



Third Session - Thirty-Sixth Legislature

of the

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report  
(Hansard)**

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Louise M. Dacquay  
Speaker*



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Sixth Legislature**

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	N.D.P.
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	N.D.P.
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise, Hon.	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary	Concordia	N.D.P.
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Steinbach	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
ERNST, Jim	Charleswood	P.C.
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	N.D.P.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	N.D.P.
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	P.C.
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	N.D.P.
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Lib.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	P.C.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Lib.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	N.D.P.
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McALPINE, Gerry	Surgeon Creek	P.C.
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane	Osborne	N.D.P.
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
MIHYCHUK, MaryAnn	St. James	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	P.C.
NEWMAN, David, Hon.	Riel	P.C.
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PITURA, Frank, Hon.	Morris	P.C.
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
RADCLIFFE, Mike, Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack, Hon.	Niakwa	P.C.
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Gladstone	P.C.
SALE, Tim	Crescentwood	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin	N.D.P.
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	P.C.
TOEWS, Vic, Hon.	Rossmere	P.C.
TWEED, Mervin	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	N.D.P.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 6, 1997

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. David Newman (Minister charged with the administration of The Communities Economic Development Fund Act):** Madam Speaker, I would like to tender the Third Quarter Report of the Communities Economic Development Fund and also table the Third Quarter Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

##### International Women's Day

**Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister responsible for the Status of Women):** I have a statement for the House.

Every year on March 8, hundreds of thousands of women and men around the world gather in celebration of International Women's Day to celebrate women's achievements and to look to future endeavours. This year March 8 falls on Saturday, so I would like to take this opportunity to recognize this special day.

International Women's Day had its beginnings in the strike by women garment workers in New York City protesting unsafe, overcrowded working conditions. Their cry was for bread and roses, bread symbolizing economic security for women and their families and roses symbolizing a better quality of life.

Our government is committed to enhancing the quality of women's lives, focusing on women's economic security, their education and training, and safety for women at home, at work and in the community. Our government has taken a comprehensive approach to dealing with violence

against women. Our approach addresses prevention, crisis intervention and services to victims and families.

Initiatives we have taken include funding of 25 agencies offering support services to women and their children, the best crisis shelter system in Canada, second-stage housing which recognizes women's needs for varying degrees of support after the initial crisis, a dedicated Family Violence Court, a land titles protected name registry, a family violence policy and procedures manual developed in consultation with the province's police services, a women's advocacy program to assist women who are going to court in cases of family violence, and an aggressive prosecutions policy on domestic violence.

In the fall of 1996, the Women's Directorate in partnership with CIBC and our police services launched a province-wide safety campaign entitled Keeping Safe at Work. This initiative is targeted to employees working alone, as well as individuals travelling alone to and from work. It is a common-sense approach for employers and employees to assess their workplace, to maximize safety and minimize crime.

Women's economic self-sufficiency is also a priority for this government. To address this, the Manitoba Women's Directorate launched and now administers the Training for Tomorrow Scholarship Award Program which encourages women to expand their career options by training for well-paid, high-demand positions in today's high-tech labour market. Women enrolled in two-year programs in math-, science- and technology-related areas at the province's three community colleges are eligible for the awards. To date, 141 students at Assiniboine, Keewatin and Red River Community colleges have received the \$1,000 scholarship.

The Employment Development and Literacy Branch of Manitoba Education and Training has invested \$12 million in training and finding subsequent job placements for social assistance clients across the

province. Training dollars are also targeted to single-parent mothers and others on social assistance. We believe that Manitobans want to work, and in order to work they must have training and skills useful in today's marketplace. This government has demonstrated and will continue to demonstrate its commitment to furthering the goal of equality for women in Manitoba. Through the year, I will continue to work with my Status of Women colleagues across this country to address major areas of concern of women including violence against women, economic security, education and training and youth. Manitoba women have always been in the forefront of change in our country. I hope that we will continue to work together to make Manitoba the best place to live, work and raise a family, a place where all will have a share in the bread and roses.

I would like to invite all members of the Legislature and their staff to participate in a celebration of International Women's Day. It will take place at the Crowne Plaza Hotel downtown today, March 6, between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. Please join us there to mark this important event. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

\* (1335)

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Osborne.

**Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne)** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I would also like to thank the Minister responsible for the Status of Women for her statement.

Today, this side of the House wishes to join with sisters everywhere and acknowledge International Women's Day which will be officially celebrated, of course, on Saturday, March 8, but which various Winnipeg women's groups in various ways have celebrated all week.

International Women's Day or IWD, as most of you know, dates to the early 1900s when women textile workers in New York went on strike to protest their low wages and abysmal working conditions. The strike of marginalized, mostly immigrant, women workers took tremendous courage. Their courage and willingness to fight back was the genesis of International Women's Day. Since 1910, women around the world have recognized March 8 as

International Women's Day, a day to celebrate their sisterhood and their determination to win full and equal participation, economically, culturally, and socially, equality indeed in every facet of life.

IWD is the time to celebrate the lives, rights, courage and achievements of all women for our fighting spirits have taken us a long way and IWD is also a day to remember and renew our commitment to all our sisters, especially those sisters who live with neither bread nor roses, many of whom live in this province. By remembering this, we acknowledge there is some distance to go, and we commit, on this side of the House, to travelling those roads.

Naturally, International Women's Day is closely aligned with labour and with the labour movement, a conjunction symbolically present in the most significant International Women's Day song, "Bread and Roses." Women want bread, the basics like food, housing, and jobs, but women want roses too: quality of life, education, culture, health care, a social safety net, the opportunities to realize their full potentials.

Unfortunately all throne speech and other puff pieces, including the minister's today—to the contrary both bread and roses have become receding possibilities for many Manitoba women, because in truth this government has to date turned its back on the full and equal participation of our women. Provincial government policies and cuts, augmented by federal ones, are impoverishing women and denying them services, economic security and respectful employment. At a time when many women are experiencing economic desperation and are desperately in need of services, these very services are being eroded. The principle of universality has been abandoned. Consider, for example, the changes to Pharmacare and to eye care. How many women do not have their eyes examined and indeed choose to support their children with this money?

Women, particularly single-parent women, are hard hit as they are the primary caregivers to children and responsible for their children's well-being. Social assistance to single-parent families with children over six, and 85 percent of single-parent families are now headed by women, is under siege. It is on its way to becoming workfare, and now we hear report after report of single parents with children under six being

bullied and harassed by their workers. Child care spaces have been frozen, post-secondary education for single women with children is almost impossible. The threats of privatization and the threats of layoffs and actual layoffs have created an insecure work environment for Manitoba's mostly female health-care providers, not to mention the staff here in the Leg., mostly women, all hard workers with families to keep and lives to lead. There is a surcharge for Legal Aid, a backlog in the Family Violence Court, last year a 2 percent cut to Family Disputes, and the average hourly wage gap between men and women is growing, not shrinking.

\* (1340)

The minister's answer, seconded by the Premier, is to offer "Shaking the Tree, A Celebration of Women." All women are welcome at the Crowne Plaza, just as long as they have the day off and can pay the \$35 registration fee, which of course leaves most women out in the cold. In my opinion, this is an appropriation and usurpation that hits at the very core of International Women's Day, a day initiated by the working-poor women to celebrate their struggles and to communicate the universal need for bread and roses. Even the title is co-opted. "Shaking the tree" is a populist expression referring to grassroots political movements and their determination to turn government upside down. Maybe this minister and this Premier could tune into the music of Spirit of the West or Peter Gabriel who celebrate the real meaning of shaking the tree and know more about this than the Tory contingent opposite ever will.

Finally, I regret my lack of enthusiasm and angry words, but poverty is a sobering reality. Tomorrow the minister may want to attend the luncheon at the union and hear Lynne Toupin tell us about poverty. Members of the New Democratic Party and caucus will certainly be there. Thank you.

### Introduction of Guests

**Madam Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have this afternoon seventeen kindergarten to Grade 9 students from the Vermillion Colony School under the direction of Mr. Arlen Scharfenberg. This school is located in the

constituency of the honourable Minister of Government Services (Mr. Pitura).

We also have this afternoon fifty Grade 9 students from Westdale Junior High School under the direction of Mr. Michael Greenaway. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst).

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you this afternoon.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Personal Care Homes Public Inquest—Recommendations

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Yesterday I asked the Premier (Mr. Filmon) some questions about the follow-up of his government through three different ministers of Health dealing with the unfortunate death of Anne Sands and the Rusen inquest that was released to the provincial government and the Premier in 1994.

There were a number of recommendations made in that report, and the Minister of Health answered in this Chamber that all of the recommendations, he believed, were implemented in terms of the government report that was commissioned after the Rusen inquest to deal with the vulnerable and elderly in the personal care homes in Manitoba.

Would the Premier please outline the action that was taken following the Rusen inquest in terms of staffing levels and the other implementation and action taken from the 1995 report that was commissioned for the provincial government, withheld before the election and released shortly thereafter?

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** First of all, with respect to the matter of Mrs. Anne Sands who passed away while a resident of the Heritage Lodge facility, I understand that the circumstances around her death, from what I have been advised, was that she wandered out of her room and fell on a bed in another room and became entrapped between the side rails on that bed. When staff found her, 911 was called. She was not able to be extricated before she suffocated.

The recommendation in the inquest of the Chief Medical Officer recommended—or one of those recommendations was that personal care homes have staff who would be on duty in hallways for the purpose, I understand, of watching people who wander. That was felt to be unworkable, but policies were developed, particularly in this case, that people who do wander would be checked every 15 minutes.

As well, the beds in that particular facility were changed in terms of the rails so that particular risk or danger would not be there.

\* (1345)

**Mr. Doer:** The Premier (Mr. Filmon) knows and the government knows that Rusen and many other people examining the issue of personal care homes since the Premier issued his Speech from the Throne in 1990 have stated that the staffing levels are woefully inadequate. Furthermore, the government's report that was withheld and covered up by the government in the election campaign and released shortly thereafter recommended that the government initiate immediately random, unannounced inspections of personal care homes in the province of Manitoba.

The Premier is responsible for these recommendations. The Minister of Health said he would implement the recommendations, the former Minister of Health. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he has taken action and leadership to stand up for the vulnerable people in our personal care homes. Has he implemented that recommendation or has he failed to do so?

**Mr. Praznik:** As I am sure members appreciate, coming into this department, sometimes it takes a while for a new minister to be up to snuff on all of the details, but I can assure the member, from the reports that I have, that the department has done and does routine inspections, including unannounced inspections. At Heritage Lodge, I believe there was an unannounced visit made in November, just for an example.

That is certainly an area that I share with him because I believe very sincerely, as I am sure he does, that unannounced visits by staff from the Department of Health are an excellent way to check the ongoing

operations of personal care homes. As the new minister, I certainly will continue that policy and hope there is opportunity to enhance it if it is not suitably adequate for the times.

**Mr. Doer:** The government, in a document that was released last year, stated that they had not implemented recommendation No. 24 dealing with random, unannounced inspections in the personal care homes, which contradicts what the minister said in the House and which contradicts what the minister said in June of 1995. It said that they will leave the issue of random inspections of personal care homes to the new regional health boards. That was a document tabled in this Chamber.

Now the Premier, of course, has the temerity to go on radio shows and accuse our member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) of fearmongering when he asked questions about personal care homes generally and Holiday Haven specifically last year in this Chamber.

I would like to ask the Premier, who will be investigating his responsibility of not implementing the 1990 Speech from the Throne, not implementing the recommendations from the Rusen inquest, not implementing the policy alternative recommendations dealing with private and public nursing homes, not implementing fully the 1995 recommendations that were made to his government, and for saying that we were fearmongering when in fact he should have been moving in to Holiday Haven last year? Who will be investigating his lack of follow-up and action for the most vulnerable people in our nursing homes here in the province of Manitoba?

**Mr. Praznik:** Firstly, with respect to the issue of unannounced visits, I can inform the member from the information that is provided to me as minister that in this particular case there was an unannounced visit of that facility—

**An Honourable Member:** Holiday Haven?

**Mr. Praznik:** No, we are talking about the Heritage manor here as one—[interjection] Would the member please just bear with me. If that is not the case, if they are inadequate, I have undertaken as minister to look at that to ensure that we are doing adequate unannounced inspections. I think all members would agree, that is a

very reasonable way of checking on that. They do occur now from what I understand from the department. If there are not enough of them, I will endeavour to look at that.

With respect to comments about fearmongering, we know from time to time there are going to be problems and issues that come forward. What is absolutely critical is we deal with the facts, that we try to deal with the facts that are before us in a rational and reasonable way. When the Leader of the Opposition comes to this House with information that is not quite accurate or not quite descriptive of the facts—

**An Honourable Member:** Name it.

**Mr. Praznik:** Well, the member says to name it. Yesterday in Question Period, Madam Speaker, the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) talked about this particular incident as if there were huge problems in that particular facility. What came to light is a problem with old beds that have been changed—that was brought to light—and the issue of how wanderers are monitored. Those have been corrected. That is not worthy of bringing fear to every resident of a personal care home in the province of Manitoba.

\* (1350)

### **Personal Care Homes Public Inquiry**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Madam Speaker, I do not know what it takes for this government to realize there is a problem. The '93 Manitoba Centre for Health Policy Evaluation indicated problems with private personal care facilities. The '94 Rusen report—and, by the way, for the minister, he should read that report which points very specifically to problems with inadequate staffing, woefully inadequate.

We have the interdepartmental task force making numerous recommendations, the minister announcing random inspections and then no random inspections. We now have the minister reannouncing that in 1997 after a death.

I would like to ask the Premier, since he is ultimately responsible for this matter, will he do the right thing

and call not an inquest into one specific death but an inquiry into the absolute negligence of this government in dealing with personal care homes in this province?

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, if members of the public are looking for examples of rhetoric, we have just had one, because we know the reality of the situation of personal care homes. We know that the level of care in personal care homes across this province has been increasing, the needs of patients who go into them or the residents who go into them are much greater than they were over the last number of years because our home care system is allowing people to live in their own homes longer. We know that that puts greater pressure on the system, greater pressure on staff.

We know and I would not deny that personal care homes are under a great deal of pressure today—there is no doubt—as they deal with an ever-increasing workload and more serious cases. We have to work to address that with them and find the right levels of staffing to provide the kind of care that is needed in those facilities. It is not always an easy solution to find, but we are working towards that, and that will probably be an ongoing matter because needs change over time.

Every personal care home resident has family who visits them. The kind of fear that the member is engendering and the kind of arguments that are being made are not representative of the kind of feedback we get from the public, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Ashton:** Supplementary, Madam Speaker. I want to address this again to the Premier who is responsible, ultimately responsible for these years of negligence. I want to ask the Premier if he will recognize that what we are talking about here is not fearmongering. These are reports; there is an inquest report, clear recommendations that were made. Will he recognize that, due to the negligence of his government under his leadership, those recommendations were not put in place and that, indeed, serious questions have to be raised about whether people were at risk and are still at risk because this government will not deal with the private nursing care home issue?

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, the member for Thompson, if I may understand this correctly, is no

longer just dealing with the issue of personal care homes or nursing care homes, but the issue of public versus private.

I can tell the member that there are from time public facilities, whether they be supported by municipalities or operated by nonprofit organizations, that also have problems. Often this is very much a function of the management group that is in place, of how they operate, of personalities, et cetera, and sometimes it is the result of faulty equipment or equipment that is not appropriate in the case of those beds. [interjection]

The member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) says money. Yes, we have to make sure that we are getting value for our dollar, but it is our intention to ensure that we are providing adequate resources to properly and adequately staff those facilities. That has been changing over time, and it will continue to do so, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Ashton:** I want to try one more time to the Premier. I want to ask the Premier, when will he stop sitting there silently and allow his ministers, his new minister to rationalize some very serious concerns that have been identified in report after report? When will he do the proper thing and appoint an inquiry that will also be able to look not only at the specific situation of Holiday Haven but the absolute negligence of this government in dealing with problems that have been identified as early as 1990 and 1993 and 1994, Madam Speaker?

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, as I have said before, we know that the needs of our personal care facilities in this province are changing because the load that they carry in terms of care requirements of their residents is increasingly greater each year as more and more people who go in are in greater need of care. We are thankfully being able to keep more people at home with the use of home care. Consequently, we know that the resources, the appropriate resources to deal with that, we have to work continually to improve those to meet those standards. It is not always easy. You have to keep working at it, and we continue to do that.

\* (1355)

### **Holiday Haven Nursing Home Public Inquiry**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Madam Speaker, it is a failure of our system and of this government that after months of failure to act at Holiday Haven, the only way a forum of investigation can take place at Holiday Haven is through an inquest, through a death. That is not enough. There has already been an inquest; there have already been three reports that have not been followed.

Will the minister today tell the House how the outstanding issues at Holiday Haven we have dealt with, like why it took five months for the management to change when it was identified five months ago; why the only way people were able to raise their concerns was through the member of the Legislature; why the Department of Health failed to follow up on recommendations and failed to follow up with concerns of staff; why the government did not implement the recommendations of its own committee; and why two days ago the minister said there were not problems in other nursing homes, and today he is saying there are problems? Where will the forum be to investigate those issues?

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, the member for Kildonan certainly offers a host of questions for me to answer, and I hope I get that opportunity to do so in a number of answers and certainly in Estimates.

First of all, what I did say to the member the other day was not that there were not problems at other nursing homes. I said, let us put it in perspective; there are from time to time. It is a human system; you have human beings delivering a service with all that entails. From time to time, it is never always going to be perfect. Can we minimize that? Can we work to ensure that when those things happen, that appropriate action is taken to correct them? Absolutely. That is, I think, all that one can reasonably expect to do because it is a human system.

Madam Speaker, with respect to Holiday Haven, the matter has come up a number of times that he has raised. As we indicated, the department last fall requested that Holiday Haven management



commission an independent report. They did; they had a proprietary right in that report. They developed a plan; it was not acceptable to the department. There was a process of negotiating going on when the events of early February intervened, and we made the decision to put in a new management team.

So the short answer to the question of what is happening at Holiday Haven today. We have a completely new management group in there who are ensuring the quality of care and working towards accreditation over a two-year period.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Madam Speaker, will the minister, who knows an inquest will not answer all the questions, explain and tell this House how issues like Paula Black who resigned because of incompetence there will be investigated; how the patient who was transferred and had to have the wounds photographed at another nursing home was dealt with; how the patients who were abused by management are going to be dealt with?

How are those issues going to be dealt with, with an inquest that is only going to be narrowly defined towards the death of one resident? There should be a public inquiry to the broader issues of not only how Holiday Haven was operated but how the Department of Health failed to protect the residents of personal care homes.

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, first of all let us understand that the inquest from a Chief Medical Officer is one tool in getting to the facts of any situation. I welcome this inquest. Obviously, within the mandate of the Chief Medical Examiner, we will find a report that will give us the facts relating to the death.

If, given the other information that comes to me through the department, through the new management group that is in place, through this inquest, we find some significant problems that have to be dealt with, it is my responsibility as Minister of Health and we as a government to address those and ensure that they are corrected and steps taken to the best of the ability of the system to protect people who are in our personal care homes. Madam Speaker, we will do that.

### Public Forum

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Madam Speaker, will the minister today outline for the public something that the minister failed to do in the fall, something the minister failed to do in '95 and '93, et cetera? Will the minister commit today that there will be a forum where all of the individuals who have concerns about Holiday Haven and the way matters were handled; where the 19 concerns that we raised with our letter to the minister; where the unexplained deaths can be reviewed and can be dealt with; and the political responsibility of a Premier saying that we are only fearmongering? Can all of these issues be dealt with? Will the minister commit today to a forum to permit those issues to be dealt with so Manitobans can have assurance that their loved ones are cared for in personal care homes in the future?

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, I would certainly agree with the member for Kildonan that there has to be some avenue for that information to be brought forward. I would separate the two types of information, however. With respect to deaths, it is an automatic procedure that they be reported to the Chief Medical Officer of the province, who makes a decision on whether an inquest is required and determination. So, with respect to deaths, let us not confuse the two because there is already a well-established process in place.

But the particular point the member raises about complaints that go back for some period of time, I am currently working with my staff on a number of options to have a model because I am interested in that information. I am interested in it as minister. I want to know if it can tell my department and me as minister and my colleagues in cabinet something that we need to do to improve the system, so I certainly want to ensure that that mechanism is in place, and I hope to be able to have something for the member shortly.

\* (1400)

### Personal Care Homes Northern Manitoba

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Madam Speaker, my questions are directed also to the Minister of Health.

In the south here we have been trying to bring to the attention of this Minister of Health the state of personal care-homes, the need for better management so as to avoid the unnecessary demise of our elders. That is a really, really sad situation. The government should be ashamed of that and do something immediately to correct that problem. In the North, however, we are not talking about personal care homes to fix up because we do not have any.

My question for the minister is, where in his planning and priorities has he placed the issue of personal care homes in the northern communities?

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, I really think it is important in debates on these issues that when we get into exaggeration for the purposes of Question Period, and I do not want to engage in that, but the member for The Pas said there are no personal care homes in the North. I do not want to get into a—it is so tempting to be able to say, when is the last time he has been in The Pas, because one of the big issues in The Pas is a personal care home in that community now that has a host of problems and probably needs a major capital injection in the next few years. It is something that we are struggling with. It has been brought to my attention by the regional health board when I was there last week, so to make the blanket statement to this House that there are no personal care homes in the North, that is not accurate. If he had raised the issue of the one in The Pas, I think his comments would have more credibility, but I am pleased to address more of this in his next question.

**Mr. Lathlin:** Did not address anything. What is he talking about?

Madam Speaker, let me ask the minister then, out of the 53 Northern Affairs communities, how many have personal care homes, and does the minister agree that there is a real need for these personal care homes? I do not know when the last time the minister was in the Island Lake area, but the last time I was there, they were looking for a personal care home. Could I ask the minister whether he agrees with me that there is a real need for personal care homes, particularly in the isolated areas?

He knows what I am talking about. I am not talking about The Pas, Flin Flon or Thompson. Because right

now we are having to send our elders elsewhere in Manitoba, you know, often in places away from relatives, friends and community.

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, as we narrow the focus somewhat, the member for The Pas is absolutely right. There is a need in many larger communities. He mentioned the 53 Northern Affairs communities. In asking that opinion, having been Minister of Northern Affairs, many of them are communities of only several hundreds of people. I think the largest one would probably be Wabowden.

**Mr. Lathlin:** You know what I am asking.

**Mr. Praznik:** I know, and I will get to that, but to say to the media and the public and this House and to ask me if you want personal care homes in communities with several hundred people, you never have the numbers.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** We do not even have one in Thompson.

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, the member for Thompson mentions Thompson. Yes, that is a need that has been identified in that community. I do not deny that.

The member referred to Island Lake. Island Lake is a large enough grouping of communities that would probably justify having a personal care home. One of the issues there obviously and makes it even worse is the fact that there are not Home Care programs in that area to take off some of the pressure.

So I am very much aware of that need. How we address it gets into a host of issues, and I look forward to a discussion with the member on that matter.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for The Pas, with a final supplementary question.

**Mr. Lathlin:** Promise even a budget, too.

Madam Speaker, my last question is to the same minister. Will this minister recognize and accept the fact that aboriginal people are human beings and citizens of this province and convene a meeting with MKO and NACC together for the purpose of

identifying concrete action plans to address the situation that we were just discussing?

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, health care for aboriginal people is a very serious matter as it is for all Manitobans, and for any member of this House to get up and ask if a minister would recognize aboriginal people as human beings I find offensive. I find it very offensive and unworthy of the member, for any member of this House.

Madam Speaker, in the first few weeks of my tenure as Minister of Health, following a meeting in Dauphin in which MKO was part of that meeting, I wrote to both MKO and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs inviting them to work with us and UMM and MAUM in finding a way of putting together some form of coordinating function that we could provide some liaison with the regional health authorities in developing and dealing with some of these issues. As of this date, I am still awaiting their reply and input. I would hope I would have it shortly, and I would welcome that input.

### **Economic Growth Manufacturing Industry**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Premier. March 14 we are going to be anticipating yet another budget, and in that budget what we are going to see is a lot of stats that are going to attempt to prop up this particular government.

What I did, because no doubt all members of this Chamber will talk of the benefits of having a well-diversified economy, is I looked at the manufacturing industry, and I went back to 1988. In the month of April when they were elected, there were 64,000 manufacturing jobs. In January of '97, there were 61,500.

Madam Speaker, if you put all the stats to the side, if you like, in terms of here is where we are doing well, the bottom line is that in the manufacturing industry where there are decent, well-paying jobs, this government is failing. It is failing miserably.

My question to the Premier is, why?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I know that the member may want to try and paint things

as negatively as he possibly can, which is unfortunate because most observers, whether it be economic observers, the banks, the Conference Board, the independent forecasters of this world, are all saying that Manitoba faces a period of buoyancy and economic growth and strength like it has probably not seen in its history. In fact, today Manitoba has more people employed than it has ever had before in its history. It continues this year, last year, and probably next year, to be in the top three or four growth provinces in the country. Its export growths have been in the upper echelon of the nation, first or second, for several years now. It also is the only province in Canada that with 1997, the new forecast just out, we will have had six straight years of increase in capital investment, the only province in Canada that can say that.

With all of these indications, one of the strengths that keeps coming forward is the manufacturing sector. We have companies expanding today, places like Vansco Electronics, places like Boeing, places such as Loewen Windows, Willmar Windows, Palliser Furniture—[interjection]

Madam Speaker, I would ask the members, please, please calm down.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Filmon:** We have had major, major increases in our exports. In fact, our exports to the world have more than doubled in the past six years. Our exports to our largest export market, the United States, have increased almost 150 percent in six years. Eighty-three percent of those export increases have been in value-added processed or manufactured goods. So it is clear that the Manitoba manufacturing economy, like virtually every area of our economy, is extremely strong and growing, Madam Speaker. I would think that that is something he would want to celebrate rather than not.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I am not going to celebrate that this Premier has lost 2,500 manufacturing jobs since he has been the Premier.

My question to the Premier is, did the Premier do anything with respect to Molson's where we lost 91 jobs, to Rogers where we are losing 82 jobs? Was the

Premier even aware that these companies were going to be moving out of the province of Manitoba? Does the Premier care about the manufacturing industry? Because, if he does, he has a funny way of showing it because we are losing jobs.

\* (1410)

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, the member opposite I know is not aware that there are massive changes taking place in the economy of the world and many of them do impact on Manitoba. The fact of the matter is, yes, we have lost a few hundred jobs in some areas of the old economy where we used to have employment numbers that were greater than today, but the other side of that coin is that January to January, according to Statistics Canada 1997 over 1996, we have almost 24,000 net new jobs. That means, after all of those jobs were lost, we have replaced them and added an additional almost 24,000 net new jobs.

Now the member opposite talks about the loss of some jobs at Manitoba Sugar and indeed every member on this side is very concerned about it. We have people involved in the sugar industry right here in our caucus. We have tremendous amounts of concern for it. That is directly attributable to the fact that his colleagues in the Liberal government of Ottawa by their trade policy destroyed those jobs, destroyed those jobs.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Lamoureux:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker, the Premier cannot have it both ways and blame the loss of jobs on Ottawa and the gaining of jobs on him—

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

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** The province is the one that is losing the jobs here.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Inkster did not have a point of order. It is clearly a dispute over the facts.

\* \* \*

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable First Minister, to complete his response.

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, the member has put the loss of jobs on Ottawa more succinctly than I could have, so I will leave it at that.

The fact of the matter is that this province is showing tremendous signs of growth as new opportunities are being accessed not only in the high-tech manufacturing areas but in areas of the new economy, in areas of computers, in areas of telecommunications, in areas of high-tech consulting.

We just met with a group this morning in our Economic Development Board who are in that leading-edge, high-technology field creating significant numbers of jobs in Manitoba. That is the way of the future, and that is what we are ensuring that we keep Manitoba focused on because those are the kinds of opportunities that will continue our growth.

#### Bristol Aerospace Employment Protection

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Inkster, with a final supplementary question.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Can the Premier tell this House what exactly is he doing to ensure that the jobs are going to stay with Bristol Aerospace as we all know that it is up for sale? Is the Premier involved in any way to try to protect those jobs and ensuring that our aerospace industry remains healthy in the province of Manitoba?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Madam Speaker, this government has been very interested and very supportive of the continued operations of Bristol. We have been in communications with both the company that is in the business of putting the company up for sale as well as the company that is handling the sale, clearly indicating to them that we want Bristol to be maintained as a unit here in Winnipeg and able to expand and grow with the activities that are available in the overall world economy of aerospace development.

### **AIDS Strategy Hospice Funding**

**Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne):** Madam Speaker, last fall Manitoba Health released its provincial AIDS strategy promising education, prevention, support, care and treatment for people living with HIV-AIDS. Last evening a coalition of eight service organizations, funded until 1998 under the federal government's AIDS Community Action Plan, sometimes known as ACAP, this group held a public meeting at which the community after two years of research and consultations determined that Manitoba needs an AIDS hospice.

My questions are for the Minister of Health. Given the provincial commitments in the AIDS strategy document and given the government's promises in the throne speech to target palliative care, am I right in assuming that Manitoba Health will be a partner in funding the AIDS hospice?

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that that recommendation that came out of the meeting last night that the member refers to is a logical conclusion from where we are in the AIDS strategy and the needs of people who suffer from that very terrible illness. Obviously today I cannot make a commitment to funding that, but I do want to recognize the importance of that recommendation, and I am sure that I will be seeing it brought forward to my attention through various channels in the near future. It is certainly worthy of consideration.

### **Services for Women**

**Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne):** Madam Speaker, because the AIDS strategy document completely ignores women and because last year 15 new women tested positive for HIV, which is a record number as far as I know, how does the minister plan to respond to women living with HIV and to their families when these women die?

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, I think for anyone who suffers from AIDS, whether they be male or female, and there may be unique issues involved, it is always a great tragedy for them and their families. So it is something we

obviously have to be cognizant of. That is part of what the AIDS strategy, I would imagine, is about, issues of palliative care and hospice. Certainly an area that I have managed to have some meetings on this subject since my appointment. I know it is one that the previous minister was quite concerned with as well.

We are certainly open to working with people involved in the partnership in dealing with this particular illness to find good, workable solutions to many of these issues. So I make that commitment to her today.

### **Implementation**

**Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne):** Madam Speaker, I am certainly pleased to hear the minister is open to these organizations because an official from communicable diseases has already told those AIDS service organizations funded by ACAP to expect no money from Manitoba Health, so I am wondering how the AIDS strategy will be implemented and how the hospice to which he apparently is also committed will be realized.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, I do not want the member to assume today. I see it as a very logical recommendation coming from that group. I have not seen it yet. All of the detail is something that has to work into consideration. I have systems in government in which to address that, including capital and other issues, so to say today, "I am committed, it will happen tomorrow" is just not accurate or realistic given the systems of government, but we are certainly committed to working on these issues and hopefully to find solutions, whether it be hospice that we can accommodate within our systems and budgets.

As a new minister, the commitment I give her is that it is an area where I recognize the concerns that are related there, and I am certainly prepared to work with people in that community, people who are dealing with this particular illness to find what solutions can work.

Madam Speaker, the withdrawal of the federal funds from this particular area is really a tragedy, and I would hope our friends in the Liberal Party can pursue that with their federal colleagues in the coming federal election.

\* (1420)

**Legislative Building  
Royal Doulton Product Promotion**

**Hon. Frank Pitura (Minister of Government Services):** Madam Speaker, yesterday I took a question as notice from the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) and I would like to respond to the issue raised by the honourable member and put on the record the background to the issue and the result.

First off, the reference made to Legislative Assembly Management committee had no connection to this issue, nor does the Speaker's office. The real issue is the contractor who operates the cafeteria and Legislative dining room allowed Royal Doulton to display and sell their products in the private dining room, which is in between the cafeteria and dining room. When it was brought to my staff's attention, they indicated to the contractor that this particular use of the private dining room was not a permitted use according to the contract. The contractor, who has just recently taken over the food services, was not aware of this restriction in the contract. The order given was to cease and desist from this kind of use, and a letter to this effect has been issued to the contractor.

**Winter Road  
Shamattawa, Manitoba**

**Mr. Eric Robinson (Rupertsland):** Madam Speaker, I only have one question. In the last couple of days I have been dealing with the Department of Indian Affairs with the Shamattawa First Nation and their housing crisis that is currently going on there, and my question is for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. As the minister knows, the people of Shamattawa are living in one of the most remote areas of Canada and certainly this province, and a community where the winter road is vital to the shipment of goods and services for a few short weeks of each year.

I would like to ask the minister if he is prepared to use part of the payment recently made by the band towards the construction of a road in order to keep the road open longer to allow a shipment of needed supplies for construction and would be showing good

will on the part of the province in assisting these Manitobans in remote Manitoba.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Madam Speaker, and the member, I acknowledge what he has asked. I will inquire with the department to determine the technical safety of the use of the road, the weights and the timing and naturally hauling at night is a little safer than in the daytime under certain weather conditions, but I will take the question as notice and contact the department immediately to determine what is possible. Naturally, the department will manage it over the course of time as the weather warms up. Hopefully, we may achieve his objectives and improve and guarantee safety at the same time.

**Youth Gangs  
Reduction Strategy**

**Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns):** Madam Speaker, we now hear that the federal government, yet with only limited jurisdiction to deal with the issue, is trying to get some co-ordinated, comprehensive response to organized criminal gangs, and I think this speaks not just to a coming federal election but more loudly to the pitiful leadership vacuum on the gang issue at the provincial level.

My question to the Premier or to the Minister of Justice, I ask again, would the government please consider acting—an action—based on our 18-point Gang Action Plan to deal comprehensively with gangs, and would they explain, given that gangs are on the mind of everyone, why this threat is not acknowledged or even mentioned once in this government's plans set out in the throne speech?

**Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Madam Speaker, the issue of street gangs in our communities is a very, very serious one, and last week I in fact raised that issue with the other Justice ministers. I raised that with the federal Justice minister. I asked for closer co-operation between levels of government. Today, I read in the newspaper about how the federal government unilaterally makes announcements in respect of the street gang issue as though there are no provincial Crown attorneys working on this problem, as though there are no police officers in our streets working on this problem. We

have been working on this problem. We are committed to solving this problem, but the federal government needs to be an active participant in this solution.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. Time for Oral Questions has expired.

### NONPOLITICAL STATEMENT

#### Sisler High School Girls Basketball Team

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, I seek leave of the House to make a nonpolitical statement.

**Madam Speaker:** Does the honourable member for Burrows have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

**Mr. Martindale:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to congratulate the Sisler Girls Varsity Basketball Team who yesterday defeated Kelvin 51 to 44 to advance to the city finals on Friday. It always feels good to see a multiracial north end team kick butt against a predominantly white south end team and especially since many of our players are six inches shorter than their competitors. It proves that talent is more important than height even in basketball. I wish them well in their city final game on Friday. Thank you.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Third Day of Debate)

**Madam Speaker:** To resume debate on the proposed motion of the honourable member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed) and the amendment moved by the honourable Leader of the official opposition (Mr. Doer), the honourable member for Pembina who has 16 minutes remaining.

**Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina):** Continuing on the theme of education, parents benefit from working with school as well. They can gain another perspective on their children's growth and development and incites into how to support learning at home. Parents who have been involved in school tend to have a better sense of directing their child's learning at home. Parental

involvement benefits the school in many ways. Parents form a natural link between communities and school. They bring a community perspective to planning and decision making. Parents can be involved in a number of ways, including participation and decision making. Parental involvement in this sense has been formalized through advisory councils for school leadership.

The regulatory support for advisory councils is now law. It is the first time in the province's history that parental and community involvement have been legally empowered. It is no longer discretionary and cannot be taken away. The regulation provides for interdependence that should characterize the relationship between school and the community in an increasingly interdependent world. Facilitating the creation of advisory councils for school leadership and working with parents and other members of the community to prepare school plans constitute a new era of responsibility and commitment for school principals.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I am experiencing great difficulty hearing the comments from the honourable member for Pembina. I wonder if I might ask for the co-operation of those members having small meetings, if they would do so either in the loge, on the chairs—pardon me—or outside the Chamber.

**Mr. Dyck:** I am pleased that 194 advisory councils have been formed since this initiative was announced. Our government continues to encourage the participation of parents and community members in the educational process. School planning follows closely on the heels of the establishment of advisory councils. With parental, community and staff input, principals are now being asked to prepare school plans that may include such elements as curriculum, cultural and extracurricular activities, student discipline, community use of facilities, grading and evaluation, reporting student achievement, student retention and promotion, staff development and areas requiring improvement.

\* (1430)

Our government advocates and requires a school-based planning because it allows individual schools to respond to the unique needs and strengths of the communities they serve. Effective planning zeroes in on the questions concerning education purpose. It allows school communities to create and develop or

rethink and reconsider underlying philosophies of education.

School-based planning allows staff, students, parents and community members to examine the challenges and choices the school faces. The process allows them to identify strategies that benefit all students, identifying desirable results that are being met or need to be met along with ways of achieving them. It also allows participants to address how various programs and services support school-wide goals. There are benefits that go beyond these, since this collaborative approach contributes to an effective learning environment by creating a consensus among the partners on educational purpose and direction. It helps to create a greater acceptance of change.

School-based planning has been known to improve communication among staff, improve their morale and that of students and create more effective relationships among schools and parents. Greater teaching effectiveness, more effective ways of handling discipline, better co-ordination of programs across grades and disciplines, and better use of resources have also been identified as benefits. A school plan is the result of a continuous planning process and is not an end in itself but the beginning of a process of guiding change.

This government has earned the trust of the people of Pembina and Manitoba. This has been earned not on words that have been spoken but rather on actions that have been taken, actions that have seen Manitoba prosper and grow. I have trust in the destination of this government and the path it will take getting there, as do the residents of Pembina.

We trust our government to take the necessary actions to ensure that the young people of Pembina and Manitoba receive an education that will prepare them for the challenges they will face now and into the future. However, reductions in federal financial support have not only affected educational programs but have also caused the government to look closely at how health care services are provided. The constituents of Pembina value affordable, accessible, quality health care. Yet my constituents also realize that change to the health care system is necessary if those things are to be maintained. Their willingness to change was demonstrated by the establishment of one

of the first regional health districts with the amalgamation of Morden and Winkler hospital boards.

Madam Speaker, there is a growing realization that institutionalized health care does not necessarily equal quality health care. While there is certainly a place in the health care system for this type of treatment, other community- and preventative-based alternatives need to be reviewed. Indeed, rural health boards are often better able to deal with the regionalized health needs and priorities of their communities.

Madam Speaker, our government recognizes that the best way to protect quality health care in light of federal cuts is not to remain stagnant but rather to explore alternatives that will be fiscally responsible while still protecting the well-being of Manitobans. The ultimate goal of all Manitobans is to maintain a quality health care system that is affordable and accessible to all. I am confident in our government's ability to achieve this goal. Our government's throne speech has given clear direction of achieving our common goals and is a continuation of the mandate that the people of Manitoba elected us upon.

Madam Speaker, I began my speech with the analogy of the road map. Together Manitobans are travelling on the road to prosperity. With our government firmly committed to the needs and aspirations of all Manitobans, we will get to our destination successfully and without incident. Thank you very much.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to unequivocally withdraw the expression I used in my nonpolitical statement, namely, "predominantly white." I think it is inappropriate to use an expression like that. I think it would be better if I and all of us here were colour blind, and so I apologize and withdraw.

**Madam Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Burrows.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, it is indeed once again and always has been a pleasure to be able to comment on throne speeches. Not ever



wanting to take it for granted that I will get re-elected, I enjoy every opportunity I get to respond to a motion of substance, whether it might have a lot of fluff in it at times or not.

I also wanted to acknowledge at the beginning the efforts put in from the table officers and right down to individuals within your office, Hansard and a very special mention to a gentleman by the name of Andy Drummond, who is our researcher, receptionist. In essence, you name it, he is the individual that does it for the Liberal caucus, just puts in a yeoman's effort at ensuring that we are able to operate as much as possible as a caucus. Hopefully someday in the not too distant future we will be able to have someone working along with Andy because of the amount of workload that is put on us as three Liberal MLAs that operate, in essence, as a caucus.

Madam Speaker, whether it is through surveys, discussion groups, interest groups, one-on-one talks or informal meetings that I have at McDonald's, I believe that the common thread that ties most concerns together is that people want a sense of security. People want to know that the quality of health care will be there for their family and friends if and when they need it. They want to feel safe in their homes and neighbourhoods. They also want to know that jobs will be there in the future. In short, they want a government that has a long-term vision that provides hope for our communities.

Madam Speaker, there was at the beginning of the session a great deal of discussion about you, yourself, and the need to have an elected Speaker. I have given a great deal of thought to that over the last couple of days, and I think it goes far beyond that. I think that what we really need to do is to look in terms of the institutions in parliamentary progress, if you like, into the turn of the century.

I can recall we had Wally Fox-Decent and his committee that went and looked at the MLAs' pensions and benefits and came up with some recommendations which were ultimately supported by every member inside this Chamber. Madam Speaker, I would suggest to you that maybe it is time that we reconvene that particular committee and start looking at electoral changes in reforms that might be on the horizon or needed. A lot of that comes from some of the

problems that we have incurred in being a caucus of three, whether it is an operating budget, whether it is a staffing complement, through the experience of mine in going through four provincial elections as a candidate in terms of the way in which campaigns are financed.

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

If we talk about the way in which MLAs are in fact elected, I am not entirely convinced that the current status quo, 57 ridings, one MLA in every riding, is necessarily the best way to go, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think we are long overdue for a good, hard look at reform of our institutions to ensure that the will of the people will, in fact, be represented inside this Chamber and that out of that, I am sure, you would see recommendations such as what we had talked about, an elected Speaker. Things change, and what we should be trying to do is to try to manage some of those changes.

Having said that, what I wanted to do for the throne speech is just to comment somewhat briefly on some of the questions that I asked during the week, to start off with the question I posed today, and that is with respect to the economy. Shortly, a week from tomorrow, we are going to be receiving the next provincial budget, as I indicated in Question Period. What I am anticipating is there are going to be a lot of statistics that are going to be padded in the sense of trying to make the government look as good as it can. It will go out of its way to condemn the federal government, whether it is transfer payment cuts and other potential issues that are out there. It is almost completely predictable in terms of what we can anticipate in the next budget.

\* (1440)

I guess ultimately what I would like to be able to see is the government take more of a hard look in terms of what it has achieved over the years. I picked out today the manufacturing industry, because I think that one of the greatest strengths that the province of Manitoba has over many other provinces is the diversification of our economy. Our economy has really never had the great booms of Alberta in the '70s or Ontario in the early '80s or, some would ultimately argue, in what is happening in B.C. But, equally, we have not had the great bust, if

you like, where the economy has completely fallen apart, and the reason for that is because we do have somewhat of a diversified economy.

When I was first elected, one of the industries that I had looked at—and it was primarily because of my concern with respect to the garment industry—was the manufacturing industry. So earlier today what I did was I pulled some numbers, and I found, as I illustrated, that in April '88 there were some 64,000 manufacturing jobs compared to January '97 where there is 61,500 manufacturing jobs. The Premier (Mr. Filmon), in response to the question, said, well, look, all in all if you look at the overall job picture that we have a net gain of jobs, and he says 10, 20, whatever thousand of jobs. Well, what I was wanting to focus on is the fact that stats can be used to be able to manipulate a case and put it in a favourable light on the side of the government or on the side of the opposition. If we all agree, and this is where it was a bit confusing, that the manufacturing industry is an important, vital industry not only for today but also for tomorrow, why then did the Premier (Mr. Filmon) virtually completely ignore the question of, why are we losing the manufacturing jobs? Instead he started to focus on the service sector where it has expanded, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

There is a big difference in the type of jobs that the Premier was talking about and the type of jobs that the Liberal caucus is talking about through Question Period. What we are talking about in essence is relatively decent jobs that are paying decent wages. What we have seen over the last couple of months is Molson, 91 jobs gone; Rogers Sugar, 82 jobs that are going to be leaving.

It is interesting. The other day I was on the computer, and I believe it was Encarta that I was on. I went into manufacturing, and it showed Manitoba manufacturing, and it had a brewery as using the example. Well, today we really do not have the major brewers. We lost Labatt, and now we are going to be losing Molson. What role did the government play, if any role at all, in trying to ensure that those jobs could stay in the province of Manitoba? [interjection]

The Minister of Justice asked if I did my share of partaking in beer consumption. Well, I do not drink, so, unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on which

way you want to look at it I guess, I did not partake in drinking Molson's. But that is in essence, from what I understand, the primary reason why they left the province, because I believe that they had 12 percent of the share, and they were hoping to increase that share, and that never occurred. At least I understand that that was one of the reasons.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was in the Garden City hotel and other facilities, and one of the little sugar packets you see, they say Rogers Sugar products. Do not quote me on the exact word, but it is from Rogers. You know, whether it is that Molson beer or whether it is that sugar, these are all products that are being consumed in the province of Manitoba in good part, and we are losing these jobs.

What did the government do? Was it even aware of it? Was it prepared to even contact the CEO over at Molson to see if in fact there are some things that we can do? I did not hear any sort of news reports saying that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) was down visiting or picked up the phone and made the phone calls.

Our Premier has a very different approach at trying to lure jobs to the province of Manitoba, and I am not convinced that it has been all that successful with respect to the manufacturing industry at the very least, especially when we talk about retaining those valuable jobs. That is unfortunate.

You know, in the second sup I asked earlier today, I asked the Premier (Mr. Filmon), what is he doing with respect to Bristol? We know Bristol Aerospace is now up for sale by Rolls Royce. Has the government or has the Premier done anything to see what we can do to ensure those jobs or that we can increase the chances of retaining those jobs? Instead of answering the question, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) answered the question. Am I then to read into it that the Premier of the province has not done anything? We are talking about the aerospace industry that employs hundreds of Manitobans, and one has to wonder in terms of what sort of action the government has done. We are not trying to imply that you can put up a brick wall at the Manitoba borders. But I will say one thing, the Premier of this province needs to get a lot more aggressive at keeping jobs in the province of Manitoba, that when we hear these budgets and when we hear these throne speeches and the government gives itself

a big pat on the back is quite fictitious in the sense that the things he is talking about are extremely selective.

When we look at the bottom lines on many important issues, this government has been failing and failing miserably. It saddens me to see that we are losing these manufacturing jobs, because they are quality jobs, and those are the types of quality jobs that I believe the Premier has to be more aggressive. You know what is unfortunate is that when we hear an announcement, there is some attention that is generated, but we have come to a point in which, you know, one, two, maybe three days of some attention is given to those jobs being lost and then it kind of just dies off as an issue.

That is unfortunate and maybe in part what needs to happen is that we have to start holding the government more accountable on some of the actions or lack of actions that this government has taken in terms of trying to retain some of these very valuable jobs. Look at when we talk about diversification. We look at what is happening in the agriculture area and the controversy that is being created in some areas. Remember the hog industry, which I will acknowledge as wonderful, fantastic opportunities. Yes, it could potentially double over the next decade, and one has to start asking the question in terms of to what degree this government has been working with the industry.

I remember hearing presentations from reps from within the industry when they were making a movement towards the single-desk check-off system, where they are saying, look, this government is catering to the elite, the large, corporate hog producers. We want to ensure that the future of hog production in the province of Manitoba will be there for the small hog producers. [interjection] The minister says, talk to them today and see how it is working. Time will tell, but there was a genuine concern. How much consulting did the government do prior to invoking some of these changes? There was not any, because there was not any consulting done, because I will tell you something, we had strong Tory cardholders that were coming, making presentation which I heard, and they were going to give up on the Tories. They were talking that we have to get—you will have no problems in rural Manitoba, just in the hog industry in itself. That is how frustrated they were feeling.

\* (1450)

Look at the elk and what is happening with the elk farming. One of my constituents by the nickname of Tiny comes up and attends our local, and he is a relatively large man, but he comes down to a local restaurant in my area and he says, you know, this is a quote that the Minister of whatever, the former Minister of Natural Resources, and the Minister of Natural Resources said, trust me, Kevin. Exactly, as the ministers laughed, so did my constituent. Then he went and he explained how the minister in about 15 minutes, of what would appear 15 minutes, because he is actually reading Hansard, I would take it, that the minister was wrong in what he was saying. He was talking about where these elk were in fact being caught. He started to talk about some of the problems in terms of the elk disease and all it takes is just two elk to rub noses and the blue-tongue disease can be transferred over. He started to talk about elk that were being poached, and I do not even know if the government is aware of this, and if they are not aware of it, I will forewarn them. It is going to be an issue at least that I will bring up in the Estimates, and if I get the opportunity for Question Period I will bring it up for Question Period.

One of the issues that he raised was that there were elk being captured in the province of Manitoba and being brought over to Saskatchewan. Hopefully, we will get one of the ministers to respond to that particular statement. It is a very serious allegation. If, as a Liberal caucus, we had the resources, trust me, we would be doing a lot more research into that particular issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So it is only a question of time, and we will get some sort of confirmation on it. Maybe the government should do some homework now and try and find out if in fact that is the case and then they can maybe make a ministerial statement or something of that nature, but at least they have been somewhat forewarned, and I will be sure to, at the very least, address that particular issue when we go into the Agriculture or Natural Resources Estimates.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we could talk about education, and actually I could talk about education for 40 minutes quite easily, and what I did was I picked out three areas in which I thought I would focus some

attention. First and foremost, the Liberal Party and I personally believe in public education as the No. 1 concern for the province of Manitoba; when it comes to education, this government has to give more attention to public education. The type of attention that I am talking about is that a public education should challenge the abilities of all students. That means that, if you are learning disabled or if you are a gifted child or if you classify as the average, if one can use the word "average," the purpose of the public education is that you have to challenge their abilities, because only by challenging their abilities are you going to be able to see them excel. If they excel, then they are going to be able to realize opportunities, and that is what government is here for, to try to provide opportunities—

**An Honourable Member:** You are a Tory.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** The Minister of Education says I am a Tory.

**An Honourable Member:** No, you have got a heart.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** No, I am not a Tory. As my colleague from The Maples says, I have a heart. To me that is what a public education is about. I brought up the question of special needs the other day. For years the government has been talking about special needs in reviews and studies. You know, I used to be the Education critic a couple of years back, and the then minister was Mr. Manness. Mr. Manness was talking about reviews of special needs, and now we finally see it in the throne speech. Not much more on the K-to-12 education, but they did say there was going to be a review on the special needs. Hopefully, we will see an actual study, and not only see the study but see action, and that is in fact what we want from the government when it comes to special needs. The crux of the question that I posed was, why did we have to go external, and I know the Minister of Education is going to be responding. When I say "external," it is external in the sense of going to outside people in order to have this review because I believe we should have the expertise within the department to be able to do a review of this nature, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But why did we have to do that? And it is long overdue, and hopefully we will see the government materialize on taking some very concrete, tangible action with respect to it.

The third issue is that of the financing of education. The financing of education in one sense has been a complete and absolute disaster from this government in terms of commitment to public education, and I could even say it even went on in the years of the New Democratic administration.

**An Honourable Member:** I do not think so.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** The member for Flin Flon (Mr. Jennissen), if you took a look at the budgets, the dollars that have been allocated, I can assure all members of this Chamber that the reliance on property tax to finance public education has grown every year virtually because the provincial government, this government and the government before it, well over the past decade has held back and cut back on public education.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that that is being very shortsighted, that the role of the teacher at the same time has been greatly enhanced. Not only are they teaching, they are also counsellors. In some areas, they are babysitters, at least it would appear at some times that they are babysitters. They are doing far more today than was requested of them in the past.

The member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) asks about the feds, and I can see this member's comments already on the budget or on the throne coming up, because we all know that he wants to make it to Ottawa, and we do not know if he will. You never assume. You never take it for granted. But, I know where his focus is going to be, and no doubt he is going to be focusing a great deal of his efforts on the federal scene. I do not blame him for that because now that is the line that he has taken to go in terms of his career.

Having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wanted also then to touch upon health care. Some are asking the question about me. I am not running federally. I am quite content on being an MLA and hope to run in the next provincial election. We have a wonderful, dynamic lady, the name of soon to be announced, who will be running in Winnipeg North Centre as long as she is able to get the nomination, of course.

Having said that, I did want to comment on health care. Health care is again a critical issue. It is an issue which I address in every throne speech and budget that

I get the opportunity to speak in. Virtually anytime I get the opportunity to speak on anything that comes before the House dealing with health, I like to believe I am expressing my thoughts. In fact, we have introduced the private member's bill on the five fundamental principles for consecutive years now, and we will likely be doing it again even for this session, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I know what the constituents that I represent want, and they do want to have those five fundamental principles of health care maintained, not only for today but for many, many future generations.

\* (1500)

The regional health care authorities was another issue which I had raised during Question Period. We within the Liberal Party opposed the creation because we were concerned with the amount of volunteers that this government is just throwing to the side who participate in so many ways throughout the province on volunteer boards. We were saddened to see that now the government, the current Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) is using a very heavy-handed tactic to try to get these volunteer-based boards to succumb to these regional health care authorities. They have indicated that they have the resources and they are going to be taking care of the debts but only if they are prepared to give up today, in essence, as opposed to allowing for more of a natural flow. I would suggest to the government that maybe they might want to reconsider that, because if they allow for more of that natural flow, what we will see happen, I believe, is that more people will at least remain interested in continuing on in some other capacity.

The greatest concern about the regional health boards and advisory boards today, I believe, is the way in which these boards are put together. What the communities want, whether you are in Thompson or Dauphin or Winnipeg, anywhere throughout the province, what you are seeing is that the people want to see some form of an election to these boards. They do not want the government to be appointing 100 percent of the board membership. And it would be tragic if in fact that does occur because I can recall speeches that I gave last session, when you have a politically appointed board they are just going to carry out what it is that the government wants.

For me at the time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the real reason why the government was bringing in these boards was to try to confuse the public in terms of accountability so they can say that they are not the ones that have closed down this particular facility or they have shut down this particular service at a particular facility; that it was the regional health board, and those are the people that you go to. Then on the other hand they would condemn the federal government for the transfer payments for any other changes that might have to be brought through the system.

They do whatever they can to avoid responsibilities. That is one of the primary reasons why we opposed the regional health boards in the first place. And now that we are going to get the regional health boards, at least, Mr. Deputy Speaker—you know, the ministers I know in the past and I trust the current minister has implied that there will be some form of an elected positions on these boards, but there is no real time frame that is set up. This is something that has to be addressed.

My time is quickly running out. There was one other area—actually a couple of other areas. There is community clinics—I say this because the Minister of Health is here—is something in which I feel—and is always generally speaking, here. The community health clinics and the future role of the community health clinics is absolutely critical for a positive change or a positive health care reform. You know the minister nods his head in the affirmative, and that is something in which the former minister said that he himself would put emphasis on, and I trust and hope that the current minister will do that because that is in essence I believe one of the greatest opportunities for us to ensure that we are bringing health care services to the people and improving the quality of health care services. It does not mean that it is going to be in additional dollars.

Also, another thing that I would like to flag, like I flagged the elk going to Saskatchewan potentially, another issue that I would want to flag to the Minister of Health is the Health Links program. If that particular program was to disappear I think it would be an absolute disgrace. It is something which has to be there. In fact, I would encourage the Minister of Health to make a long-term commitment to the Health Links program; to promote it and to actively promote it.

We actively promote the number 911 as an emergency number. For those of you that do not know, the Health Links is a 24 hour, seven day a week health service where it is operated by registered nurses. They do a fantastic job. If you wake up at two o'clock in the morning and your child is feeling ill, instead of going to emergency services you can pick up that line. You make the phone call, and you can be helped out. They might end up telling you to take him to the hospital but I would appeal to the government to make that long-term commitment. It is an excellent idea, and they need to have that commitment because after you get that commitment then we can start advertising the number that much more broadly. That is what the government should do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you can advise me when I have a minute left to go because I do have an amendment that I would like to move. How much time do I have?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Seven minutes.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Seven minutes. Not enough, I am afraid. Not enough. I wanted very much so to talk also very briefly on the gambling issue. The gambling issue is something which this government created in its infancy back in 1989. We have a problem in the province of Manitoba today. It is a social problem. This government has failed to recognize that. Even in the province of Alberta—and it took the provincial election—they have finally acknowledged, and they are going to respect the will of different communities, and that is something which this government should be doing. They have to listen to what those rural communities are saying, what some of these social advocacy groups are saying. There is a very serious, negative social consequence because this government has adopted a gaming policy that is based on raising cash.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not opposed to gambling per se. I would argue that a gambling policy should be based on tourism, a tourism-driven policy, and there is a big difference. You do not need VLT machines in every community. We were saying that for years, and then the Desjardins report came out and reinforced that. It talked about realigning some of these VLT machines. They had the VLT machines close by to The Maples Collegiate.

\*(1510)

**An Honourable Member:** Across the street.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Across the street, says the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski). Is that what we want? At least we should have consulted with the people before we started putting them in every corner of the province. There is a role for gambling. I will concede that. In fact, a number of years ago I was very explicit in terms of what I thought we should be doing with the province with respect to gambling.

I know I have missed a number of very important issues. No one really has enough time to address all the issues that they would like to do. I will get another opportunity, no doubt during the budget as long—it depends what happens, of course, with the throne speech vote. There are a few possibly disgruntled members, which speaks a lot about personalities, but I will not talk about the individuals. Personalities, possibly of the Premier, and style, of course. It was interesting reading the article about the group of four, the four most influential people. The only one that made me feel somewhat comfortable is that Mrs. Filmon was, in fact, listed as one of those individuals, someone which I do have a great deal of respect for. Having said that, I look forward, if we do make it to the budget process, to add more words on the budget.

At this time, I will move, seconded by the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry),

THAT the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following words:

THAT this House further regrets:

THAT this government has failed to provide leadership in managing change in our health care, Education, Justice and other government departments; instead, they have shortchanged Manitobans by blaming the federal government for their own shortcomings and failing to provide services the citizens of Manitoba deserve.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The amendment is in order.

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am delighted to be

able to speak today on the throne speech at the beginning of this legislative session.

I have been fascinated by how in four short days we have come full circle back to, in many respects, the kind of questioning that I thought would be gone, the kind of attitude that I thought would be gone from the members opposite because they had made such a kaffuffle about courtesy, decorum, manners, following the rules that I really thought I would see them reforming their own attitudes and behaviours in the Chamber this session.

I am not including the Liberals. I am saying the official opposition. Because while I disagree with a lot of things that the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) just said in his speech, they have remained courteous and, unfortunately, the official opposition, the NDP, have not made any attempt.

The first day we were back, again we saw the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) mouthing very rude comments to and about the Speaker, and we had not even been here 48 hours, so that is par for the course. I thought, given all of their pontificating, that they would come back wanting to set an example. Unfortunately, the example they are setting is not the one that I thought they would want to reflect to us, and that is regrettable. It is very regrettable, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we have so many good initiatives in the throne speech and we have so many things outlined in the throne speech that I would think they would believe in and would want to support.

I would throw a little challenge out to them. I would invite them to be part of the solution. I would invite them to work with us rather than consistently against. I would invite them to look at the other side of the coin. I would invite them to see the other side of the picture. They come in prepared to be negative on principle just for the sake of being negative, sheerly and only and totally for the sake of being negative, because I have seen them speaking against things that they urged us to do in earlier times.

When I say I ask them to look at the other side of the coin, the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) just now, after we expressed horror on this side of the House, realized what he had said and had the good grace to completely withdraw a statement that, had he

paused to consider the other side of the coin, would never have made. In making a statement as he did that he was glad to see—I will not go through the statement because—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I hate to interrupt the honourable minister but, at this time, I would ask the minister to be more towards the issue that is before us at this time, and that is the throne speech. I do believe if the minister continues on this track, we will be going on a bit of a fishing exhibition, and it will not help the decorum of the House at this time.

The honourable minister, to continue.

**Mrs. McIntosh:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I realize that as we do decide to go through the throne speech and we seek to implement the many good initiatives in it that it would be helpful if the opposition could be supportive of those things that in the past they have said they were or alleged they were supportive of. I do accept the member for Burrows did withdraw his statement, because he heard us call out and say, think about what you have just said, and he did withdraw it. It is in Hansard so I do not need to repeat it. It is there for the reading.

But I say, if you take pause and look at the other side of the coin, to see the other side of the issue even if you have to wait until someone on our side draws it to your attention, you may find that the other side has some merit. I invite them to do just as the member for Burrows did and withdraw errors you have made in judgment when you look at what we are saying in the throne speech and not just be negative for the sake of being negative. I take a look in four days that we have been here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and already just to give you some examples of how, instead of concentrating on the good things that are outlined, the plans we have, and seeing how together we can move forward on them, the opposition has already attempted to divert us away from those things onto a different venue.

Two examples pertaining to me in my department, just by way of providing an example, they are not necessarily issues that I take extreme umbrage with, but they are typical of the kinds of things we have been hearing in the last four days, things that will not help

this government or help the people of Manitoba as they pursue a good agenda for the people of this province.

Working together, the Leader of the Opposition in his speech spent a great deal of time talking about the need to co-operate. So I think I am entitled to the same amount of time to answer his particular comments. When he says that we need to co-operate and then encourages his members to do the opposite, there is an inconsistency. It reads well in Hansard from his perspective, and it reads well in Hansard to his supporters, but it does not ring true in what they say and do.

The two examples I can mention, because we have only had two in these last four days, one was the establishment of the post-secondary council where we named the members of the council. We had been through the debate at the time of the committee hearings on whether these should be lay people devoid of conflict or the special interest groups on the council running the affairs of the university. We went and adopted the model of the Universities Grants Commission, which is a board of lay people. The council, of course, replaces the UGC, and it seems fitting to use lay people. There are a lot of other reasons it is good to use lay people.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at first I thought it was amusing, and then I thought about it a bit more and I thought, it is not amusing, it is kind of sad. The Education critic for the NDP acted very surprised that this council was made up of lay people when we have been very clear that it would absolutely not have any of the special interest groups on it but that they would consult by law with the special interest groups.

The opposite critic from the NDP, Jean Friesen, said she would have preferred this to be a broadly based group, which would include someone from the aboriginal community. Mr. Deputy Speaker, no research, no homework, no knowledge of what she is speaking, because we absolutely do have an aboriginal person on that council. More than that, we have an aboriginal person in the person of Herman Green, whose whole background is in dealing with educational issues as they pertain to aboriginal people and self governance so, I mean, she did not do her homework. She did not know what she was talking about. She did not have a clue. But she spouted off to the Free Press

as if she did, saying they should have an aboriginal person on there.

\* (1520)

Well, we do have an aboriginal person and a very good one with a background in just the area we need, but she did not know that, she did not research it, but she spouted it off just to be negative. If she had looked at the other side of the coin or done her homework, she would never have criticized us for not having an aboriginal person when, indeed, we do have a very capable aboriginal person there, so negative just for the sake of being negative.

She also indicated in there that we should have someone who had some ability to understand what is going on in the high schools. She said that we needed someone who understood the linkage between high school and university. She said, for example, one of the tasks will be to co-ordinate the connections with high schools to make the transition from high school to post-secondary education more smooth than it has been in the past. She accused us of not having a person there who is expert in that way and, indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we do. We have a person who is a director at the South Winnipeg Technical school, which very clearly works hard on linkages between high school, apprenticeship, colleges, is both a high school and a college and represents three different school divisions. So she said, where are the trustees, where are the people who are knowledgeable about the transition from high school to college?

Well, he is there, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would invite the opposition member for the NDP to go and do her homework. I will not name this person. I invite her maybe to go and research who these people are and find out for herself which one is the one that is connected with South Winnipeg Technical school. It might do her some good to have to research things before she opens her mouth and spouts off to the Winnipeg Free Press on things about which she has no knowledge and has done no homework.

So on the two things she criticized us for, three things—she criticized us, first of all, for not having anybody connected with the institutions. This she says when we have a former board of governor chairman. We have a former board of governor. We have a



sessional lecturer from the University of Manitoba, when we have past student council presidents, when we have a whole host of people who have spent considerable time connected in leadership roles with post-secondary institutions.

That was her first criticism, and she was wrong. She was right in the sense that we do not have any people currently employed by any of those institutions on the council, and she knew that last year when we debated that issue and said we would not be putting on that council people currently employed with any of the institutions for obvious reasons of conflict. That debate was done. This was not a surprise to her.

So she refused to acknowledge the academic connections that are there with these people. She then accused us of not having an aboriginal when we have one. She then accused of not having people with connections to the transition from high school to college when we have one. She had not done her research. She was being negative solely and only for the sake of being negative.

The other issue that came up this week was an issue of how committed we are to early years intervention. This is a very important thing to us. It is something that we have been looking towards for at least two years now with the establishment that we made of the Children and Youth Secretariat. Not their government, our government recognized the need to co-ordinate those activities. We have now had in place for the better part of two years the Children and Youth Secretariat, which has been looking and working to plan how we are going to co-ordinate the whole child from birth on. We have a very deep commitment to early intervention, to early childhood development, to helping families with children in the preschool years, with children who are at risk.

I find this just so ironic. Again, the member did not do her homework, did not do her research. I was interviewed by the Winnipeg Free Press and asked about fundraising. I think this is maybe not a bad thing to put these details on the record because I understand the history revisionists from the other side are still running around trying to take us off our commitment to early years intervention by grossly distorting in a very negative way, again for the sake of being negative, the reality of words that have been said.

I got a phone call and was asked: Did I believe it was all right for the Winnipeg School Division to raise money for their school division by applying for a lottery licence? At that time, I said, well, if they wished to raise money by applying for a lottery licence, they are duly elected; they have the right to make that decision. They would need to go apply for the lottery licence, and I do not know what Lotteries would say to them, but they certainly have the authority under the law to make that decision.

I was then asked: Do you think it is a good idea to raise money by having a lottery in a school division? I said, well, again, that is up to them. It would not be my preference. I would prefer to see fundraising activities that in and of themselves were active rather than passive. The fundraising activity of applying for a lottery licence is a passive one. You apply for the licence and the money gets raised through raffles or whatever. An active fundraiser would be a car wash or some other activity where the students themselves are actually involved in a meaningful activity, or the people who are doing the fundraising themselves are actively involved in a meaningful activity, the activity in and of itself having merit.

I used, by way of example, the initiative that Fort Garry School Division has which I am shocked to see the opposition now criticizing, and I would venture that the member for Fort Garry, I would suggest to her that she let the Fort Garry people know how much the NDP abhors their fundraising initiative. Their fundraising initiative involves bringing students over from foreign lands. The students pay a fee; the school division makes money from that fee. The foreign students get to know and understand our Canadian culture and ways, and the students at Fort Garry get to know and understand and appreciate the people from those foreign lands. I am really disappointed that the New Democrats abhor that particular fundraising model to the depth and intensity that they do. I suspect that if it were one of their constituencies doing it, they would like it. Again I say, negative for the sake of being negative, because why would a cross-cultural exchange that leaves money in a school division be so terribly bad? Anyhow the NDP do not like that particular way of fundraising; that is beside the point.

\* (1530)

I had said to the Free Press reporter at that time that I would prefer to see rather than a passive lottery-type fundraiser an active, involved educational-type fundraiser, because raising money by lottery has no educational merit in and of itself. I was then asked, does Winnipeg No. 1 need to raise money because the government is not meeting its educational needs? My response was Winnipeg No. 1 is receiving enough money from government in its special levy to meet its basic educational needs, but they do have other things they offer in their division which are costly and are not funded by Education. They are enhancements and I was very clear in talking to the reporter, in the full conversation which of course was not reported, but just the capsules. These are enhancements; they are very good enhancements. They are very worthwhile enhancements, particularly for children at risk, but they are enhancements in that they are not funded by the educational system which is giving money to hire teachers to teach academics and we do not fund the early childhood years through education.

That is funded through another department of government. They have opted to do this for their own reasons which are good and worthwhile, but they are costly and they are enhancements, and that is true. They are definitely enhancements to certain schools in Winnipeg No. 1., and they are definitely costly. Those are two pieces of information that are true and they are not reflections on the Winnipeg School Division nor are they in any way, shape or form critical of the need to have early years intervention. It is simply a statement that the Winnipeg School Division was and is redirecting some of the dollars given to hire teachers to provide early school intervention because they see a great need in some of their schools for early years intervention.

We also see that great need, so we are not arguing about that. What we are talking about is from whence should that money come? What source should it be funded from? The Head Start programs that are in existence doing extremely good work to address that very need are not in schools. The training at the teacher institutions deals with the teaching of academics for students six years old and up. It does not deal with early childhood development, early years intervention, or early needs. We do learn a lot about those things in our daycare provider training out of Red

River Community College, and those people have early childhood expertise, but the people with Bachelors of Education do not necessarily have expertise in dealing with children, two, three, four years old. They are trained to teach academics and literacy and computation and citizenship and a wide variety of other things to students from age six up. So the training is all completely different.

Anyhow, from those comments the Education critic again, solely and totally for the sake of being negative, got up and said that the Minister of Education thinks these are costly enhancements and drew from that the illogical conclusion that I believe that early childhood intervention and early childhood assistance for children at risk was not a good idea. A wrong conclusion, and anybody who has followed my career of my 17 years as an elected official in education, my decade as a school trustee wherein one of my main focuses repeated ad infinitum to my colleagues was we have to do something to get to these kids before they come to school. What is the way to get to them if they are having difficulty when they start? Some of these problems should have been identified before they hit the school doors.

We helped sponsor—here is the height of irony, again showing how the opposition is being negative just for the sake of being negative. The opposition critic at the same time that she is hammering this side of the House, saying that because we acknowledge that these were costly and that they were enhancements to the current system—at the same time she was saying that, because we said that, we did not believe in early childhood intervention, we were, through the Children and Youth Secretariat, co-sponsoring a very good event, I felt. I believe the opposition maybe thought it was good too because a number of them came. They were invited to come to hear a speaker of international renown come and talk to us on the benefit and the need for early childhood intervention, early childhood development.

It is just so ironic that at 2:30 or two o'clock the Education critic would say, you do not understand the importance of early childhood intervention, and then at five o'clock that same critic would come and sit with me in a room to listen to a speaker that we had co-sponsored to come in to talk to all MLAs about that very topic. Again, negative for the sake of being negative.

Those are just small examples. They are minor in nature in that they are not earth shattering in terms of public perception or any of those things. They are just little examples how after four days in the House even on two relatively minor things, my critic in her relationship with me can only be negative, rude, insulting, questioning my motives. I did not challenge her on them, but she has questioned them from her chair in the House, and we have only been here four days. I see others do the same thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We have some wonderful initiatives in the throne speech. We have people who on the other side of the House, if they flipped the coin, as the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) did earlier, and saw the other side of the picture and looked at themselves from the other angle and realized what they had said and done, would change their minds just as he had the good grace to do. I invite everybody to have the good grace that the member for Burrows just showed, when he withdrew his racist—no, I cannot say that—when he withdrew his comments about white people and do what he did and withdraw their negative criticism about policies that I know in their hearts they believe. They believe in early intervention, just as we do. They may even believe in the Children and Youth Secretariat. They may even believe that dollars that need to go for children at risk in their preschool years should come from another approved source other than taken away from teachers' salaries.

They may believe that it is wrong to let a teacher go to hire a nurse. They may believe it is wrong to let a teacher go to hire a therapist. They may believe that we should keep those two teachers and have Health and Family Services provide that nurse and that therapist where required. They may believe that, but because we believe that and we stated that we believe it, they will never allow themselves to support it because they are compelled to be negative for the sake of being negative. I had really hoped that, after the way they grandstanded last year, they would be the ones to want to set the model for decorum, they would be the ones who would want to show that they can accept ideas that in their hearts they really like instead of pretending they do not like them so that they can just hammer. I think that, if they did that, perhaps, we could get a lot more done for the people of Manitoba.

I throw out a challenge to the opposition on our throne speech. I say to them: examine your conscience, examine your hearts, examine how you conduct yourselves and the rhetoric you put forward. Re-examine what you say, just as the member for Burrows re-examined what he said when he heard us all go, ah, listen to what you said. But as soon as we did that he realized, and he had the good grace to stand up and apologize and withdraw immediately rather than risk us maybe rising on a point of privilege tomorrow. I am not questioning his motives. I think he withdrew it sincerely as soon as he realized how he had revealed something that he maybe did not wish to reveal.

I would invite them to do that with the other issues in the House. I would invite them to look at the issues that they are maybe glibly spouting off on and recognizing ultimately the harm they could do by not supporting early childhood intervention, by not supporting the Children and Youth Secretariat, by not supporting a co-ordinated effort, by not exploring ways to deliver education wherein all the dollars set aside for education can actually go to education and provide those needs that are part of the development of a young child that in most instances could be and should be delivered by the families. The teaching the child to talk, the teaching the child to walk, the teaching the child to use the bathroom correctly, the teaching the child the appreciation of literature by sitting him on your knee and reading to him or her, by talking with the child and walking with the child, by holding the child and loving the child, those are things that normally happen in families, and in most families those things do happen.

\* (1540)

Where they do not happen, who should provide those for the child? They need to be provided. Statistics will show us the economic benefit, the health benefit. That speaker that we co-sponsored yesterday showed that even to the opposition. But for the sake of that child, that child needs those things.

We have people trained in early childhood experience, our daycare workers. We have courses at Red River Community College that tell about early childhood experience. We have all kinds of vehicles in the community through community organizations. The

high scope speaker that we had in yesterday talked about training people in the community to do a lot of this work with these children at risk. And these things are not happening in schools, they are happening in settings other than schools where they are giving the children what they are missing in their home experience so that when they come to school they are ready to learn.

Now, if the opposition wants to take the dollars that might be used to hire a teacher and let the teacher go and take those dollars to hire someone to come in to nurture and love and prepare that three-year-old for the day he might come to school, then they can carry on because that is what they have been saying the last couple of days. They can carry on repeating that. We are saying there is a better way. Do not let teachers go to do this. Do not fire a teacher because you cannot afford them anymore to free up the money to do this very important work. Work in a co-ordinated effort with the delivery agencies that would otherwise be caring for this child anyhow and provide those needs, address those needs, provide those things that child requires so that when they come to school they come fully ready to learn. That is what we are doing with the Children and Youth Secretariat.

How many times did I used to hear when I was a school trustee, why cannot the government of Manitoba, which at that time was the Pawley government, get its act together and stop chopping the children up into little pieces and having Health look after them here and Family Services look after them there and Education look after them there? The child is divided into a whole series of pieces with a separate caseworker for each piece and no co-ordination. Why can that Pawley government not get its act together and start co-ordinating the effects, co-ordinating the impacts of at least four major departments?

At that time I used to argue for Health, Justice, Family Services—it used to be called Community Services at that time—and Education. We have now added a fifth department, but they did not do it. I can remember coming down here and talking to Roland Penner about this when Roland Penner was Minister of Education. I can remember coming down and saying, you have got to start co-ordinating the departments because we have children at risk and the needs are not being met, and they did nothing. We have done it. We

have got the Children and Youth Secretariat. We now have added to that secretariat a fifth ministry, the Ministry of Native Affairs, and we have done that because we have seen and we have looked at the statistics. The numbers of children at risk who exist in that community who need help, they need our help, and the statistics are worrisome. In Health they are worrisome. The number of cases of diabetes, the number of cases of fetal alcohol syndrome children, a whole host of health problems, a whole host of societal problems, the number of children in care, the number of women in crisis shelters, those things are all things that need to be addressed coming from that community of aboriginal people who need our help. So we have added the Department of Native Affairs to the secretariat.

So when I go into schools as I do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a regular basis, and I visit schools in rural Manitoba, and I visit schools in small towns, and I visit schools in downtown Winnipeg and in the suburbs and in farming communities, I have visited Hutterite colony schools, I have visited home schools, I have visited small Christian schools, I have visited innumerable public schools, and I find a vast number of students doing very well, being very happy, in good supportive families with a top-notch educational experience.

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

I also find the students at risk, the fetal alcohol syndrome kids, those students with learning disabilities, the autistic students, the students who have circumstances at home that none of us would want for anybody and they come to school and they are at risk. They usually need remedial help, they will need special needs help, they are at risk, they require specialized care with dollars, and it is costly. There is nothing wrong with saying that it is costly when it is costly. The members opposite would put blinkers on and would say, if you say something is costly, it means you are against it. What utter nonsense, what utter nonsense. To acknowledge that something is costly does not mean that it is bad, it simply acknowledges that it is costly, that you have to find money from some place to pay for it. I find that, again, negative for the sake of being negative, they will put a connotation, their own emotional weighting on every word that is uttered. I say something is costly, they say, that means you do not like it. I say back to them, that is utter

nonsense. You are putting an emotional weighting on a word that simply reflects fact.

So these are very good things that we need to do, but they are costly, and we need to find money from sources that may not currently exist or from sources that do exist to fund them. We never had fetal alcohol syndrome children in the abundance that we currently have them. We now have many, many children in that category; we never used to see any. They are very costly to educate. We need to do something to help those mothers as they become pregnant, and we are doing things there. We are doing them through the education system, which the opposition members might care to do some research on.

So if we can help children avoid being born with these syndromes, that is step one, but once born, they need care, and it is costly. The fact that we have identified it is costly and that we need to source dollars from somewhere for it shows that we are realistic, shows that we care, shows that we have identified the problem and that we are addressing it when the opposition, quite frankly, when they were in government, never took the time to address it. They never took the time to address it, and the member for Swan River is yelping again as he does in this House, and saying I have said that this is an enhancement. Again, an emotional weighting to a word. It definitely is an enhancement. It is a wonderful enhancement. It is an excellent enhancement. What does enhancement mean, I ask you, my dear friend, from the North?

What does an enhancement mean? An enhancement means that you make something better, that you make it—from Dauphin, pardon me—something better. An enhancement means that you have taken something and improved it. So, when you say that I say something is an enhancement, why do you think I then mean that it is not good? [interjection] Now you are saying, but you said it was a costly enhancement, and you are proving my point. It is an enhancement. It makes the thing better. It is costly. We need to find money.

You know, Mr. Acting Speaker, the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) is proving my point. He is proving my point by the comments from his seat. He is saying that, if I say something is enhancing, somehow I am saying it is not good. Well, I do not know, I can remember wearing a gardenia corsage

when I was a young woman, and the young man who is now my husband said, that gardenia really enhances your hair. I thought it was a compliment, but then, of course, I put an emotional weighting on the word too, so I guess I am asking them to stop, stop, stop being negative just for the sake of being negative.

They know. They know beyond all shadow of doubt that we have done more to work with early intervention, with children at risk, than they ever did, and I can go back and I can tell you because I was a trustee in the system all the while they were in government, trying to get the Pawley government to do something to help us with some of these emerging problems. They never helped us. They refused to help us. I went through Maureen Hemphill, Roland Penner and Jerry Storie. Jerry Storie was the best of the three. [interjection] Well, Jerry Storie would at least listen. Jerry Storie tried to help, but Maureen Hemphill and Roland Penner did nothing when we came pleading with them for help. When we had special needs kids in our schools and I came to Maureen and asked for help, I would hate to repeat to you in the House the kind of help I got from that woman. It was nothing, nothing.

So what I am saying is we identified these emerging problems. The Pawley government did nothing. We came in and we established the Children and Youth Secretariat. It has done two years of work in planning. It has already put \$450,000 from Health into Education, so school divisions can hire nurses without having to first fire teachers. You never did that for us over there in the NDP benches. You made us fire teachers to hire therapists. We are correcting that. We have corrected that. That is in place right now, right now. We have \$450,000 to hire nurses, from Health into Education, so the school divisions do not have to let teachers go as you in the NDP made us let teachers go.

We are going to be more sensitive to the system. We are proving that. We have also taken \$250,000 through the Child and Youth Secretariat to train paraprofessionals through the Department of Family Services to go into the schools to do diapering, to do those kinds of things that classroom teachers should not have to do and that are not of the higher level of skill required that nurses must have in giving injections and so on.

So we have \$700,000 in Education right now coming from Health to assist with some of these special needs that you people when you were in government in the NDP never thought to do. Through you, Mr. Acting Speaker, to the opposition, the Pawley government, when we asked them to do these things for our kids when I was a trustee, said no. We are offering to do it and we are doing it, so please do not let them stand over there and be negative for the sake of negativism and read stuff into everything we say and do, misrepresent themselves—[interjection] They really are upset, are they not? They really are upset.

\*(1550)

I think the record should know that the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) and the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) are going ballistic on the other side of the House because they cannot take what I am saying. They have settled down now. They are standing with their mouths hanging open, but they have been just howling over there as I tried to point out their own record of achievement, which the member for Thompson knows because he was here.

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

He was part of the naysayers that would not help with early intervention. He was part of the government that turned off private daycare centres. Now he is making faces. He is putting his hands to his ears and wiggling his fingers and sticking his tongue out. He looks like a fool, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am just saying that so that Hansard can know that he is doing that.

I just feel that that is a disgrace. This is the man who says the decorum in the House is shot. This is the man who got up and spoke all night long about how noble and good and proper he was. This is the man who claims to know Beauchesne and has raised more incorrect points of order in this House than the history of this Legislature has ever known.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Oh, that really hurts me.

**Mrs. McIntosh:** This is the man who is heckling from his seat right now. He is heckling from his seat right

now, and I want this on the record because he keeps standing up and saying that he is the perfect one in this House and we are not. I am tired of them. I think they need to behave themselves in this Chamber.

### Point of Order

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Thompson, on a point of order.

**Mr. Ashton:** On a point of order, I realize that my mere presence in this Chamber does bother the Minister of Education at times, but I do believe we are debating the throne speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I am wondering if you might ask the Minister of Education to get off her personal vendettas and focus on the issues.

It is highly entertaining to hear her talk about Beauchesne and speeches in the last session, but I do believe we are talking about the throne speech, and I would appreciate it if you would call her to order and, by the way, if it might help her focus, I am quite prepared to leave the Chamber so that she can get some control over herself and come back later, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mrs. McIntosh:** On the same point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate what the member said, that it is asking for decorum so that we can implement the things in the throne speech, that I am probably almost as out of order as he was, and I would like him to take a look at his Hansard comments on the throne speech, his Leader's Hansard comments on the throne speech and all the other members—

**Mr. Ashton:** I have not spoken yet.

**Mrs. McIntosh:** But you are going to, and I can tell you beforehand, I can tell you before you even do it that your speech will not be relevant. So I would invite him to go back and examine his party's record—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Thompson did not have a point of order, but may I request the House that as we are speaking to the throne speech that we remain as relevant to the throne speech as possible and we refrain from challenging each other from our seats. It would help the decorum to be maintained.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable minister, with 52 seconds remaining.

**Mrs. McIntosh:** I would just indicate that in the speech by Mr. Doer, the Leader of the Opposition, he mentioned this very topic I have been discussing. He says that I said—he says, the Minister of Education says, the money for early childhood education should come from a corporate fundraising like they have in Fort Garry.

I never said that, for starters. He is incorrect, he is wrong, he has put false information on the record deliberately and consciously, but I am being as appropriate as he is because I am addressing the topic that he raised in his speech, and I am correcting the false information the Leader of the Opposition put on the record, and I am asking the opposition to, please, let us not go through another session with them doing this day in, day out.

We can do better than that, people. We can do better than that for the citizens of this province.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Could I remind the honourable members at this time that I have recognized the honourable member for Broadway to put forward his speech. I do believe he would like to and, if the honourable members want to carry on some dialogue, I would appreciate it if they did so in the halls so that we could hear the honourable member.

The honourable member for Broadway, to start.

**Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway):** It was during a municipal campaign in Alberta that a politician dropped into a grocer's facility, in his grocery store, being managed by the owner. In the course of the conversation, the politician said, and may I count upon your support? Can I? The grocer said, I am sorry, but I have already given my support to your opponent. And the politician laughed and said, ah, in politics promising and performance are two different things. The grocer smiled and said, then you can have my promise, sir.

**An Honourable Member:** Was he a Tory?

**Mr. Santos:** It is in Alberta.

In politics there are two ways of dealing with political promises, the pragmatic human way we call usually Machiavellian, you promise one thing and you do another, because Machiavelli operates on the practical side of life, on the so-called nonmoral ground of strategy and decision making. He said you have to comply with your promise if possible, but if you have to break your promise to achieve your purpose, you can break your promise. In other words, the end justifies the means. That is one point of view. But this is not originally called Machiavelli. The idea came from the brother of Marcus Tullius Cicero when he was advising his brother who was a senator in the Roman Senate. Yes, this is the advice of Quintus Tullius Cicero's brother, Marcus Tullius Cicero. He said, "Human nature being what it is, all men prefer a false promise to a flat refusal. At the worst the man to whom you have lied may be angry. That risk, if you make a promise, is uncertain and deferred, and it only affects a few. But if you refuse you are sure to offend many, and that at once." Is this human nature? Do we really want polite, white lies? That is the Machiavellian way.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair)

I said there are two ways of dealing with promises. What is the other way? The other way I have to draw from the book it is written: the Lord hath commanded. If a man made a vow to the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth. That is the moral righteous way. We still have the choice as human beings to proceed one way or to proceed the other way, but we suffer the consequences.

\* (1600)

In other words, it is not merely a suggestion, it is a command, and it comes from the highest source that when you make a promise, you make a vow, you should do exactly what you said you would do. Why is that? Because we must not promise what we ought not to promise. If we do, then we are called upon to perform what we really cannot do. That is good logic that comes from Abraham Lincoln, a God-fearing man. Is this the expectation of the general public? Are we going to accede to that practical, pragmatist but immoral way of dealing with promises? If we do, the

consequences are easy to foresee. The public have lost confidence in public institutions, and the confidence of the general public among politicians is at the very least as low as their confidence in a used-car salesman. They are not putting any more trust but a diminishing degree of trust in the promises that we make publicly, politically, even in the political platform that we said we are running on.

What is the reason why we must do the moral way, the righteous way of dealing with promises? According to King Solomon, this is the reasoning why we should proceed according to our word, why our word should be our bond, as the Premier (Mr. Filmon) had been saying the other night. I remember more than once he said, our word should be our bond. I heard him. I agreed with what he said. I did not agree with what he did.

Why should we live according to our words, according to our promises? Let not thy mouth be hasty before God, for he is in heaven and you are only here on earth, so let your words be few. Just as being too busy gives you nightmares, so being a fool makes you a blabbermouth. So when you vow to Him that you will do something, do not delay in doing it, for God has no pleasure in fools. Keep your promises to Him. It is far better not to say you will do something than to say that you will do it and then not do it. Do not try to defend yourself by telling the messenger from God that it was all a mistake. That would make God very angry and he might destroy your prosperity. Dreaming instead of doing is foolishness, and there is ruin in the flood of empty words. Fear God instead.

Sometimes in our vision we promise glorious things in the political forum, things that we know will not pass. They are so visionary, so idealistic, so impractical that we promise the thing to the public. Yet it is outside our capacity to do it and, if it is done deliberately, like in the case of the Jets, there is an element there of—I do not want to be unparliamentary—misleading impression, being a stranger to the truth, in the words of the former Premier, Sterling Lyon.

All political parties are run by men, and men do the obvious way—when I say men I include women. Men and women, all right, men and women, very clear. We all fall short of the ideal thing. We cannot say we are

perfect or we know everything. There are things outside our control. There are things within our control. Sometimes we claim beyond what is within our control—[interjection] Yes. He said, we will do economic development. That claim obviously depends on many variables, many factors, only one of it being government leadership and government stimulation and, yet, there are other extraneous factors that affect economic development that are outside our control. Yet, because we made the claim, the public will blame us when it fails of realization. What you cannot do, you do not promise. Then you will be expected to fulfill things that you really cannot do. That is enough rationalization, so we should be very careful with our words and with our promises.

Having said that and having argued that, when we do make a promise, we follow the moral, righteous way of fulfilling our promise, no matter what the difficulties are, provided what we promised is within our capacity to do.

Let me now look at the record of this government, comparing the promises they made and the performance they did. The specific promises they made, this government promised on April 20, 1995 to spend \$191 million in capital spending. That is the promise. What was the action? What was the performance? Then they cancelled all capital spending by cutting \$53 million to Manitoba hospitals in the 1996 budget. Again, we are following the Machiavellian way. People like to hear promises; we give it to them. We cannot keep them because it is outside the budgetary capacity of government. We do not do it. When we do not do it, they lose their trust in our public institution. They have cynicism of all politicians. They will not only direct the cynicism against those who are perpetrators of these promises that are broken, but directed against every one of us, and they say, you are all alike. You are all alike. You make promises, and you do not fulfill them.

\* (1610)

What happens when there is a general lack of trust in public institution, a general lack of faith in political public people? What happens to society? There will be an attitude of defiance to the established authority. Under the setting we are raising our children, as the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) has said, let us



go to them in preschool days and rescue these people. When they see the example around them about unfaithfulness and promises that are not fulfilled, what else do we expect? They will not trust our public institutions. There will be problems right there at the beginning, and this will go on and on, and there will be social costs associated with all their attitudes, their defiance to authority, lack of reverence to established practices, lack of respect to their parents. This is all the foodstuff, the stuff by which future social problems are made.

They also promise to maintain spending in priority areas of health care. What did they do? What was the performance? They cut \$20 million in Pharmacare. They reduced the benefits to senior citizens from 80 percent to 70 percent coverage. From 80 to 70. They eliminated lifesaving drugs. Then they cut eye examinations for everyone between the ages of 19 to 64 years.

**An Honourable Member:** We have to pay for it now.

**Mr. Santos:** We have to pay for it now. All the seniors have to dole out the money in order to undertake this essential, necessary, preventive kind of eye examination. So there is again this gap between promises made and performance of this government. They maintained, in the past fiscal year, that there will be 24-hour emergency services in Winnipeg. That was the promise. What happened? They cut 24-hour emergency services in the five city hospitals. There was public protest, and that was very understandable. This government yielded and restored the 24-hour emergency at least in the four hospitals that were involved.

On April 15, 1996, this government promised to let no one take our health care away from us. No one shall take our health care away from us. Then, that was the promise. What was the performance? They started privatizing 25 percent of home care, which caused a strike by home care workers; so there is again this gap between political promises and political performance. We live to the Machiavellian way of dealing with. We cater to the expectations of the general public that it is better to make promises even if you cannot fulfill them, rather than deny outright, because you do not want to make political enemies. But that pragmatic and practical way of dealing with it

has consequences in terms of long-range effect on the nature of our political system, the nature of political obedience, and the nature of social and political problems that beset human society.

These are just examples of the consequences when we break our promises as a matter of course. There are no more qualms about breaking promises. Too light to make promises, and then yet we claim "my word is my bond." That is not the case in actual performance.

Now at this juncture, since I am dwelling on the area of health care, I would like now to convey the serious concerns of the most vulnerable group in our society with respect to this area of public policy, health care. I wish to discuss the issue of health care from the perspective of the Manitoba senior citizens who expressed their collective thinking on this issue in their 1996 October Conference which the member attended and I also attended.

Their most serious concern in that October Conference on the Issues of Today and Tomorrow is on the diminishing quality and availability of health care in this province. This pattern is clearly observable by the following events that had taken place and is still taking place but not limited to the following. I have already mentioned the closure of emergency room facilities for some period of time in the past fiscal year; and if it can happen then, the likelihood it can happen again. The likelihood of its recurrence in the immediate future brings some serious concerns in the hearts of senior citizens, particularly, and of all Manitobans who need emergency treatment whenever they are in the risky period of their lives.

As a result of cuts in health care support, there have been long waiting period for some diagnostic tests effectively delaying the treatment of some essential cases that need immediate attention. And while they are waiting for diagnostic treatment because of the long waiting list, some of them may in the meantime die. Of course, that eliminates the problem, but this is death as a result of inadequate facilities and unavailable health care in this province. There are also long waiting lists on surgery for cardiac bypass, and you know what cardiac problems means? It means immediate attention and if your surgery is delayed for a period of time, what would be the result? Either you become

incapacitated if you do not die; more likely than not because of the seriousness of the problem, you die.

Let me ask if it is your life, if it is your own self, if it is your own body, how much would you allocate to make this really available and accessible to you and to the rest of Manitobans? You will say, no limit to my life, deficit is no problem, debts are no problem, I want to live. I will pay if I have to. But you need immediate attention, and that is a problem, a serious concern on the part of our senior citizens. If you need a hip replacement and you are in pain, you fell, for example, in the snow as a senior citizen and you have to wait a month while waiting for hip replacement, that is a painful situation to be in. It is terrible, especially if you have done the best you could to contribute to the uplifting and development of this country. It may result in severe incapacitation or permanent disability on the part of the individual.

Of the Pharmacare benefits, the coverage that we had with respect to medication, since 1992, and I am talking about factual records, there have been escalating costs of drugs and at the same time some of the listings are being delisted from the covered list of necessary medication. At the same time at the federal level, they passed a law amending the federal act and giving pharmaceutical companies a 20-year monopoly on the new drug, and being new they cost more and there is escalating cost of these drugs that are necessary and essential for human health and survival. If the monopoly is 20 years, can you imagine the huge profits that these companies will be raking at the cost of our senior citizens, and at the same time they are being delisted and not covered? This is a terrifying prospect for senior citizens who have to take expensive medications for a long, long period of time, maybe for life, especially for people who are asthmatic and have to take essential and necessary drugs.

Generally there is a shortage of hospital beds in our hospital facilities. There are cuts in hospital staff. Even cleaning, auxiliary staff are being cut. As a result, the medical people, the doctors and the nurses, they are frustrated. They are dissatisfied. What do they do? There are other offers somewhere else. There are recruiters coming from Texas and other states in the United States. We train all these people, and yet after we train them, they find their working conditions, their working environment unacceptable

and they leave. There is a shortage of doctors as a result. There will be a shortage of our doctors, especially in rural areas in Manitoba, because of the frustration and dissatisfaction with the conditions of work, thereby lowering the health care standard which is the unique feature of the Canadian health care system in the face of other health care systems in the world.

We are very proud as a people in the nature of our health care system, and yet we are doing the things that lower the standard of that universal health care that we have in this country. Therefore, in the conference, as a result, the senior citizens, through the sponsorship of the Manitoba Society of Seniors, offer positive suggestions. What are some of the positive suggestions they offer? That the province maintain health care emergency facilities available to all people in all life-threatening situations. Is that reasonable? Very reasonable, because it protects risk of health and life of all Manitobans. They should not be closing all these facilities unless it is proven that their closure would be safe for the general public or the general population and it will be cost effective.

\* (1620)

They also asked the provincial government, along with sister provinces, to lobby the federal government, so that the federal government can maintain the traditional Canadian health standard through a strong Canada Health Act, supported by continued transfer payments to the provinces, specifically for health care purposes. What happened recently, they amended the act, which used to provide contributions from both provincial and federal sources so that this health care would be attended to. At this time they provided block granting of health and educational needs of the provinces. It is now within the discretion of the individual recipient of these transfer payments to allocate the money any way they like, sometimes to the detriment of health, which is a very important value to people.

They also recommended that the home care services should be expanded, especially if there is a policy among hospitals of early discharges of patients in order to keep the costs down and to keep the infirm in the home environment. If they are to be in the home

environment, and they are to be discharged earlier than they should, then there should be auxiliary services available to them, home care services where the patients are, even in their own home. I do not see sometimes the logic prohibiting members of the same family from taking care of their infirm and having some public assistance to do so. Who else can have the compassion, the interests to take care of people except their own relatives? What is wrong with that?

They also recommended that the Pharmacare benefits reduction should be slowed down. There should be low deductibles and that certain drug should be retained in the approved list until it is proven that the listing would not have harmful consequences. That is a very reasonable recommendation. Very reasonable. Preventive medical care, as exemplified by regular eye examinations, nutrition education and nutrition counselling, should be promoted by the government, especially if the government is to go through the community-based health care facilities, so that the service can be cost efficient and cost effective. Those are reasonable recommendations.

Personally, I think that an ounce of prevention—there is truth in that saying. There is wisdom in that proverb. An ounce of prevention is worth more than a pound of cure. If that is true, I recommend three rules for maintaining your health, whether you are a senior or not a senior. What are these practical rules of maintaining one's health? They all start with E, so I call them E rules. The first E means, eat what your body needs, so it is about eating. One of the most pleasurable activities any human being can do is eating, but you should be very discriminating in what you eat. You eat only what your body needs, not what your tongue wants, not what your palate wants, because naturally the tongue wants sweets, you know, and fats, and all the things that your body does not need.

**An Honourable Member:** Pizza.

**Mr. Santos:** Ah, that is a healthy food, provided it is cooked right, but it is better to eat the primary food, the organic ones, the natural grains, natural nuts, fruits and vegetables as they are found in nature. As much as possible, you do not eat processed stuff, because in the processing they are adding other ingredients that your body does not need and which are harmful to the body.

So we eat also protein-rich food like fish, fowl and particularly milk. Milk is a good food. [interjection] Broccoli—despite President Bush's aversion to broccoli.

**An Honourable Member:** Where is he now?

**Mr. Santos:** I do not know where he is, but he is not eating broccoli. We should eat those foods with essential minerals and nutrients and vitamins, essential fatty acids. Do you not think it is more pleasant to eat a red sweet pepper in the raw or two oranges to get your Vitamin C rather than pop a single vitamin pill?

**Some Honourable Members:** A raw onion.

**Mr. Santos:** Yes, it is pleasant, nice.

I said milk is a good food. It is good because it provides calcium for the bones, especially for the female sex. After menopause, you know, what is happening to them? They lose an average of 2 percent of their bone mass every year, so that if they live up to age 80, there will only be 40 percent of their bone mass in the body. Do you not notice you get shorter and shorter the older you get? Some women, their ribs will crack if you hug them because of this loss of bone mass.

Now, that is the first E. Eat the right stuff in its natural state. The second E is eliminate. You do not just put food in there, inside; you have to eliminate.

**An Honourable Member:** How do you do that?

**Mr. Santos:** Well, you know how you eliminate. You eliminate what your body does not need. If you keep your stuff too long, it will be toxic then. Provided you eat the right stuff, you have lots of fruit, there will be no problem. [interjection] Yes, bran.

**An Honourable Member:** Not brandy.

**Mr. Santos:** Brandy is good. It is an antiseptic provided you only have very little.

**An Honourable Member:** In moderation.

**Mr. Santos:** Yes, that is right. They even say that wine is good. The Frenchmen have some trouble understanding this. They eat lots of fat and lots of

stuff, and yet they live long. That is the red wine and with cheese also.

It is not the wine really. It is something in the grapes, yes, that helps, opens up your arteries. But if you drink too much wine—I was talking to a pathologist, and he said, all right, your arteries are open, there will be less cholesterol in your arteries, but what happens to your liver? The liver is not working. It is like a machine. I say eliminate what you do not need. The carbon dioxide that you take when you smoke, when you puff on your cigarette or even cigar—[interjection] It gives you pleasure. People say, oh, let me die while I have my pleasure. I am sure you will. The metabolic waste should be eliminated, of course, through your kidneys.

\* (1630)

Now, the third E. [interjection] Eliminate. What is the third E? Exercise. It should be moderate exercise. Do not push it too far. Why? Exercise not only gives the body—you know what exercise does for the body? It produces inside of you called serotonin. Serotonin, it relaxes your body.

**An Honourable Member:** Could you spell that for Hansard, please?

**Mr. Santos:** Serotonin, the way they say it is for now. It gives us the sense of well-being. Do you not feel good after a workout? And if you have some pain, let us say your joints are aching and you do some little shovelling like I usually do, half an hour or so.

Then there is such a thing, another by-product, called endorphin. It relieves your physical pain actually. I used to have something here in my shoulder, you know, and I have been rubbing it with certain rubs and things; it stays there. What I did, I have been shovelling. Now it is gone. Why? That is the way it is; that is the way it works. One famous medical doctor, Sir William Osler, once asked a group of young doctors this question: why is rheumatism too crippling to the rich and not to the poor? Then the young doctor explained, it is all related to the rich man's diet. They live high, they eat expensive proteins like steaks and lobster. Compared to the poor man, he eats cheap carbohydrates, simple stews and things like that. No, Osler said, you are all wrong, that is not the

explanation. The reason why rich men suffer more crippling effects from rheumatism is because the poor man cannot afford to rest. He has to work despite rheumatism, has to keep on working and keep on moving his body. The rich man rests and all the more he feels the pain because there is nothing to do. The person who is working, he does not feel the pain anymore. He is thinking about his work. You know that pain is related to the working of your brain.

So when they go on working, their joints although initially stiff and uneasy, they have self-lubricating functions if they keep doing physical activity. That is the beauty of exercise. The best exercise for a person, so that it will not be too strenuous, you should walk every stairway rather than take the elevator, and do it slowly on your way to work. If you can walk from the parking spot of your car to the place of work, do it, because that is built into your daily activity. You do not have to spend extra time or pain.

Let me conclude. Next, the highest value in our life is life itself. There is no substitute for living, no matter how painful life may be. No matter how troubled we may be, there is no substitute at all for being alive. That is the highest one. Next to life is health. Health. Health we must protect and we must promote. The person who is too busy in his occupation to take care of his health, too busy in his work to take care of his health, too busy accumulating material possessions and neglect his health, some day when there is no more time for him to do so, he will have forsaken the value of his health. And he will say, I am willing to part with all my wealth in exchange for my health. There are people like that. But it is too late.

Finally, a pleasant and positive attitude in life, there is no place for heartache or other negative things or hate or anything like that, fill ourselves with the joy of life, accept life the way it is, laugh whenever you can. That is the best way to cure your illnesses.

**Mr. Gerry McAlpine (Sturgeon Creek):** Madam Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to speak on behalf of my constituents of Sturgeon Creek and participate in the discussion of the Speech from the Throne.

Before I begin, Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome everyone back to the

House. It does not seem that long that we have been away, but it has been long enough, each of us to get back and go back to our constituencies and reflect on the last legislative session and talk to our constituents and understand what it is they, the people whom we represent in this Chamber, want us to accomplish in this new year and this new legislative session.

The people of Sturgeon Creek told me that they want a government to look forward and not a government to look back. I think that this government has demonstrated in the Speech from the Throne that we are forward looking and forward thinking, that we will look toward the future and not dwell on the past and that we will try to make this province a better place for our children and not squabble about what could have been done.

Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) when he talked about politicians in terms of their promises and what they have made, and I think that it is also important to understand. I agree with a lot of what the honourable member has put on the record; some things I do not disagree with, my knowledge and understanding of health care. I think we have some difference in understanding, although our basic philosophies may be in the same area. But I think some of the things that he has put on the record are inaccurate.

One of the things that he referenced, and I am going to address some of those aspects in terms of, he referenced health care in terms of—he left this on the record. When he is talking about being open and communicating the word of the Bible in terms of—and I think that we as politicians, elected people, should not mislead people. I think that is something that he has through his remarks regarding the health care and leading people to the effect that we have cut health care in terms of the dollars that have been put into health care.

I think that is an erroneous statement that he has made, and I think that I would like to correct him on that record, because that is this government's highest priority. He talked about the 24-hour emergency service. If he remembers, in looking back over that period of time, it was not this government that cut off the emergency services, it was the emergency doctors

that went on strike and held this government at ransom on that particular issue.

I do agree with him on the home care issue. It is good that we are expanding the home care issues, and this member favours our vision that we have to expand on that and that families should take responsibility for their own senior family members.

Madam Speaker, we in this province are very privileged. We live in the greatest democracy, and in spite of what the honourable members from across the way have demonstrated over the last little while in terms of in what they have said and put on the record, we do live in the greatest democracy in the world. It is the greatest country in the world, and I believe this is the greatest province in Canada. The 57 members sitting in this Chamber today are among the most privileged of all Manitobans because the people of this great province have given us the enormous responsibility of representing them. We cannot let them down, and we must serve the people of this province to the best of our capabilities. This means that we cannot just think about the past. We have to think about tomorrow and the next year and the next generation. I sincerely think that we are doing that.

The honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) talked about promises. You know, I think that this government in terms of what we are doing—and certainly I can only speak for myself on this; I certainly do not speak for all members of my caucus—but I think that we do not make promises that we know that we cannot keep. I think that we are well intentioned in terms of how we are communicating to our constituents, and that is the way we must serve the people of this province: to the best of our capabilities. This means that we cannot just think about those things, but we have to really feel them in our hearts. If we are not committed to them, then we should not be saying them, and if we are saying them, I agree with the honourable member for Broadway in what he is saying: if a promise is made, it should be kept. The people of Sturgeon Creek know that, after seven years in serving them, my word is my bond.

\* (1640)

Madam Speaker, the throne speech lays out this government's objectives. It proposes several initiatives

which will look toward the future in terms of making Manitoba's economy and society stronger. The initiatives that the throne speech set out highlight the attention our government has paid and will continue to pay to the needs of all Manitobans and serve to reaffirm our commitment to making Manitoba a great place to live, to work, and to raise our families.

Fiscal management is the underlying foundation of our economic strategy because responsible taxation and public spending are essential for economic growth and jobs. This government has been working hard with Manitobans to create opportunity for jobs and economic growth by developing a framework which includes the strongest balanced budget legislation in Canada to ensure that Manitobans will enjoy all the advantages and the opportunities of a deficit-free government into the future. This includes legislation, Madam Speaker, legislative prohibition against any increases in income taxes, the sales tax, the payroll tax, unless Manitobans first give their approval in a province-wide referendum.

We will be among the first provinces to pay down the debt. We have an economic plan that builds on our many strengths and looks outward toward our trading partners, toward the future.

Madam Speaker, I think that it is evident that this economic framework that our government has put into place has been the catalyst for the surge that we have seen in Manitoba's economy in 1996 and will continue to see in 1997.

There were several positive indicators of Manitoba's economic performance last year, which, economists predict, will continue to surge ahead. I have had an opportunity to talk about those. As the legislative assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, it is always a pleasure for me to be able to talk about the economic growth, and the economic future of this province under this government.

Last year Manitoba recorded a higher growth in manufacturing shipments than any other province in the country. This continuing boom in the manufacturing sector is responsible for creating over 9,000 new jobs since 1992. Because our government has been so active in encouraging new investments,

thousands of more jobs will be created in the coming year by companies such as Motor Coach Industries, Vansco, Isobord, and McCain, just to name a few.

With respect to our exports, Madam Speaker, Manitoba's total exports increased 19 percent in 1995 following a 25 percent increase in 1994. Between 1990 and 1995, Manitoba's exports to the U.S. have more than doubled, growing by \$2.2 billion. In the first ten months of 1996, Manitoba's exports to the U.S. continued to rise, and our exports in non-U.S. destinations rose 8.1 percent, the strongest provincial performance in the country.

Our retail sector performed well last year also, posting an annual gain of 5.3 percent compared to the national growth of only 1.6 percent. It is expected that the retail sector will continue to expand in 1997 as well as 1998.

Agriculture is another area that performed well last year, and is expected to do even better this year under our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns). Cash receipts are expected to increase by 12.4 percent due to the continued gains, crop receipts, livestock receipts. The honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) talked about the hog production in the province, and the future and growth that is taking place in that sector. It is also taking place in the value-added and all the other aspects of agriculture. That is only a portion of what the agriculture industry can look forward to under this minister and under this government, Madam Speaker.

As the Speech from the Throne indicated over the past year, agriculture and the agri-foods sector have achieved significant success in both diversification and value-added incentives. Hog production which I have already mentioned, potato production, the processing of new crops and nontraditional livestock are all experiencing phenomenal growth, as producers in our province respond to the massive changes in the transportation and trade, and seize emerging opportunities that are available to them. Those changes are taking place because we have a changing world. This government, I think, is being proactive in watching for those changes, and being reactive to them, which is demonstrated in this Speech from the Throne.

This government has reconfirmed in the Speech from the Throne that we will continue to work hard with Manitobans to create opportunities for job creation and economic growth. I think it has to be said for the benefit of the opposition members across the way, it is not only this government that is going to pave the way and do the things for the people, the farmers and the agricultural industry, or those businesses in the manufacturing industry, they are going to take the responsibility for themselves. The government is going to offer the opportunities and help them and work in partnership with these people. I think that is the important aspect, not to do for people what they can do for themselves. We will not waver from the commitments that we have made to build a stronger province, and we will do that only through the participation, as I have indicated, with all Manitobans and all sectors of the economy. The Speech from the Throne set out some of the initiatives that this government will undertake through the course of this year which will provide more opportunities, more jobs, better health care, stronger schools and safer communities.

The foundation for our vision must include living within our means. I think that we, in terms as far as government, cannot dictate to the people. I think the people have to take some ownership for what we are doing. They have to be responsive to the economies that are out there. We as government identified many of those, and that has been outlined in this Speech from the Throne.

The people of Manitoba I think for the most part agree with this government. With the balanced budgets, we can save millions of dollars in interest payments which result in more jobs and more money for health care and education while protecting our children from the burden of that suffocating debt that we have been experiencing for so many years since 1988.

\* (1650)

We have been able to work together with small business to provide the necessary tools to get our economy moving again through initiatives like the Business Start program, REDI, the Crocus Fund, Grow Bonds, the Vision Capital Fund and the Communities Economic Development Fund.

There are many opportunities for Manitobans to access the support of government. The people of Manitoba should take the initiatives. We should provide the assistance. REDI has already generated \$53 million of economic growth in rural communities right across Manitoba. It has created more than 1,350 full-time jobs and more than 3,000 part-time jobs for youth in this province, Madam Speaker. Our government is also excited about the Community Works Loan Program, which is expected to provide at least \$12.5 million in small-business support over the next five years, leading to the creation of as many as 3,500 jobs, so it is no coincidence that Manitoba is leading the nation in small-business hiring growth.

By far, small business continues to lead all other industry in job creation in the Manitoba economy. There are currently 34,000 small businesses and 83,000 self-employed entrepreneurs in this province. That is a significant amount of people in that economy that are making major contributions to the economic future of this province. This government will continue to help those small businesses in Manitoba by ensuring proper training and educational tools are available and accessible for business entrepreneurs. I think that is important. I think it is important too that we as a government have to always remind—and I always remind myself that it is better to teach people how to fish rather than feed them a fish for a day. Teach them how to fish and they will feed themselves for a lifetime. I think that is really important, and that is what this government is offering to these business entrepreneurs.

We will also continue to support the Winnipeg private-sector effort to establish Winnipeg as a global hub for the multimodule transportation and logistic services. This is a major, major economic boost as far as the province of Manitoba, the city of Winnipeg, and it is poised to capitalize on the need for goods to travel quickly and efficiently between North America and emerging markets in Asia and in Europe. Will that not do well for the value-added industries that we have in this province, the agricultural industries and the sectors the we have, the hog producers, the markets that are available to us in Asia, the populations in South America? Manitoba is positioned very strongly to be able to capitalize on that, and this government is taking a leading role on that.

Winnport focuses on the fact that in many cases it could be cheaper and more efficient for cargo airplanes to fly into Winnipeg's 24-hour International Airport, which is virtually at the centre of North America and has plenty of access capacity to transfer their cargo to trucks or trains and send them across the continent. We have the leading trucking industry in this country as far as the positions of head offices in the trucking industry in Winnipeg alone. I think that puts us in a strong position to take advantage of that and to enhance that industry as well. Winnport promises to have very exciting possibilities for the future. It could create thousands of jobs, directly and indirectly, right across the province and provide enormous benefits to Manitoba's exporting companies.

Along with Winnport, Madam Speaker, other initiatives our government will embark on in the new legislative session include the signing of a one-year agreement infrastructure program with a view to establishing a long-term national capital works program, and although it falls short of the last infrastructure program that we had, I believe that we are positioned well to take advantage of the opportunities that will be coming forth from the federal government. We certainly welcome anything that does come in the betterment of our province: developing stronger ties with the emerging markets of Brazil, Argentina, Chile, South Africa, Ukraine and Asia; continuing to implement the 1994 agreement on the internal trading; extending the provisions to include other public-sector organizations and their procurement; expanding Manitoba's economic and cultural relationships in the Americas through promotion of the 1999 Pan Am Games; supporting new initiatives through a provincial tourism strategy, including the development of regional plans through grassroots consultations; and finally, continuing to attract new companies and investment in the development of Manitoba's rich oil, gas and mining resources.

Madam Speaker, I believe one of the most important responsibilities of any government is to ensure a strong education system, not only for—well, definitely for our children and our grandchildren, but also for those who have to make changes in their lifestyles because of changing careers or anything like that. This is all done for the future of the people in Manitoba.

My government is laying the foundation for high quality education, setting standards for the educational excellence that they will help our children acquire the skills they will need to succeed in today's rapidly changing world. I think that we have to be ready for that. I think we have to be proactive, because as I have said before we are in a changing economy, we are in a changing world. We cannot stand still, which the opposition sometimes when I listen to them and the questions that they ask in Question Period, they want us to stand still. They are not open to change. They do not realize that if there is no change there is no growth. They seem not to have been able to learn that yet. We have to continue to remind them and try to convince them that these changes have to take place.

Education will continue to be one of this government's highest priorities, second only to health care. We will continue to encourage excellence in the classroom by emphasizing the core subjects, the standards, giving parents a stronger voice and restoring order in the classrooms so our children are equipped with the skills that they need in order to succeed. Education is one of the most important investments we can make in our society. It has the power to lift people from their lowest economic standards to the highest in as little as a generation.

The Leader of the official opposition, he referenced the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) in terms of his new-found experience when he was able to take advantage of the education and the opportunities when he had to make some changes in his life. Look at what has happened to him now in taking advantage of that. He is now the MLA for Point Douglas, where if that opportunity was not made available to him, maybe he would be doing something different. I think that education as what this government has committed to is an exceptional matter, and it is a matter that we are going in the right direction. As a result, this government recognizes the need for the changes and support changes that will lead to improvements in our education system.

\* (1700)

We are committed to ensuring that our education system meets the needs of our students, just as they met the needs of the member for Point Douglas, to provide them with the skills that they will need to get a job and



to succeed. The only difference is—and the member for Point Douglas I think maybe did not realize the importance of what side he should be sitting on and what government or what party he should be supporting, but that is his choice and I respect him for that.

It is important to remember that to succeed in improving things does not always mean one must spend more money. We are living in difficult times, the federal government has initiated massive reductions in transfer payments to our province, not to say anything in the least of the infrastructure payments that are forthcoming to us, yet our government continues to provide funding for education that is second only to health as a percentage of our budget. We are finding ways to deal with the changes in the federal funding and are using our existing resources efficiently and effectively, because we must do that as a government. We must find the ways in order to spend our money more wisely and to get the maximum benefit for our dollar. I think that our Finance minister is achieving that. When he comes down with his budget sometime later this month, I expect we will have that vision, and I look forward to having that and sharing that with all Manitobans. We are finding ways to deal with the changes that we are having to meet. This government knows that one of the key ways to ensure that we have the resources and the future to fund the quality education system, as an example, is to continue to balance the budget and to begin the process of reducing our debt servicing costs.

The very fact that this province's balanced budget law is beginning to bear fruit has allowed us the ability to steer clear of funding cuts to education for the 1997 and 1998 school year. If our education system is to continue having a valued place in our society, we must continue to encourage excellence in education, with an emphasis on the core subjects. Schools should be safe; schools should be productive environments where teachers and students can work together, and where there is order in the classroom. Parents must continue to have a strong voice in our education system. We will also ensure our post-secondary institutions are providing competitive, quality programming that fulfills the needs of all our students.

New initiatives which the throne speech outlined and will be introduced in the coming months include

further the adoption of the world class standards and uniform testing, developing heritage language curricula and resources, revitalizing the apprenticeship program to provide exciting career opportunities. We will also renew efforts to work with and assist First Nations people in Manitoba to realize their full potential and to take advantage of opportunities which we will work to make available to them. Some of these new initiatives include placing aboriginal high school, college and university graduates into entry level positions in the private sector, ensuring the education and the training system is more responsive to the needs of aboriginal people.

Madam Speaker, our government will continue to make education a high priority. We will strive for the excellence in our school system. We will continue to initiate positive changes which will give our young people the skills and the knowledge to compete in the global economy. This brings me to the changes the Manitoba government has made in welfare and social assistance programs.

Due to employment first initiative, the provincial welfare caseload has declined by over 600 cases. Hundreds of welfare recipients have found permanent employment or are now in training programs. I think that is commendable. Our government has achieved the success through the partnerships with the private sector and the community. The throne speech mentioned one of our initiatives. Youth NOW is a new program aimed at young people between the ages of 18 and 24 years of age who are receiving municipal income assistance. These young people will now have the opportunity to participate in project-based training and employment initiatives that will assist and prepare them for a secure employment. Youth NOW, partners with community nonprofit organizations and private training agencies to deliver training and employment assistance. All projects offer counselling throughout all phases of this project as well as employment follow-up to ensure successful employment results.

With respect to health care, Madam Speaker, this government in partnership with all Manitobans will look towards the future and will guarantee high quality and accessible health care well into the next century, and I think that if there is anything that is changing in any aspect of our economy or in terms of our budget or this throne speech, it is the health care industry. I am

fortunate in Sturgeon Creek to have a fairly significant component of the health care in terms of the manufacturing sector, the distributors in Sturgeon Creek, and it is a real pleasure to work with that industry, and I think we have some work that we can do in that area to help and to work with these businesses to create an environment that will help them to grow and to prosper as they are capable of doing.

There is some real money being spent in this province as a result of that in terms of the reputation, but we have to maintain that reputation in this industry in order to keep these businesses viable.

Sometimes we tend to complicate the simple, and I think that there is nothing more obvious than in the health care aspect in terms of health care where we tend to make the simple things more complicated than we have to. We make them complicated so that we no longer understand them anymore, Madam Speaker, and I think that is a danger. Not only is it dangerous from the aspect of creating health, it is also a disaster when it comes to the spending of the money that we have to be able to support that complication and support that complicated matter in terms of creating health.

We must look to the future to make necessary changes in the health care if we want the health care system that serves all Manitobans. Technological advancements have given us the ability to change the way we do things while federal funding cuts have made change a necessity in that area, because we have to find ways of doing things better.

\* (1710)

Our government has made health care a priority, and it will continue to be a priority as far as this government is concerned. It is on the minds of most people in this province. Therefore, we must serve them in that area. We spend more in this department than in any other, and the throne speech reconfirmed our commitment to health care. We will continue to work towards modernizing the health care system through innovation such as rural health authorities and new governance structures in Brandon and in Winnipeg.

The health care initiatives that the throne speech touched on include providing services closer to home,

such as post-surgical cardiac rehabilitation, dialysis, chemical dependency programs, mental health programs, an expanded home intravenous program, a mobile child health clinic, a provincial children's asthma education program, an expanded role for nurses, and finally, midwifery and other women's health initiatives.

In all these initiatives, Madam Speaker, what they are addressing is that they are giving the responsibility to the people who can best serve their own communities, and I think that is really the important thing. I think that we cannot only tell the people in these communities, but we have to demonstrate to them that they have the ability to take ownership for these very important initiatives.

We are in partnership with Manitobans, and I think that is in the making and in the designing of a modern health care system to ensure an affordable, accessible and quality system to meet Manitobans' needs now and into the future. With our aging population, I think that there is no time that is more evident, more important, and more prevalent.

But, Madam Speaker, let me also add that we as individuals must look at ourselves and within ourselves. I believe that we must take some responsibility for our own wellness. When we talk about responsibility, I think we do not necessarily look at that maybe as deeply as we could. We talk about too often, or the opposition references the fact, that we as government should be taking responsibility for all Manitobans, and doing the things for Manitobans that they should be doing for themselves.

The word "responsibility," if you really look at it, if you have the ability to respond, then you should respond. So everybody has the ability to do that, and they should respond accordingly. But, Madam Speaker, let me also add that we as individuals must look at all these issues. As we change our lifestyles and our attitudes about health, we need to shift our focus towards this wellness concept. Health promotion, disease prevention, and delaying the onset of disabilities are the three components of the wellness model that will improve the health of Manitobans, but will also help reduce the demand for the expensive hospital services.

It is important to remember that health is more than health care. Many interrelated aspects of our lives influence our health. For this reason, I believe that we need to take responsibility of keeping ourselves well, because health is a state of total well-being—physical, mental, social, emotional, and spiritual. As individuals, we can work to ensure that we remain healthy, rather than simply seek treatment when we are ill.

The throne speech has laid out the vision of this government for the coming year. The measure of our success as making our vision a reality will not be judged by how much government is spending, but what we are spending it on. The Speech from the Throne set out some of our priorities and initiatives this government will undertake through the course of this year, which will provide more opportunities, more jobs, more health care, stronger schools and safer communities.

I thank you for the opportunity to put these few remarks on the record, and I see that my time has expired. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Gerard Jennissen (Flin Flon):** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for allowing me to put some words on record pertaining to the throne speech for the Third Session of the Thirty-sixth Legislature. First of all, I would like to welcome back all the honourable members, and also the pages. I wish to congratulate the three new ministers. I note that all three of them are rookies from the Class of '95, which was also the class I was in. So, all together in the Cabinet, there are four rookies now from the Class of '95, and that makes me feel rather proud. It is obvious that the Class of '95 was quite successful.

I also would like to pay tribute to ministers that are no longer ministers. I would like to pay tribute to the former ministers for the work they have done, not only for their own party, and for the Legislature, but for the people of Manitoba. First of all, the former House leader, for which I think were his Herculean efforts in a most difficult and most heavy session, under unfamiliar provisional rules. I think he earned the respect and the good will of virtually all sensible members in this House. Similarly, the former Minister of Natural Resources deserves tribute for a job well done. We also want to wish well the member for

Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister), a former Minister of Government Services, who is going to enter the federal arena; we wish him well. But that is all the nice things I am going to say.

Last session ended on a very fractious and divisive note, and I do not know if that is a session we can be proud of, at least not the ending. There were casualties, Madam Speaker, and I think perhaps the first casualty was trust, trust among the various parties in this House. Not only that, now a cloud hangs over the chief presiding officer of this Chamber, a cloud that the First Minister, the Premier (Mr. Filmon), could dissipate at a moment's notice but he does not appear to want to do that. I am not sure why the reluctance or the pigheadedness, as some people might phrase it.

Now the Chamber operates under the old rules, rules which do not make too many of us very happy, but rules under which we are willing to work. What is happening now also I think is a strengthening of what was as how we ended which is recriminations and trading insults and finger pointing and you are to blame; no, you know, we are to blame; we were to blame, that kind of stuff. I do not think that serves our constituents well, and I think for the sake of those constituents, our constituents, we must show some civility to one another. I think we must put our individual egos on hold and think of the greater common good of this Chamber for the sake of our constituents. When we talk about individual egos, remember that they are easily stroked and they are easily bruised as power ebbs and flows, and I am sure that some former ministers know exactly what I am talking about.

Make no mistake about it, the people we are honoured to represent are watching us. They are watching us and they want us to get on with the job of governing. They want the government to govern, and they want the government to govern in an open and democratic fashion. They do not want government by stealth, by ideological extremism or by using self-serving agendas developed after the election. Similarly, our constituents expect the opposition party to be responsible, to be critical, to be outspoken, to hold the government accountable, but to be civil in the process.

\* (1720)

The throne speech is supposed to be the government's blueprint for the upcoming session, Madam Speaker. Throne speeches tend to be the same. They tend to be feel-good, warm, fuzzy and bland documents and this document is no different. It is the usual middle of the mandate, stay-the-course document and everyone knows this, even expects this. At the beginning of the government's mandate, we notice that the throne speeches will emphasize slashing and cutting, euphemistically phrased as being fiscally responsible, and that particular throne speech at the beginning of a mandate is aimed at scaring the taxpayer. Then there is the middle of the mandate throne speech, as the one today, or the one a little while ago rather, and that takes on a kinder, gentler tone, as I notice that many members opposite did take on a kinder, gentler tone and I do appreciate that. After all, the theme now is, in the middle of the mandate, moderation and it is obvious that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) must have had his pep talk on moderation. I can sense it in the members from the government when they speak.

So once again, we expect at the beginning of the mandate a throne speech which emphasizes slashing; at the middle of the mandate, a throne speech that emphasizes coasting; at the end of the mandate, a throne speech that emphasizes sort of spending the loot that we have garnered. Well, I guess it is euphemistically called the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. The cynics might say it is buying votes, and after all, the government can afford to be moderate right now. The slashing has been done and MTS has been sold.

These throne speeches as we have today, the moderate ones, are to inform the electorate that the Tories indeed have a heart and that is very good to know.

**An Honourable Member:** Have you got a heart?

**Mr. Jennissen:** I hope so. Also, I think that we are fully aware in this throne speech that the government is on a course that does not avoid pork-barrel politics, and it is quite obvious to me that they have learned very well from an expert at pork-barrel politics, Mr. Lloyd Axworthy. But the public is catching on. They can read the long-range strategy of this government fairly well. They are aware of the three phrases of this strategy: the slash at first, then you coast and then you

spend. People have become cynical; our constituents have become cynical. They have experienced the cutbacks, the job losses, the broken promises. There is a serious credibility gap. There is a serious credibility gap between this government and the people of this province.

It does not matter that the throne speech paints things in utopian colours. The fact is that there is a different reality on our streets and our schools and our hospitals and our communities. No one believes this government anymore except, perhaps, as Mark Twain says, children and foreigners, children because they are innocent, and foreigners because they are new to the situation.

One of the striking things about this throne speech is how many of the so-called positive initiatives are piggybacked onto federal initiatives. You know, I think it is dangerous to rely on what the feds will do, because we know what their promises are worth, and I will just mention a couple of those promises, fighting NAFTA and scrapping the GST. Those are indeed hollow promises.

But is it not ironic, though, that this government has to hitch its wagon or its star to the Liberal's pre-election propaganda machine? I guess one could be very cutting about it and say, is this a melding of the red book with the blue book, and what do we get as a result, Madam Speaker, a pukey kind of mauve colour?

On page 2 of the throne speech, Madam Speaker, and I quote: "Our provincial government has committed to two immediate national priorities: job creation and children in need." Job creation, I would say, let us get real. Have you been on the streets lately? Have you seen these graduates from our universities looking for hamburger-flipping jobs and many of them not being able to find them?

I will use my son as an example. He took four years at the University of Manitoba. I think he did fairly well. He took an advanced degree in Arts. He has a job he thinks is quite good. He is proud of this job. It pays \$6.60 an hour. Sometimes he gets 30 to 35 hours a week, very irregular hours. He could make, in a good year, \$10,000, but I think that is not a way you could ever really raise a family or make a decent kind of living, although my son does appreciate the job. At

least he has got a job, and he does not have a huge university loan like many of his peers have. They are incapable of paying back those loans, certainly not with a hamburger-flipping job. Maybe that is why so many of our students are reneging on paying back their university loan. They cannot pay them back. So I am very unsure, very skeptical about the government's promises of job creation.

It is hard to talk about job creation when we know the record of this government, the slashing of access programs, for example. In January of this year alone, we lost 700 jobs in this province. In addition, there have been shutdowns at Molson, Rogers Sugar, P & H Foods, Portage Manufacturing, Woodstone Technology and so on, and that is not even mentioning the hundreds of jobs lost in the Manitoba railway sector or the 600 jobs lost in the Department of Highways.

As well, there has been a slow, relentless drift hemorrhaging away of jobs, a couple of jobs here, a couple of jobs there. I will give you an example. In The Pas last week, four jobs lost or moved when the Department of Northern Affairs shut down in The Pas; three other jobs are being privatized; two and a half to three jobs lost last week in Flin Flon that were connected to the Northern Station transportation program, a very important program. So this slow, relentless seeping away of jobs is happening all across this province.

As for that other pre-election national priority this government wishes to hitch on to, that is, helping children in need, it sounds great. I wish it were true, but I have little faith in the stated intentions, because I believe, and I sincerely believe this, that this government has done more to create child poverty in this province than any other government in the history of Manitoba.

Let us look at the record and see what this government has actually done in the last few years to increase child poverty. They have expanded the base of PST to include baby supplies and children's clothing. They have cut funding for foster parents. They have eliminated the treatment portion of the Children's Dental Program. This has a negative impact on 43,000 children living in rural and remote areas. How can this be construed as helping child poverty? This shortsightedness may indeed save the government

a few bucks now, but there are tremendous long-range costs, and these costs will be staggering. The Children's Dental Program was one of those proactive, community-based, preventative programs that the government likes to talk about when it talks about health reform. Then why did it cut those programs?

The government talks about helping children in need on the one hand, but on the other hand reduces the budget for child daycare. The number of subsidized child daycarespaces have been reduced from 9,900 last year to 8,600 this year. The government has reduced provincial social assistance rates which affect families with children; we know that and you know that. This government has failed to implement the recommendations of the Postl report relating to child poverty. Those are just some of the examples how this government has not helped child poverty.

Yes, the government may talk in glowing terms about fighting child poverty, but beyond the rhetoric there is a reality. The reality is that the 17,000 families that use Winnipeg Harvest Food Bank are still there using that food bank. That is up, by the way, by 2,000 from last year. Similarly, in Flin Flon, the Lord's Bounty food bank sees increases every year. These families have children.

Yes, we are still the poverty capital of Canada. We cannot wish that reality away. One could argue that in the throne speech at least there is a mention of child poverty, which presumably indicates that the government is aware of the problem or the seriousness of the problem. However, being aware of a problem and doing something about the problem are two totally separate things. We need more than a few cosmetic flourishes. Excuse me for being cynical, but this was the government that gave tons of money to Barry Shenkarow and the Jets and then slashes, slashes the food budgets of little kids.

Of course, seeing that children get proper nutrition is not nearly as glamorous in the press as saving the Jets, and children do not vote. But that is cynical, and excuse me for being cynical. I know that the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh), who talked previously; says that we should not be negative for the sake of being negative. We are not being negative for the sake of being negative, but we want to speak on behalf of

those who are often voiceless and who do not seem to be well represented in this government.

The throne speech begins by outlining a framework for growth. I would like to briefly examine the five elements comprising this framework for growth, and to point out, although these five key elements are couched in positive language, that there are shadows to those elements as well, that there is a darkness to the silver lining that they are showing us.

First of all, the first key element in the framework for growth is a balanced budget. Now governments of all political stripes agree that putting our house in order fiscally is important, but there are flexible and there are dogmatic ways of doing this. I think that we have chosen a rather inflexible method of doing it. I think also that the Finance minister has deliberately projected a low surplus. We know we are going to have more money at the end of the year than was projected because it will make the government look better that way. It will make it look that growth was greater than expected.

\* (1730)

It is not quite being honest. It is a little too manipulative, a little too much like a Julian Benson pre-budget workshop because you know the same answers will emerge, regardless how you structure the little groups. The answers are already predetermined. They are going to make the government look good. It is very clever. I do not knock the expertise of these gentlemen, but, again, it is not quite honest. Besides, ladies and gentlemen, if we are talking balanced budget, the provincial government must realize that the federal government, too, wishes to put its fiscal house in order. If the province offloads to municipalities, why then do they criticize Ottawa for the same process? It costs Ottawa, I believe—and I may be wrong here—38 cents to the dollar to service the national debt. It costs the province 11, 12, 13 cents. Considerably less to the dollar to service provincial debt.

Now I do not like offloading either at any level. But what is good for the goose is good for the gander. You cannot say we have to do it out of necessity, but the bad feds cannot do it. I say, let us start tapping some of that rainy day fund. The rain is here. Let us stop

underfunding Health, Education, and let us really get on seriously with job creation.

Now, the second framework for growth element mentioned in the throne speech is a fair and competitive tax system. We have talked about that in this country, and in various provinces, for years. That is not so easy to construct after NAFTA, by the way. The old adage the poor are getting poorer and the rich are getting richer is truer now than I think it has ever been. Over the last several decades, the corporate portion of the tax dollar has shrunk dramatically, while the personal income tax portion of the tax dollar has increased dramatically, and the banks are not exactly starving. In fact cynics point out that the only growth industry are banks—food banks and the regular banks. Their profit, the regular bank profits are enormous.

I noticed during the last federal election that some Liberal members campaigned against the family trusts, trusts instituted by the former federal Tories, trusts which allow the rich and the super rich to evade taxes, but after the election I also noticed that the same federal Liberal members did not mention family trust again. Apparently it is okay to tax, you and I, 40 percent or 50 percent, and I am not complaining about this. It is okay to tax us that, but it is not okay to tax family trusts which are not only being tax sheltered, but allowed to move their money offshore. Now, is it okay for the Bronfmans to put \$2 billion of family trust money tax free into the Cayman Islands or wherever without paying taxes? Is it acceptable for the Irvings to put \$2.2 billion offshore tax free? Is that acceptable? It would seem to me that if they even payed the rate that we are paying, we would have a couple of billion dollars to work with, either for transfer payments or for programs, for paying off the debt.

Of course, that did not happen. The Tories started the family trust as a tax avoidance scheme federally, and the federal Liberals allowed it to continue. We see the same shortsightedness when it comes to taxing giant pharmaceutical companies. Both federal Liberals and federal Tories are willing to extend exaggerated patent protection to big pharmaceutical companies knowing that this is an indirect taxation on the people, and it costs the people billions of dollars because they cannot use generic drugs as soon as possible. Yes, indeed, let us have fair taxation, let us have it.

The third element of the throne speech framework for growth is job creation and growth for all regions of the province. It is an economic plan and it sounded like an excellent idea. Let us hope it is more than rhetoric. I do not see a lot of quality jobs being created at the moment. I see some, mainly low-wage, low-skill jobs being created, and I am fearful that the extremist Conservative ideology that has ruled this province for a number of years will prevent any meaningful investment in job creation, although I must admit that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is trying hard to now project a moderate image, but the people are not easily fooled. Yes, there will be gestures, there will be attempts to build on our strength and there will be some money—tourism, mining in the North, and I really appreciate that, value-added agricultural products in the south and that is important. I do not wish to demean those attempts, but it is often a case of too little coming too late.

This government is still in the privatization mode and still believes in the general bull-moose theory if it is good for big business, it has got to be good for everybody. It believes that. It still believes that the values of the marketplace are the only real values in our lives. How can you talk about job creation and building on strength when you will not even rescue a failing transportation infrastructure? Walking away from the railroads, highways, airports and ports is not the way to solve our economic problems. Both at the provincial and the federal levels, this is happening. If there is any serious intent in job creation, let us work together with the federal government and go to the areas of greatest need, where there is the greatest unemployment. I suggest you start in Pukatawagan and Shamattawa, where the unemployment rates are over 90 percent. [interjection] It is not that parochial because Shamattawa is not in my riding; however, it is in a northern riding.

The fourth element of the framework for growth is the social policy element to ensure that the benefits of growth are shared fairly. This is predicated on the belief that there will be substantial growth. It is only a hope, and it is not yet a reality. I am suspicious of Tories and fair sharing; in fact, in my world, Tories and fair sharing are mutually contradictory terms. Let us take a look at the last example of fair sharing, the sale of MTS. Yes, the brokers made millions. Yes, a small group of Manitobans who flipped their shares quickly must have made some money. But did that help all

Manitobans in all regions of Manitoba? I know the government will make a case that it will, but we very much doubt it.

Are improvements to health care, education, justice and social services to wait until there is significant economic growth? Are we going to ignore need? Are we going to allow the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry to gather dust on a shelf? The government talks about self-sufficiency and independence for individuals, but what about provinces and countries? Let us see now, our northern railroad is owned by an American company; CN is controlled out of New York; our former telephone company, the majority of shares are owned outside of this province. This does not sound to me like we are creating any kind of provincial independence, leave alone individual independence.

Lastly, the fifth and the last element of the framework for growth is the most vague but also, in a sense, maybe the most important. I really enjoyed seeing it there. I thought it was worthwhile. This element revolves around our heritage of co-operation, our spirit of community, mutual respect and good will. It is a philosophical statement that deals with our essence as a people. It deals with the quality of life. This element has an important spiritual dimension to it.

Now, none of us live by bread alone. You are your sister's keeper; you are also your brother's keeper, and I am glad we see that in this element. However, although I congratulate those that drafted the Throne speech and included that, much of this I think may just be there for window dressing. That concerns me.

Much of this fifth element, this human and spiritual element which stresses our human commitment one to the other, including being in this Chamber, is essentially the CCF manifesto. This is what the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation was all about. I am very glad to see that at least this government is paying some lip service to the ideals of social democracy.

\* (1740)

I hasten to add, however, that this government has a dismal track record at fostering concord among diverse ethnic and socioeconomic groups in this province.

This government in fact, and I hate to say this, but it has little credibility among aboriginal people, among workers, organized labour, northerners and so on.

The social gospel values that motivated Tommy Douglas, the CCF and later the NDP are not obvious in Tory governance. This government is much more into ruthless competition than co-operation and sharing. The values of the marketplace predominate in the psyche of this government. It is a minimalist government, a government or at least a Premier who feels that the province should be run as a chief executive officer would run a large corporation. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Premier would read the books and would pattern his government on a style suggested by a management consultant from the United States, Stephen Covey. It does not surprise us.

The real decisions by this government are not made by cabinet even. They are made by a small inner circle in the Premier's office. Everybody knows that. The Free Press knows that. In fact, if we want to get even more cutting about it, to parody the Wayne and Shuster material, skit, perhaps you remember the one about Big Julie in Rome? The day that Julian Benson I think walks away from the Premier's office, I can just see the Premier chasing him and saying, don't go, Julie. Please don't go, Julie. Julie, don't go. I can just see it, because he needs Big Julie. But you know, Big Julie will leave.

Madam Speaker, this throne speech includes many things, but it also understates or leaves out many things. I understand you cannot put everything in a throne speech, but I search in vain for at least some serious mention of workplace safety. It is certainly an issue in Flin Flon, because miners have died. There are fatalities, there are widows, there are orphans. There is no mention of plant closures and the devastation that job loss inflicts on personal and family life. Of course, that does not happen to Tories. They are all born rich, that is sort of the mentality over there sometimes. There is nothing on nursing home standards, nothing on the impact of educational cuts on the classroom, nothing on the morale of teachers. I wish that some of the honourable members opposite would join me on my tours to meet some of the northern teachers, teachers who struggle with classrooms, large classrooms where half of the students have fetal alcohol syndrome, how difficult that is.

That is just one of the many problems that teachers face. There are other issues, Madam Speaker, that I could deal with that the Throne speech deals with other than those five main elements that I just talked about. We could talk about the regional health authority. They certainly are creating some serious problems for us in the North, apart from the fact that they are totally nonelected, that the members of the board are totally nonelected, apart from the fact that most of those members appear to be former Tory candidates or at least a good number of them are. Now, I heard the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) say the other day, well, the regional health authorities are not elected, but then we should not be too nasty about this because after all most of the local health boards, hospital boards, now are not elected. But I am saying if we are pleading for trust and understanding, and even the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is doing that, would this not be a great time to start? Would this not be a great time to implement elected regional health authority boards? In fact, the former Health minister had hinted, had suggested, that there would be at least a phasing in of these elected boards.

You cannot just talk democracy, you have got to actually practise it. We could talk about regional health authorities; we could talk about the fact that Pukatawagan does not feel it belongs in the Burntwood area, in the Burntwood region, but fits much more naturally with the Norman region.

We could look at health care seriously because I learned, in fact to my amazement, that last year in Pukatawagan alone there were 307 medivacs. Now, this is a small community, 1,500 people, 1,600 people. There is a medivac for every 5 people here. This sounds incredible. Something is wrong. Instead of spending maybe a million, a million and a half, maybe \$2 million to fly people out, why do we not fix the 15 kilometres of road, give these people road access? There are a lot of simple solutions, but we do not seem to want to practise some of those simple solutions.

Also, I could talk about, Madam Speaker, from the throne speech, page 4, and I will quote: "My government is actively promoting the mid-continent trade and transportation corridor initiative which will provide for a seamless, uniformly regulated infrastructure to support the efficient and effective movement of Manitoba goods and services to new and



expanding markets in North America and beyond.” Now, those are fine words, but at the same time we are privatizing, at the same time we are underfunding roads, at the same time we are laying off engineering aids too at the same time we see our railroads, our ports and our airports being thrown to the tender mercy of the marketplace. Now that does not fit in with the strategy of trading north-south.

We know the Crow rate is gone. We know that there are many more stresses on our road system. We know that, and yet the government seems to say, well, the marketplace will take care of it. Let us have this wonderful trade corridor, but they do not want to build the infrastructure, put the money into the infrastructure to make it work. Privatization, deregulation are the order of the day, all on the assumption that somewhere this glorious, heavenly ordained marketplace will make sure that everything will work for us. Well, I am sorry, I do not believe in minimalist government. I think we have to intervene. We want good road networks. We want good transportation links. We want the ability to ship goods, north, south, east and west.

Madam Speaker, I could also briefly talk about the Pan American Games mentioned in the throne speech, and I am very happy that we are so honoured in 1999, but I will suggest again to the government that when they do their PR and their propaganda, their little glossy pamphlets, include northern Manitoba, please. When the tourists and the visitors do come, shove them a little further north to Swan River and Dauphin and Flin Flon and Snow Lake and Leaf Rapids and other points north.

Another point, Mineral Exploration Assistance Program. Yes, it is very positive, and I think we have to congratulate the former minister who did a lot of work on this, the one-window shopping, making it easier for mining companies to come in. But there is another and a darker side to mining, as we all know, and I am referring again to the fatalities in the mining industry. We cannot just stand back and say, well, that is just the way it is, this job carries great risks. We have to be much more proactive.

Yes, so we are happy with the mines, we are happy with Photo Lake, we would like to see the mining sector expand, but I believe, and I will always believe,

that you can have profitable mining and also you do not have to have deaths. You can have safe mining, and that is what we have to work on. Now, whether this involves higher fines for companies that are negligent, whether this involves better inspection, whether this involves tighter rules of inspection, I do not know, maybe all of the above. All the stakeholders will have to get involved to work this out, but we have to be serious about it. I think we are past the age that we can say, you know, that 98 deaths at HBM&S alone are acceptable over the 70 years of operation, a death every nine months. That is not acceptable.

We can have good mining practices; we can have profitable jobs in mining; and we can have safe jobs. But we have to work on it. We have to take a proactive approach. The government cannot just say, well, let us just let it go the way it is. It is not good the way it is. A status quo is not acceptable. I notice also in the throne speech there is a brief reference to protected spaces, Madam Speaker. I hope that this time when they create four parks, they do not create them in my riding. The paper parks were created with very, I would say, minimal consultation with the aboriginal people or other northern people. I am not objecting to protected spaces, but I think we had better start listening to Manitobans, and we had better start doing a lot better at consulting before we actually create these parks.

We do not want paper parks that do not really fit into any kind of plan. We want this to be carefully done. We do not want them to overlap with TLE areas, treaty land entitlement areas. On page 7 of the throne speech, I read and I quote now, to commit a number of entry level positions each year in the private and public sector for aboriginal graduates. I am really happy that the throne speech at least talks about aboriginal people and problems faced by aboriginal people. Let us hope that this government is serious about that.

Creating a few entry level positions sounds fairly vague to me. I am not sure how this government will concretize that. This government has not had a happy relationship with aboriginal people. In fact, they are widely distrusted or mistrusted by aboriginal people. That is not my doing, that happens to be a reality. I think certainly a lot of fence mending has to happen between this government and aboriginal people. Treaty land entitlement is mentioned, and it is going in an encouraging direction. I think we have to settle, and

let us settle once and for all the outstanding land claims, and get that behind this.

I would like to end, Madam Speaker, by saying that a short while ago the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) accused this side of the House for being very negative, just for the sake of being negative. I would like to assure the House that this is not the case. All of us wear party-coloured glasses; we are all members of a party. We may try to be as objective as we can, but the minister I think expects us to be cheerleaders for the government. That we cannot be, because our role as loyal opposition is to be critical, to point out the weaknesses and the flaws in the government and the government programs.

**An Honourable Member:** And the good points. You are only doing one-half of the equation here.

\* (1750)

**Mr. Jennissen:** We are willing to acknowledge some of the good points of this government, if the minister is equally willing to acknowledge some of the bad programs of this government. Unfortunately, the Minister of Education sees only the positive, because she is in government. She wants to downplay the negatives. She does not want to even acknowledge the negatives that do exist and that do flow from extreme right-wing agenda. Extreme right-wing agendas have negatives, as do extreme left-wing agendas.

It is our job on this side of the House and also the Liberal colleagues from this side of the House to be a responsible opposition, an accountable opposition. We want to keep the government accountable. I hope that as a member of the opposition in accordance with the wishes of most of my constituents, that I have pointed out some of the negative and darker aspects carefully camouflaged in the throne speech, because that is our job. Thank you very much.

**Hon. David Newman (Minister of Energy and Mines):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise to speak in support of the Speech from the Throne. This is another point of new beginnings in the province of Manitoba. Every time there is a throne speech, we have a set of directions set down for us as a government. This particular set of directions that has been set down is most pleasing to myself personally.

It shows truly that the combination of the mind, body, including emotion and spirit, are being addressed in the throne speech.

The economic agenda that our government has is a product of the mind. It involves the application of reason and intelligence and thoughtful decision making, research and planning, and it is a very responsible sort of approach to carry out the responsible stewardship expected of a government. It deals with the fundamentals. It deals with the bread on the table. It deals with the generation of wealth in our society. It deals with the motivation of people to work and generate profits, generate income, which results in taxes, which results in the pay-down of our accumulated debt, which is for the benefit of our children and grandchildren. It is a very responsible economic agenda. All of it is done with a considerable amount of heart. It is done using intelligence for the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

In the area of health, it is designed to address the needs of the body. In health and education and family services, it is done to address the needs of the spirit and the emotion of people as well. Human beings are complex, and all of those different component parts have to be addressed by any government. Our way of addressing them is to create environments, to create motivation, to inspire, not to control, not to provide the answers, not to tell people what is right, but to allow them, individually and through their families, to make those decisions on their own.

It was interesting seeing the Headstart workshop. I had the good fortune of attending that and participating one of the evenings here in Winnipeg with the program, with all those individuals seeking to gain the knowledge and skills and direction necessary to deal with the influence, the nurturing of children from zero to six years of age. It is a federally funded program. There are 13 Headstart operations in the province of Manitoba at this time, and all of them are focusing on investing in the future of children at that age when they are most in need of installation of values, an example, just love and touching.

The name of that workshop was Building the Spirit of the Child, and I subscribe to the view that the most important part of a human being is the spirit. That can be the difference between being a successful human

being in the sense of maximizing your potential, being able to make a maximum contribution for the benefit of others, and that spiritual underpinning is the basis for proper application of mind and body and emotion. I am very pleased to know that not only our government but the federal government has found that to be an important way to address the social problems we have in Manitoba and elsewhere.

Our government has benefited from research available and, with the involvement of the Children and Youth Secretariat, has developed directions and policies that are emerging to supplement an existing tapestry of programs which are addressing that particular kind of age group. It is most exciting that the community of Manitoba is becoming increasingly aware of the need to focus on that age group, the need to invest, because we all know we have very limited resources to do all kinds of things that we would love to do in government, and we must work together. Governments must work together. The three levels of government must work together, and the community must work together in all its component parts.

I had the good fortune to participate in a panel last night, which included Anita Neville of the City of Winnipeg School Division; David Cassels, the Chief of Police; Victor Vrsnik of the Manitoba Taxpayers Association; Kathy Mallett, representing the Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg; and the guest speaker from the Perry Preschool Program, and that is Dr. Larry Schweinhart. That event was supported by the Community Education Development Association, the Andrew Street Family Centre, the Canadian Association for Young Children, CUPE Manitoba, Winnipeg Teachers' Association, Early Childhood Education, Social Planning Council, Weston School Community Council, King Edward School Community Group, Pinkham Community Council, William White Community Council, Mulvey School Community

Council, Children and Youth Secretariat of our province and the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce. It is a demonstration of how comprehensive things must be to approach this challenge, to make this investment wisely, to find the funds to support the kind of investment necessary, and the collaboration, the challenge of collaboration bringing those disparate kinds of groups together, each to play their part in their own way.

Because I am a past president of the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, I was struck by the presence of the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce in this. Just as they saw the importance when I was the president of addressing the environmental challenge, the environmental moral imperative, the business community is saying that there is a new direction, a new focus that they should address, and that is, I believe, this investment in early childhood, investment in children first.

The business community has an interesting role to play in this because the Perry Preschool approach depends on parental involvement, and parental involvement in the zero to six-year-olds in the daytime is not easy for many working people. So to have the business community participating in this is an indication that they are wanting to be educated, wanting to be aware of what the sorts of things that they can voluntarily do, and, I would submit, in their long-term self-interest, and certainly the interest of the children.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The hour being 6 p.m., when this matter is again before the House, the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Newman) will have 30 minutes remaining.

This House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 6, 1997

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Tabling of Reports

Third Quarter Report, Communities Economic Development Fund; Third Quarter Report, Manitoba Hydro- Electric Board Newman	161
--	-----

#### Ministerial Statements

International Women's Day Vodrey	161
McGifford	162

#### Oral Questions

Personal Care Homes Doer; Praznik	163
Ashton; Praznik	165
Lathlin; Praznik	167

Holiday Haven Nursing Home Chomiak; Praznik	166
--	-----

Economic Growth Lamoureux; Filmon	169
--------------------------------------	-----

Bristol Aerospace Lamoureux; Downey	170
--	-----

AIDS Strategy McGifford; Praznik	171
-------------------------------------	-----

Legislative Building Pitura	172
--------------------------------	-----

Winter Road Robinson; Findlay	172
----------------------------------	-----

Youth Gangs Mackintosh; Toews	172
----------------------------------	-----

#### Nonpolitical Statements

Sisler High School Girls Basketball Team Martindale	173
--	-----

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Throne Speech Debate (Third Day of Debate)

Dyck	173
Lamoureux	174
McIntosh	180
Santos	189
McAlpine	194
Jennissen	201
Newman	208