems. These problems have not just come to the forefront in the last few years but have been growing for many years. Some of the problems that come to mind are welfare, unemployment, child poverty, crime, homelessness, urban sprawl, housing, rising property taxes and these are just some of the issues the city faces today.

Let me begin with the rising property tax. I have had many phone calls concerning this. For instance, a resident on Springfield Road paid a total property tax of \$857 in 1992. It increased to \$1,133 in 1993. This is an increase of \$276, which is 32 percent. The reason for the increase is because the senior citizen on Springfield Road lost the Manitoba pensioners school tax assistance of \$175 as well as lowering the property tax credit from \$325 to \$250, which is another \$75. This is a total of \$250 taxes that have been added.

Of course, many taxpayers blame the city and the local school division for the increase in taxes, but it is really the province that is offloading on the city and school divisions. We must stop the increase in property taxes because there are too many people who will be forced out of their homes. We must do revenue diversification to stop the overdependence on property taxes.

Poverty, welfare, unemployment and crime are on the rise because there is total inactivity on the economic front in Manitoba. The focus must be on economic stimulation to support small businesses which will create jobs. The only economic activity or increase in revenue has been from gambling. The deficit is around \$700 million while Saskatchewan has reduced its deficit by about \$1 billion.

The government has lost control of the economy. There seems to be no vision for this government. When you meet people at the door or at the coffee shop or at public events, the main

issue is unemployment. As a result of terrible economic conditions, we have crime, child poverty, welfare and so on. There are about 18,000 cases of welfare in Winnipeg alone, which means there are about 30,000 people existing on welfare.

The many people who call me about jobs is a good indicator as to the No. 1 problem in Manitoba. The poor economic performance has brought about tremendous social problems. Our youth of today have a bleak future. All the youth employment programs have been gutted. Our youth will probably not live as well as their parents.

The throne speech talked about creating jobs, but the record speaks for itself because fewer people are working today than when the Premier (Mr. Filmon) took office. The private sector has also shown no real hope. All the economic indicators point to a 4.8 percent decrease in private investment.

Since the government took office, 47,400 Manitobans have left the province because there is no future for our youth or for the unemployed. The growth of poverty is a major social problem in our country, and Manitoba is a leader in western Canada. There is a growth in the work of Winnipeg Harvest, soup kitchens and welfare.

Maurice Strong, a well-known Canadian, recently spoke of the dangers of global conflict between rich and poor countries. He also stated the growing gap between rich and poor in well-off countries such as Canada which could lead to social breakdown. We are presently beginning to experience some of this breakdown right here.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech does not address the problems of the 1990s. If these problems are not addressed, our children or the next generation will not live as well as the present generation. The throne speech does not provide a vision or a hope for Manitobans. Thank you.

* (1150)

Mr. Bob Rose (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure for me, as it has been for my other colleagues, to have the honour to rise and speak to the Throne Speech Debate.

I would like to, as my other colleagues have done, welcome you back, Mr. Speaker. I have not had the experience of serving under another Speaker, but I cannot imagine anyone else bringing a better mix of fairness and firmness and humour to that position. I appreciate the way you conduct the affairs of the House.

Also like my colleagues, I would like to express a word of appreciation to the Clerks and the Hansard staff, the Sergeants-at-Arms and their staff as well, but particularly to the Clerks, since those of us who have the opportunity to chair committees later on work a little more closely with the Clerks, and we get a real good appreciation of the kind of guidance and interest that they bring to the affairs of the House.

I would also like to, as other members have done, congratulate the new MLAs in the House, the successful candidates in the by-elections last fall, and certainly from the initial performance that we have been able to observe of the five new members, not only their constituents but the people of Manitoba are going to be well served by their tenure as MLAs.

Last weekend after the throne speech and the moving and seconding on Friday, I had the opportunity to visit with some people locally in Turtle Mountain and was talking with the president of our constituency association, as a matter of fact, Fred King. He asked me now that we have the formality of the throne speech on the record that what happens next? I said, well, the first eight days are dedicated to debating the Speech from the Throne. He responded, eight days, could you not do that in an afternoon?

I had to explain to him that each and every one of us have to have the opportunity to rise and put our thoughts on record and debate the issues as brought forward by the throne speech and anything less than eight days would deny each of us the opportunity to expand on those thoughts.

I could not help but also notice, Mr. Speaker, that it is also an opportunity for members to put inaccurate information on the record. The honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett)

took only about 15 seconds after an eight-month rest to accomplish this. I refer to her lament about the eight-month time span between sessions, and I quote her comments. "This occurred to me on Thursday when we came into the Legislative Assembly Chamber for the first time in eight months, a Manitoba record I might add, not one that the government should be particularly proud of."

We need only to go back to June 1984 when the Third Session of the Thirty-second Legislature ended to early March 1985 when the fourth session began. A period of eight months. So our recent vacation from this Chamber is not even a modern-day record, never mind going further back into history. I am sure that the honourable member would also be interested to know that the thirty-second Legislature was the NDP government of Premier Howard Pawley. I do not know if they were proud of that eight-month layoff or not. In fact, I would suggest that the record that was set was that it only took 15 seconds to put inaccurate information on the record.

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

Now, Mr. Acting Speaker, this is hardly an important issue. I am positive that we are all guilty from time to time, often unknowingly, of putting inaccurate information on the record, but I challenge all of us, particularly the new members, to avoid falling into that habit of casual statements that may sound good but are not accurate.

During the eight-month hiatus the political landscape has changed drastically in Canada and marginally in our province. Both opposition parties gained some satisfaction in the by-elections having retained all their previously held constituencies and the NDP gaining back the constituency of Rossmere taken from the NDP by the Conservatives in 1988.

The historical track record of by-elections indicates that they are not always happy times for incumbent governments, particularly when the electors know that the results will not be so drastic as to change the government. But I think the

political landscape picture is much clearer when we examine the results of the federal election.

Yes, the Progressive Conservatives carrying the baggage of nine years of responsible government, and I say "baggage" because responsibility has always been the opposite to popularity. We see that in our families with parents and children. We see that in our schools with teachers and their students. We see that with law enforcement agencies and those people that they have to deal with.

So the federal government was carrying the responsibility of responsible government and it does not translate into popularity. They had their representation somewhat reduced in the House of Commons, with much of the support, of course, going to Reform, who are demanding eventougher government.

But what happened to the socialist NDP? Without the baggage of a governing party, with all the political correctness that they could muster, well, Mr. Acting Speaker, Canadian voters rejected the left-wing philosophy massively. They did not even want this philosophy as an acceptable opposition. [interjection] I mentioned that we were reduced somewhat.

This was not a rejection of their Leader or a rejection of the incumbent members per se but rather a statement that socialism as represented by the NDP is no longer an acceptable alternative for Canada, if it ever was.

We see that realization understood by senior members of the provincial NDP. With no realistic anticipation of forming the next government in Manitoba, the front benchers, the fully experienced members of the NDP party are abandoning that party. The former member for Rupertsland has disappeared into the Liberal caucus federally, which is quickly exhibiting the characteristics of the last Liberal caucus to alienate western Canada.

The former member for St. Johns has disappeared into electoral oblivion. The member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) is about to enter the wondrous world of triple dipping and I do not

suggest to any members of the House that these were not very capable and excellent representatives in this House. I do not suggest—and I wish them well in their future endeavours, but there is a good indication of the thinking that is going on in those senior members who would be almost certainly senior members of any new cabinet that might be formed in a new government to understand and realize that the opportunity of that happening is slim to nil.

It is little wonder, I suppose, when you look around the caucus of the NDP with the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) agreeing with the thrusts of this government to develop in rural Manitoba and agreeing with the initiatives that have been taken in her own constituency and at the same time her caucus colleague, the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), trying not only to destroy any kind of development in her constituency, it has been in all of rural Manitoba.

Then we have the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans). He told us in his presentation that it was his job to criticize. Again I quote from Hansard: "You are either in or you are out in our parliamentary system. If you are in, you have all the power, you pull all the strings, you make the decisions. We in opposition, or whoever is in opposition, has the responsibility of being critical, of keeping government on its toes, of being ever vigilant. . . . I guess it is not the best way to be portrayed, but that is the British parliamentary system that we have inherited."

And for once in this House I will agree with what the member for Brandon East said. He is exactly right; it is the job of the opposition to keep the government on its toes and to criticize. But I would also suggest to you that it is the job of the opposition to provide a credible alternative, and they do not do that.

Whatever happens to McKenzie Seeds, the honourable member for Brandon East is against. What is his alternative? Is his alternative the way it was when he was in charge, when McKenzie Seeds was losing thousands and thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money every year, as opposed to their profit now of almost a million or

over a million dollars a year since it has been taken over by the better managing group appointed by this government? In his tenure, McKenzie Seeds was next to worthless, perhaps a few bucks for some hard assets. Now it attracts investment from across Canada. It has taken over Ontario companies. It has expanded its markets across Canada and across the northern United States. Compare those two positions, and we ask: Is this the credible alternative this House and Manitobans are expected to consider?

The lack of credible alternative is evident in their everyday questions as well, Mr. Acting Speaker. When will the members of the opposition include in their preambles where they are going to find the funding for the demands implicit in their questions? Is it from increased taxes? Is it from further, currently painless borrowing from next generations? Or is it from some other program as the honourable member is suggesting? But how much are they going to cut from other programs? How much are they cutting from other programs to find the money to finance all those things they daily demand in this House?

* (1200)

Mr. Acting Speaker, I doubt if they have ever even thought about it. A credible alternative? I think not. It is even evident in the amendment to the throne speech as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and to which we are speaking at the moment. One, two, three, four, five points listed as the support of the amendment suggesting that the government has lost the trust and confidence of the House and the people of Manitoba. Not one in all those five points suggests any credible alternative. Not one positive suggestion. Not one indication to the people of Manitoba what that party might do if they had the opportunity.

At least with the Liberals there were some ideas suggested in the amendments, such as a 3 percent reduction in the provincial sales tax for three months—I think that was the proposal—and a proposal to establish a prairie stock exchange. Now this amendment was dealt with last night by the House, and I think we are all pleased that it was

defeated, but at least it does give something for the members of the House to debate, something concrete, some suggestions that the members of the House and the people of Manitoba can look to that party and have at least some indication of what they might do if they had the opportunity.

I also noted with interest, as some of my colleagues have, some of the comments made by the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Edwards): "It is fundamentally dishonest and wrong to continually borrow on the future." Hear, hear. I agree. That statement should perhaps be carved in stone above the entrance to this building where each one of us might see it every day when we come in.

I challenge the Leader of the Second Opposition to take that statement and forward it to his federal colleagues, who after assuming office less than a year ago, brought in their first budget that increased expenditures instead of addressing the problems that the Liberal Leader is suggesting that it is fundamentally dishonest to continually borrow from the future, a path that the federal government is embarked upon with the airy-fairy suggestion that maybe two or three years down the road we may try to deal with some of these problems.

Another quote from the Liberal Leader: this government "took away teacher training days. . . ." Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, what this government did was in response to requests from the many school divisions around the province that were totally unable to make the Manitoba teachers' union understand the realities of today's economy. They had no alternative but to deal with teachers' contracts that not only did not freeze much less reduce the continued annual increases, and they needed some opportunity in order to be fiscally responsible themselves to deal with that.

What this government did was provide them with that opportunity. Now it is not illegal to have teacher training days. It is not illegal in Manitoba to continue to improve your abilities in classrooms. No one is going to send in the RCMP and arrest any teacher who attends a professional development day. The only difference is that under

the management of the local school divisions they no longer will be paid for some of those days.

I have great difficulty explaining that sometimes to the people in Turtle Mountain who are primarily agricultural based, primarily primary producers. I explained to them that is what it is all about. They tell me that most of the winter and a good part sometimes in the summer they, at their own expense, go to various classes to try and improve their abilities as producers, try to add to the economy of our province.

They find it very difficult to understand why a professional would not, instead of continuing to attend those professional development opportunities, choose to stay home and declare that they have been denied a teacher-training day—totally inaccurate information by the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Edwards).

Another quote from the Leader of the Second Opposition: "That is the single biggest problem we face, retaining our own investment dollars, the hundreds of millions of dollars that leave this province every year." The single biggest problem we face in Manitoba is the loss of capital. He was referring to RRSP funds, I believe. I think the figure he used was \$600 million that had been invested in the last few days before the deadline for RRSPs. He was lamenting the fact that most of this money went into Ontario or into stock exchanges or into mutual funds or into bonds and none of it was of any benefit to Manitoba.

I think what the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Edwards) does not understand is it is not a lack of capital that is our problem in Manitoba, it is not lack of management, it is not lack of capable people well-trained and with the ability to retrain very quickly when the opportunity arises. What we have lacked is markets.

That is why this government and why the former federal government in Ottawa, who worked so very, very hard to bring about freer trading pacts between not only our neighbours to the south but to other parts of the world—they worked hard on NAFTA. They worked hard on the U.S. Free Trade Agreement. They worked hard on GATT. Finally,

we have all these things in position where we in Manitoba can take advantage of those markets, and we now have the spectacle of the new Minister of Agriculture contemplating signing an agreement with the Americans totally closing the border to all our grain exports. Where will be the Leader of the Second Opposition on that situation? Will he be in the same position that he was on the North American Centre for the Environment?

Again I quote from his speech: "It was very regrettable that Winnipeg did not get the North American Centre for the Environment, . . ." Very regrettable. The Deputy Prime Minister of Canada admitted publicly that in the final analysis it was a political decision. Never mind all the work that had gone into the preparation for the research. Never mind the categories and the criteria that had been established. Throw all that out. In the final analysis it is a political decision. We have the spectacle of the Leader of the Second Opposition in Manitoba who would like to be Premier of this province standing in this House and saying it is very regrettable. Is that the same thing he is going to say if we lose access to our agricultural markets in other countries?

* (1210)

Mr. Acting Speaker, I do compliment the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Edwards) for what I consider to be accurate comments on the infrastructure program. He said it is not a long-term solution to employment. He said it was an example of co-operation among three levels of government. He said it is an opportunity to undertake such much-needed projects with lasting benefits, and I agree with those statements.

Some of us do not fundamentally encourage or agree with shared costs with strings attached. The honourable member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) commented to me the other day that some of the cynics in his constituency were referring to the infrastructure program as a chicken in every pothole. But I think that the results of this program, a co-operative program among the three levels of government, would be most positive for all Canadians.

I mentioned a moment ago that we do not always agree with shared-cost programs, and I think back to my experience when I was a member of the Souris Valley School Division on the board of trustees. The government of the day, regardless of the party, would time and again come forward with shared-cost programs saying, if you will bring this program into your school division, if you will hire this type of a person to deliver that program, we will pay half the cost.

Time and again we sat around that decision-making table on behalf of our local students, on behalf of our local taxpayers, and wrestled with that proposition that had been put to us because in many cases it was not particularly applicable to our students, but of course it was being offered at the bargain-sale price of half cost.

So did you perhaps shortchange your students a little bit and let other divisions around the province or other students have the full benefit of that program, or did you raise half the cost from your local taxpayers and bring in programs that you did not think you particularly needed in the first place?

I suggest to you that one of the problems with the shared-cost programs with strings attached is that so often it leads to expenditure that is not really needed and is probably one of the driving forces behind government overexpenditure at all levels.

Fortunately, that is not the case, I believe, in the infrastructure program, because the parameters are broad enough that the initiatives that are coming forward are ones that are much needed and would probably have been done in any case if the local jurisdictions had been able to afford them.

I am pleased with the announcements that have been made to this date inasmuch that from a rural constituency I am very aware of how often the smaller jurisdictions are missed out in some of these government programs. We can loosely define rural Manitoba as all that area outside the Perimeter Highway, but rural Manitoba is everything from the bustling cities like Thompson or Dauphin or Brandon or Portage to very small

municipalities of only 500 or 600 people with no town of any size at all.

So I was very, very pleased, as I said a moment ago, when the first announcements came down a week ago, to note that many of the smaller jurisdictions in our constituency of Turtle Mountain had their projects approved, small projects, \$10,000-, \$15,000-, \$20,000-projects, that needed to be done and the smaller jurisdictions were recognized and had the opportunity to do that. So often in programs for rural Manitoba we pay more attention to population, and those smaller jurisdictions miss out.

Mr. Acting Speaker, in conversation with my constituents last week I was trying to explain to them the real significance of the Speech from the Throne. I pointed out that it is really a road map or a guide or a blueprint, whatever word you want to use, for where the government is intending to head. The throne speech is traditionally long on generalities and short on specifics, and I think a good example of this was contained in the November 1992 Speech from the Throne when this government indicated that they were intending to examine the opportunities of expanding rural gasification.

Little more was said about that initiative in this House or in the debates or in the business that comes before this Chamber, but since November of 1992 the background work was being done. Options were being examined, populations measured, possible usage measured, so when the infrastructure program was signed in January it was possible to move very quickly to bring the expansion of rural gas service in parts of rural Manitoba.

I am pleased that the communities in Turtle Mountain of Souris, Wawanesa, Boissevain and Killarney will have the opportunity to access the gas service. It is not necessary, I do not think, to reiterate the number of advantages this lower cost form of energy will bring to these communities and also for those communities that are not currently listed. The service is that much closer, and as the development takes place over a period

of time they will also have the opportunity to expand.

One needs only to look back to rural electrification, a thrust in rural Manitoba brought about I think by the former Liberal government of D.L. Campbell, but it did not all happen at once. It did not all happen in the same year. It took place over a period of several years, and I suggest that the same opportunity will be there to bring natural gas to even more communities in rural Manitoba. But with that indication in 1992 from the throne speech that this was the thrust of this government, it came to fruition in the spring of 1994.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, there is no better way for Manitobans to determine the long-range intentions of the government than to look in the throne speech. I would like to highlight just a few of the future initiatives of this government that they will follow up well beyond the next election. This government will announce new initiatives to encourage small-business expansion, and it has been repeatedly indicated that it is the small businesses of our province and of our country that are the engine of the economy, that create the most employment. This government will build in the framework established for economic growth and fiscal responsibility, and I emphasize "build in the framework" because this government has built a framework for economic growth and fiscal responsibility.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

This government will support an aggressive campaign to strengthen our position in international markets. Again, building on what we have done in the past—and hopefully the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Edwards), when we encounter those kinds of difficulties agreed to by the Liberals in Ottawa, will not find it regrettable.

We will enter into a new Winnipeg development agreement to strengthen Winnipeg's economic position. We will work with the farm community to combat renewed agricultural trade harassment. We will work with rural communities on a variety of initiatives, including a review of The Municipal

Act. There are a number of initiatives going on in rural Manitoba, in fact all across the province. The review of The Municipal Act is only one. We know that the Boundaries Commission, the School Boundaries Review Commission, is holding hearings across the province. All of these things are indicators of a do-something government, of a government that realizes the changes before us, the changes with us and that we have to, to the best of our ability, examine those three options for those changes and consult with the people of Manitoba in the process.

* (1220)

This government will focus on agri-food efforts to take advantage of new opportunities and production, processing and export, continued support for the value-added approach. As the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) pointed out the other day, why export grain at three or four cents a pound when you can value add an export at one or two dollars a pound?

This government will act on a nine-point plan to combat youth crime and violence. That, of course, comes from the thrust of our Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey), who brought together interested parties from all across the province, seeking their advice and their guidance on how to combat the ever-increasing problem of youth crime and violence. This government intends to act on that nine-point plan that was recommended by that conference.

This government will be continuing to press the federal government to toughen the Young Offenders Act, and again our Minister of Justice has made those requests to the federal government, that the people of Canada are no longer satisfied with having young offenders treated lightly, not that the people of Canada do not have some sympathy and some understanding of the problems that are behind it, the basic problems, but surely there is a level beyond which action of some of our younger offenders is not acceptable and our government is striving to work to combat that.

This government will introduce legislative amendments to make young people more

responsible for their actions by denying driver's licences to those under eighteen if they have any convictions. My goodness, we should all remember how very, very important our driver's licence was at the age of sixteen. If there is anything that would be more effective in getting your point across to our young offenders, it would be requiring them to wait another couple of years before they were able to have a driver's licence.

Mr. Speaker, that is just a few of the throne speech highlights. I want to say that I do not always agree with everything our caucus and our cabinet decides, and I do not always believe that the opposition parties are always wrong or misguided in their questions and their ideas.

It is not dissimilar from the fact that I did not always agree with my colleagues on the Souris Valley School Board or other democratically elected forums of which I have been a part, and I did not always agree with some of my business partners, and I certainly have not always agreed with some of the members of my family. But in fact this agreement and this discussion is the essence of the democratic process.

As the honourable Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Edwards) pointed out, despite the warts and imperfections of the democratic process, it works. So while we may disagree on details or how to proceed, fundamentally the members of this government agree on our blueprint for the future.

I thank the people of Turtle Mountain for the honour and opportunity of representing them in this Chamber. I thank them for their support, their encouragement, and their suggestions and their criticisms from time to time.

I believe that the new and continued initiatives set out in this throne speech well represent the views of the people of Turtle Mountain. I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to defeat the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the first opposition (Mr. Doer) and to accept the throne speech of this government. Thank you very much.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): I am pleased to rise and add my comments on this Speech from the

Throne, Mr. Speaker. [interjection] Such as it is, as my colleague for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) indicates.

I have listened to some of the debates that have taken place in this House, and of course there are many concerns that I have with the glaring omissions that I have noted by this throne speech.

But, before I get into the content of the throne speech, or the lack of content, I would like to first welcome the Chamber staff back for another session of this Legislature, and I would also like to welcome you back, Mr. Speaker. I have enjoyed your guidance over the last number of years and we look forward to your further guidance as we continue our deliberations in this session.

I would also like to congratulate the new Pages that have been chosen to assist us in the Chamber with the performance of our duties. I believe that it is an honour for those young people to have been chosen. I know that there were some young people in my community a number of years ago that were also working as Pages in this House, and they, from time to time, tell me about their experiences and how proud they were to have served members of this Chamber. Of course, they have fond recollections of the events that took place. I believe that this is an opportunity for our young people to become knowledgeable first hand of the process that we undertake in the Legislature as we represent our various constituencies for the province.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is again a pleasure for me to represent my community of Transcona, the constituents of Transcona, in this Legislature. I am proud to have had the opportunity over the last three and a half, nearly going on four years now, to represent my constituents.

We have had an opportunity to solve many of the problems that they have brought to my attention. I think it would be unfair for me to say that we have been successful in solving all of those, but we have made an earnest effort to assist our constituents in the resolution of the concerns that they have brought forward.

I have also today, Mr. Speaker, during the comments on this throne speech—I will be raising some of the ongoing concerns that my constituents have with various programs that the government has been dealing with or not dealing with, as the case may be. I will be raising those again when we get to the Estimates debate for the particular departments as we go through the budget process.

I have listened to some of the comments also by the second opposition party as they have made their comments and, of course, by the government members when they have added their comments on this throne speech.

When the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) indicated just a short time ago that he was disappointed that Manitoba had not been chosen for the new environmental centre, I find that I must agree with the Minister of Environment. It is very disappointing that Manitoba was not chosen for that new environmental centre.

I believe that the federal government chose to play politics with this issue and awarded that centre to a province other than Manitoba when it is my understanding that Manitoba was high on the priority list and should have been chosen for that centre and the jobs that were associated with that.

I call on my Liberal colleagues to put pressure on their federal colleagues to make sure that future events like that do not occur and that Manitoba is not again deprived of those opportunities.

I find I was very much disappointed, too, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the federal Liberal Party, when they were in opposition, telling Canadians and Manitobans how opposed they were to the cruise missile testing, and then what do they do? Within a few weeks of getting into office, we see the missiles flying over Canada.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything more ridiculous, it is the Liberals when it comes to the changing or the flip-flop of their position, when it comes to the cruise missile testing. On top of that, the objective of the federal Liberal Party was to renegotiate the NAFTA agreement, and they were going to protect Canadians. They were going to

make sure that there was an energy clause in there to protect Canada, and what do they do? They capitulated; they signed on the dotted line the very same agreement that had been negotiated by the previous government. What a flip-flop if I ever saw one. No wonder the federal government talks about cynicism of the Canadian electorate when it comes to politicians, and if this is not the perfect example of why a Canadian should be cynical about politicians, I do not know what is. On top of that there is another issue that I think most of us in

this House are concerned with, and that is the issue of smoking, particularly how it affects the health of young people but, in general, the health of all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have 34 minutes remaining.

The hour being 12:30 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday. Everybody have a great weekend.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, April 15, 1994

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Presenting Petitions		Workforce 2000	
Curran Contract Cancellation and Pharmacare & Home Care Reinstatement		Friesen; Manness; Maloway	279
C. Evans	274	Education System	
Hickes	274	Plohnan; Manness	282
APM Incorporated Remuneration and Pharmacare & Home Care Reinstatement		Seven Oaks General Hospital	
Dewar	274	Gray; McCrae	283
Reading and Receiving Petitions		Home Care Program	
Curran Contract Cancellation and Pharmacare & Home Care Reinstatement		Gray; McCrae	283
Plohnan	274	Infrastructure Works Agreement	
Tabling of Reports		Cerilli; Stefanson	284
Annual Report, Department of Highways and Transportation		Nonpolitical Statement	
Findlay	275	Manitoba Winter Games	
Reports: The Trade Practices Inquiry Act; The Insurance Act		Orchard	284
Ernst	275	Speaker's Statement	
Oral Questions		Written Questions	285
Unemployment Rate			
Doer; Filmon	275	ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Seven Oaks General Hospital		Written Questions	
Chomiak; McCrae	277	McKenzie Seeds	
Education System		L. Evans	285
Edwards; Manness; Filmon	278	Throne Speech Debate	
		(Sixth Day of Debate)	
		Dacquay	286
		Schellenberg	291
		Rose	297
		Reid	303