



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

41 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XLII No. 8B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1992



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 7, 1992

The House met at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (Seventh Day of Debate)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) and the proposed amendment of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, when I began my remarks before our adjournment for supper, I remarked on the watershed that we are going through now politically. You know, I wish I had a lot more time to speak tonight, because when I look back on the Conservative Party of 1988, pre-election, and the Conservative government today, what a difference four years makes.

We have had members who were not here at the time. I recognize that they perhaps did not really realize what the Conservative Party got elected on—lecture opposition members about being positive, that we should be more positive, Mr. Speaker. I would recommend as reading for those members, Hansards. For example, this one from the 1988 session. I went through the speech from the Leader of the Opposition, the now Premier (Mr. Filmon). I could not find one positive word about the then-NDP government, but I did find some interesting remarks from that member and other members. This is why I say we are at a watershed.

Who remembers the Conservatives of 1988 on health? We must "have community-based facilities in place before we cut back on hospital beds"—the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the then Leader of the Opposition, February 15, 1988. A great statement, Mr. Speaker. It still rings true today. He said we must have those community-based beds in place before hospital bed closures. No hospital bed closures for budgetary reasons, I remember that quote as well.

Is this the same Conservative government of 1992 that was talking back then? I could spend the entire 40 minutes on health policy, on the fact that the Conservatives of 1988 were hypocrites then and they are hypocrites today. I will prove my point, Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks by a comment

by a great historic Tory who, I think, summed it up rather well.

Let us talk about education. Who can forget their platform in the 1988 election? Who can forget 90 percent funding for school districts, provincial funding of 90 percent? Mr. Speaker, in 1992, do we have closer to 90 percent funding? No, we do not have closer; we have less and less funding, fewer school divisions. Look at the list. Even since the now Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) has left the portfolio as Minister of Education, he knows that it has gotten even worse. As bad as it was even a year ago, it is even worse. We could each spend the next 40 minutes on that.

* (2005)

On the deficit, I wish the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) was here, because one of my favourite things, from April 11, 1988, is the now Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship saying, and this is a direct quote: The main thing a Tory government can offer is their reduced deficit, Mr. Speaker—a reduced deficit.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same member who now sits as part of a government that has a real deficit of \$642 million saying that the main thing you can get out of a Tory government is a reduced deficit. Well, I could spend the entire speech on Tory fiscal policy, but there is something even better than that.

I ask you to think back to 1988. I ask you to think back to the demonstrations that were taking place outside: We are not going to take it, Mr. Speaker. I would ask you to think back to, oh, the now minister responsible for Autopac, who was then critic for Autopac, talking about what? Autopac increases. Well, is that not interesting?

Let us try a little bit of history for some members who have maybe forgotten what had happened. Not revisionist—this is going to be in the words of the Tory members, most of whom are sitting in the front benches today.

In 1985 and '86, the Conservatives at the time criticized the NDP for what with Autopac? Not reducing rates, Mr. Speaker. By 1988, bodily injury claims were rising in the province, and what were the Conservatives now criticizing the NDP government for? For not increasing rates so there

would not be a rate shock. I have the quotes here from the same person who now sits as minister responsible for Autopac, who criticized the NDP for not recognizing what was happening. In terms of what? Bodily injury claims. He said, and this is on page 441 of Hansard, 2nd of March, 1988: "They couldn't see it coming."

They could not see it coming—talking specific, and this, by the way, was in the same speech where he had announced to the press at 1:30 he was going to be giving a speech at three o'clock where he was going to make unparliamentary remarks—he called the minister a liar, Mr. Speaker—and he was going to get kicked out of the House. This is the same minister responsible for Autopac. Well, is it not interesting that indeed he was thrown out.

Now the shoe is on the other foot. The same individual who was the critic, who criticized the government at the time for not reacting to bodily injury claims, now trots out an Autopac increase that is of an equal magnitude and says, guess what, Mr. Speaker, bodily injury claims are up; we have to do something.

Oh, how times change in four years. The minister responsible for Autopac says, this is 1992. The premium increases tell him it is time to review the program and the benefits paid out under it; I think it is time to have a debate in the public about what the public wants in its insurance package.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I seemed to be part of a debate in 1988. It was called the election, and boy, did the NDP government get the message at the time. People wanted changes. Well, what did the government do, the Conservative government that was elected? Did it lower Autopac rates? Did it act on the recommendations of the Kopstein report for no-fault insurance that would cut rates by as much as 20 percent? What did they do? They did absolutely nothing in regard to the most fundamental recommendation of the Kopstein report.

Today, the minister, faced with the prospect of a 95 percent increase in rates over the next number of years, says, we are open to suggestions. My God, Mr. Speaker, if any party should have the answers, it should be the Conservative Party, after going around in 1988—[interjection] Well, they clap, and here in 1992, what do they say? We have the answers? No. They are saying, give us some hints, give us some ideas. Well, start by implementing the Kopstein report, no-fault

insurance, something we have been pushing for, something our critic has been raising for the last four years, something they have sat on.

Mr. Speaker, let us deal with this Conservative government, the reality of Autopac and the reality of what is happening. There was another thing they did. They did not just criticize the rate increases, they said there would be, and I will make it very clear. It was another quote from a Conservative member at the time: Our plan with Autopac would be to avoid political interference with the rates and no hiding the losses. The rate increases should have to apply to the Public Utilities Board.

What they did not say, Mr. Speaker, is that in 1992, before the Public Utilities Board could even deal with the entire recommendations of Autopac, they would have a cabinet meeting and decide that while Autopac had come up with a suggestion that would save a combined \$2 million for motorists in Manitoba, both in terms of the premium tax and in terms of having a flat rate, a capped rate, for payment to insurance agents, they did not explain to anybody in 1988 that they were not even going to give the Public Utilities Board the chance to rule on that. They did not have the nerve to tell Autopac. Autopac had to pick up the Public Utilities Board document and find out that the Conservative government, in 1992, had said no to a plan from Autopac to save the motorists of this province \$2 million.

* (2010)

I mean, did anybody on that side not see what just happened in the American election? Does anybody remember another comment from 1988, George Bush, read my lips, no new taxes? Well, here in Manitoba, we had our own George Bush, and it was Gary Filmon. He said two things. He said, read my lips, no more big Autopac increases. He said, read my lips, no more political interference in Autopac, and in 1992, he has broken both those promises to the people of this province. Indeed, it is a watershed. It is the beginning of the end of any credibility that this government could have on issues like Autopac. Mr. Speaker, 1992 and 1988.

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

Is it just the NDP that is saying that this Conservative government has sat on the issue of Autopac for four years? Well, no, there is someone else. It is not Frances Russell. It is not Arlene

Billinkoff. It is Fred Cleverley. Indeed, Fred Cleverley has been saying, if you have any concerns about Autopac, who do you call? Glen Cummings, the Minister responsible for Autopac. Indeed, what did Fred Cleverley say in two columns earlier this year? What did he say? He said, bring in no fault, and he said, cap the payments to insurance agents in this province.

What did the Conservative government do? They did nothing on the one, not only did not cap the insurance agents' fees, they have now overruled in cabinet, the kind of political interference they said they would not impose on Autopac—they have prevented Autopac from saving the motorists of this province \$1 million. The word is hypocrite. Whether it is on health, whether it is on education, whether it is on fiscal policy, the word is hypocrite.

The quote I was talking about is one I have used in this House before from Benjamin Disraeli who said: "A conservative government is an organized hypocrisy.", Madam Deputy Speaker.

Well, this government has proved it is definitely hypocrisy. Whether it is organized or not, I am not sure at times, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am not sure if they are particularly organized, but hypocrites they are.

I say that, indeed, there is a watershed to this government, and I say to them that people have longer memories than they think. You know, I talked to a lot of people this weekend in my own constituency who could not believe that this government is now going to be increasing Autopac rates by up to 13.5 percent.

I could not believe it because, you know, I remember sitting as part of the NDP government at the time and the discussion that took place, and I remember saying at the time, you cannot raise premiums as dramatically as occurred in that one year in one year. That is what people said. That is what the people of this province said in 1988. Boy, did we get a message in the NDP caucus, Madam Deputy Speaker. Boy! Some of us remember it well, having survived, and those who did not. [interjection]

We know which side the member is speaking from. I am not blaming the new member for Portage (Mr. Pallister). I am just wondering if anybody bothered to tell him before he got elected in the by-election what this government is going to be doing to the motorists of this province at the time the

rate increases take place for Autopac after what they ran on in 1988, Madam Deputy Speaker.

You know, the bottom line with this government is that they can only go so far with those kinds of developments, and throughout this session, I think we are going to see the rest of the veneer stripped away.

You know, they ran on a platform in 1988 of no additional taxes, but they have been offloading so much, Madam Deputy Speaker, that not only are they not maintaining health and education services, but in terms of education services in many areas throughout this province, there are major increases taking place in terms of property taxes. If that is not a tax, what is it? Is the property tax payer not a taxpayer? Is the increase of property taxes because of the actions of this government? Is that not an increase in taxes, another platform of this government from 1988 that is rapidly eroding away?

* (2015)

So as I said, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is going to be an interesting session and it is going to be, in my view, an absolute watershed for this government. If they want to sit there and think that Autopac is not going to be a major issue to people out there, they should talk to them now. They should talk to them, because you know as bad as it was for the NDP back in 1988 in terms of Autopac, at least we had not run on the platform that this party, the government now ran on in 1988. There was no doubt in anybody's mind.

I have the quotes here, Madam Deputy Speaker, in detail from Gary Filmon saying, oh, we are not going to have big increases. We are not going to have political interference—well, famous last words indeed. We are not going to take it, no new big increases. We are not going to take it, no political interference. We are not going to take it anymore.

Indeed, all I can say is, let us see the current reaction in terms of the public. We will see who they believe from now on in terms of Autopac, whether they will give any credibility across the way to a party that in the first place never agreed with the Autopac concept and now after four years has a minister who ran the main campaign in 1988 against the NDP in terms of rate increases and political interference and now has the nerve to say in 1992, if you have any ideas, let us know.

Well, I have a lot of ideas. Our caucus has a lot of ideas in terms of Autopac. We put them on the

table: no fault, capping agency fees. We are not alone. There are so many other areas. There are so many areas, and we will not be as trite as the Conservatives were.

Well, I look at the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), who used to sit in his seat—the most that members opposite when they were in opposition would advise was, call an election. Let us have a new government. We could respond in kind, Madam Deputy Speaker. We know that the election will come not soon enough for us or for the people of this province. We will take our case. We will not respond in the same kind of tired, old rhetoric that they applied in 1988 talking about calling an election, that being their only platform.

Madam Deputy Speaker, how they have the nerve to stand here today, how they can face their constituents when they go back on the weekend and look them in the eye when they are now going to be bringing in increases in terms of Autopac that are some 11, 12, 13 percent above the rate of inflation, in the range of 600 percent of the rate of inflation, how they can turn and look their constituents in the eye when they had just said no to \$2 million in savings for the motorist, how they can look their constituents in the eye on political interference and do anything other than recognize that they have no credibility left is beyond me.

Indeed, a Conservative government is a hypocrisy, Madam Deputy Speaker. It may be an organized hypocrisy, but it is becoming increasingly disorganized. It is very clear we have reached the watershed. This is going to be a watershed session for this Legislature. Unless the Conservatives recognize what they are doing, which is, they are burning their credibility on issues that got them elected in 1988, the bottom line is, the verdict will come from the Manitoba voters.

I just remind them, as indeed happened in the election in the United States, if there was one thing that spelled the end of the George Bush administration, it was the "no new taxes." Well, indeed, they have their equivalents. Their time of accountability will come.

Believe you me, having remembered and having seen in black and white in Hansard reading just again today some of the things they said when they were running for election and seeing how they have acted when they were in government, indeed, their time will come, Madam Deputy Speaker, and we in the NDP will be reminding the people of Manitoba

where they stood in 1988 and how low they have sunk in 1992.

The bottom line is we cannot wait for the opportunity to let the people of Manitoba speak on this hypocritical, tired, old government. Thank you.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity to speak on the throne speech. Before I do that, I just want to pay tribute to my Leader, who has chosen to step down after nine years serving this party.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Mrs. Carstairs has worked very hard. She is a very honest person and she is a very honest politician. I think we are all going to miss her, and I just want to say thank you to her. It is very difficult to get people in this House who are really true to their convictions and who do not get derailed by a narrow political vision. Mrs. Carstairs has shown us all a very good example.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this is my fifth throne speech reply. Since 1988, as a member of this Assembly, I think I have matured and learned many things in this House. I feel it is very important that I must do what is right for the people of Manitoba as a whole, not only what is right for the people who voted for me. That is my principle when I come to this House. I make sure that my views reflect the opinion of my constituents and Manitobans as a whole.

* (2020)

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are many things we have seen for the last two years, and I just want to touch base on one of the things the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) was saying—call an election. We just had two by-elections and what has happened in the Crescentwood by-election, I want to talk about that. I think that honesty in politics is the most important thing.

We went door to door in the Crescentwood area, and what I found there at the doors—because of my involvement in health care and being Health critic for five years and people recognizing me, they were simply asking me if I was supporting a cut in health care. That was the question all the time. Are we supporting the health care cuts? My answer was tell me who is supporting the health care.

Then we saw a note there, a letter from Tim Sale, a Crescentwood by-election candidate. I can stand anything but somebody who is going to lie and manipulate the facts, I cannot do that. It said, and I

will read it, the Liberals endorsed the Tory cuts to our health care system. Their candidate has not said a word about the potential economic disaster resulting from Mexican free trade.

What they have done, and actually if you look at the results, more than 65 percent of Crescentwood voters rejected that kind of policy and the kind of abuse against us. That was a major topic of discussion. The discussion basically here is a question of honesty and dignity that you do not tell lies or tell things which are not right. Say what is right and what you say here, believe that.

It was very, very frightening, but we did not hear that in Portage. In Portage, that was not the issue and the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) is here, and I welcome him. I think he will bring a lot of openness and courage and also real commitment to his community. It is very positive to see the kind of profile he has, because I went to Portage also. We had a candidate and their candidate was telling the NDP that Pharmacare cuts are being made in this House, and they are supported by us. I think that was very, very bad manners, and those kinds of things do not lead us anywhere.

I want to tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, something. I was reading the 1992 Canadian Medical Association magazine and there is a Gallup poll here. The Gallup poll is dealing with the honesty and ethical standards of various professions in this country. And where do the politicians come? We are at the bottom. And why are we at the bottom? Because these kinds of things, what we do and say, reflect on all of us. It is very shameful—very, very sad. I wanted to talk about it, because I thought it was very important that we all agreed in this House that health care was an important issue, because we passed a resolution. Because the resolution that I would read simply said that we are going to work together to ensure that health care is preserved under five basic principles, those five basic principles are only going to be preserved if somebody is going to do the right things.

* (2025)

In this case, Madam Deputy Speaker, everyone, except a few, knows that the right things are being done. It is a very, very dangerous road because this government is not going to have the fruits of health care reform, not what I am going to get out of this, or my party is going to get out of this. Manitobans are going to have the beneficial effects not in one

year, two years, three years, four years, probably five or 10 years time, and then somebody else is going to have the benefits. I think if they are really interested in the public that they should say it is the right thing to do and let us see this reform take place. That is where we will differ with the minister.

I think we should—because our role is to make sure that somebody thinks what they have said—make sure they do that and that is why we are going to continue. It is not easy to be on the same side, but for the right thing we must do it.

I want to read a few quotes, because I think it is very essential. It is not essential what I say about the throne speech. There are many experts in this province. There are good journalists, good reporters, good politicians, very, very smart people, better than all of us probably. But simply by coming here, it does not make us an expert and a genius overnight, because we have 24 percent of the votes, so we are the saviour of the whole world, but at least we should try to do the right things.

I want to read, it was April of 1987, and the quote is: I asked the advice which would refocus the emphasis on health care services from the traditional, institutional framework. I wish to reaffirm that commitment to support the growth of this program, so that we can bring the refocusing away from our institutional model. Who was that? It was not this Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). It was not the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Filmon). It was not the Leader of the third party, but it was the then Minister of Health.

The Minister of Health, on May 25, 1992, said on Mike McCourt's Report that he was going to talk to the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) and the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis) and ask them to do what is right for the people of Manitoba and not be afraid of the success of health care.

I think that is the issue here. There are some parties afraid that this is going to be successful. It will not be an issue in the next campaign. I think that is the trouble here. It is very, very dangerous because—[interjection] Madam Deputy Speaker, we do not have to defend anybody. People know what they are doing. There is no need to defend it. They know exactly what is happening, because that has been proven by two by-elections.

It is going to be proven in Rupertsland also. We will know that in November of 1993 who is going to win that seat because we know we are doing the

right things. We know that these people appreciate it, because it does not matter which way you go, third party or second party or first party, if we can keep them away from that side of the House that will be our biggest service to Manitobans.

I want to talk about the total hypocrisy of even having colour blindness for the logos. In the Crescentwood by-election, we had two red colours going all over the place and the question was, who was the real candidate? That was the question, who the candidate was, because we had one orange sign in Portage that was the true colour, but then we had the orange-red in Crescentwood. We asked somebody—that was the height of the nonsense I have ever heard, but they say no, no, it is still the NDP colour, but it is orange-red. It is very sad, because there are a lot of members in this House who are doing their job, and one member is sitting on the right of me, the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). He works very hard, but the issue here is the ethical and moral standard of people like all of us. That is why we are at the lowest in the poll. That is very sad.

Madam Deputy Speaker, since May of 1992, we have been to various health care conferences. We have kept the same message. The message is still the same, that we want to make sure that health care reform will succeed, and we want to make sure of that. We have to make sure that we keep this minister on track, and that is our role. We have seen from some other party, which we all know, that every place they go they have a separate message. They go to a union and they will say, oh, well, they are cutting all the beds, you are going to lose all the jobs. They go to doctors and they say, no, it is really bad, you know, they are against doctors, and then they go to physiotherapists—oh, no, no, they are against you. It is kind of the social and critical warfare which is their philosophy, and it is very dangerous. Again, that is why we are low in the credibility poll as politicians in this country. That is very sad.

I want to express my views, because it is very tough for me as a health care professional when I go to institutions, and they ask me as their health care provider, how can I support the bed cuts? But they fail to understand that the government was given a mandate by the people of Manitoba, and one of the issues was the health care issue. The issue was how we were going to refocus the whole health care resource in the long run. At least two parties, which have at least 42 percent plus 28.1 percent

voters, 62 percent people are supporting the health care reform. That is more than them.

* (2030)

Madam Deputy Speaker, that is one which is going to be shown at the next campaign, because everything is going wrong with our NDP.

That is not the case—health care reform will succeed whether they support it or not, that is not the issue anymore. They should talk to the minister in British Columbia or in Saskatchewan, or if you really want to really go deep, go to Ontario. Once you go to Ontario, you will not be able to come out of the depth of the bed cuts and the loss of jobs and the kind of distrust that the government has created in the health care sector. It is really, really tragic.

I think this is so important that even as a member, a single member of the Assembly, if we can even help to make a change—I am not afraid of anyone, because people, when they elected us, have told us this is an important issue; please do it carefully.

If the NDP can think of one reporter who has said that health care reform is not right—just pick one. Not even one so far has said health care reform is not the right thing. In fact, everyone across this nation has been saying, follow the example of Manitoba, the kind of health care reform that is taking place.

I think it is so essential, and we want to make sure that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) will understand that the issue of health care reform, what his government has started, must carry on and not get derailed by some of the negative things that are being created by self-centred, self-motivated and very, very narrow-minded people, because if you get afraid and change the minister, say, for example, next year, that will derail your health care reform more than anything else, because it takes a long time for somebody to understand health care reform.

The health care system is very, very complex. It changes so rapidly from day to day. It is a responsibility that is so sensitive that anything you touch, you are going to have some negative impact in the initial stage, but in the long run, this will be the most important thing for us to do.

Then we can discuss in 1994 who was right because people will decide that, and they have already shown in the by-election that health care reform—when the NDP said that was the issue—I am reading from their brochure, that was the No. 1 issue—that issue was defeated, Madam Deputy

Speaker. It is so essential that we continue to do the right things.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it is very easy in this House to complain and not have a single positive suggestion or constructive criticism. It is very easy, and we did that in 1988. I do not think there is anybody in this House who has criticized more the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) than myself.

I think as elected officials, we have the responsibility to maintain a standard of criticism and also maintain a mutual respect so that we can achieve something. It is much easier to achieve with co-operation than with a fight. I think that has been happening. We have been able to resolve many things. I can bring every day's caseload with the names attached, but we have not done that because that is unfair—unless we are forced and action is not being taken.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am simply asking my colleagues on the right side of this House, please, make sure that what you are saying, can you deliver that tomorrow? For example, in 1994, if you become the government, can you do that? You will not be able to do that. It is very tough.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are stories and stories and scientific evidence all across this nation. One can take a single topic and go on health care reform all along, but the important thing, what I wanted to convey were the right things.

I just want the minister to know that we had our six-month report, and we have sent to the minister our report, and basically what we have found is that many things in this health care package are being done at a slow speed. We want them to do it at a faster speed, because it is so essential that things should be done as soon as possible. Otherwise if it is next year, then there will be again a fear of backlash or worse. I think they have the right and they can do it right now, so we will encourage the minister to that.

One positive thing that came out of the throne speech was the pharmacare card. The pharmacare card is a good issue, and we have all been working on that. Now I think everybody is trying to claim who really had the idea, but it does not matter as long as it is being implemented. Somebody said, we had it in 1985; somebody said '86, somebody said '88 or '90. The important thing is the pharmacare card is there, and we want that card to stay and make sure that Smart Card will come eventually.

When initially the Smart Card idea was coming, I remember the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) said it was terrible. I remember that because that was a question. But then when the Ontario government said, we are going to do it, oh, it is a good idea, you know? It is not that bad. I think some people are slow in remembering, but that is fine.

Madam Deputy Speaker, why I am spending so much time on this is because I have seen what they did in the Crescentwood by-election and what they were doing in the civic campaign. I want to talk about that. We have seen social warfare, but in the civic campaign we saw a kind of new warfare. It was an ethnic warfare they were trying to start, and we worked very hard in all the ethnic communities to make sure that this party does not exploit any ethnic group anymore. [interjection] Well, the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) wants to talk about that. If she wants to talk about that, that we can go into detail and we will make tomorrow's headline, and it will not look very good in the papers tomorrow morning. [interjection]

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am not wasting my time, because I know I am not wasting my time. The member for Wellington is worried about my wasting my time.

* (2040)

Madam Deputy Speaker—[interjection] I just want to tell the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) that I will give him the copies of all the speeches of all House critics. Their agenda and the Tory agenda are almost the same, basically, reform for health care. So I will give him copies to read that. It is so important because he seems to witness in person but he does not know what they are doing. He wants to do the right thing—but every day they are frightening people. They are saying everything is falling apart. The health care is going down the drain, come down and save us. We want to have this public show now. Twenty people called them and said, oh well, we have an open debate on health care reform. What is happening? The membership of the party goes from one place to another, and we have seen the same presenters for five years. That is what I have seen.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the same presenters, the same questioners, the same question in the same fashion, they have been asking. I am really forced to say these things today because I will not

be able to have a good sleep if I do not get this off my chest. I mean, when I was going to the Crescentwood by-election, that was the issue—bed cuts, bed cuts, everything is falling apart, antiunion. These people do not know what they are doing. It was terrible. I wish that people would change.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are many things that have gone wrong in the past, many things that have gone wrong, and if we continue to follow the same path, then we will do more things wrong. That is why we are cautioning that all of us must do what is right for the people of Manitoba. We are spending \$1.9 billion for 1.1 million people. If we were spending smart, why do we have a problem? Something has gone wrong. To change the mistakes of the past 30 years, it will at least take 30 months. I think they have to have some direction. That is why they cannot face at any public debate they want to talk to us, they will not, simply because the simple question we ask them is, how are you going to do it? Then they go in many, many different directions.

It is very tough to face the lies, but it is very easy to face the truth, even if it hurts. I think that is the issue here. Let us face the truth, let us really follow what you say today and what you are going to do tomorrow. It is very tough, that we have seen. We have seen it in 1988 and 1990. It was very tough to do that, because we were immature in some ways. We did not have experience. I did not know about politics. I did not know too much about health care. We thought that that was procedures here. You will come and you have to do all those things. That is not the real thing, because that is not getting them votes. That did not get any votes to us. People wanted a truthful government, and I think that is our role, to make sure this government stays on the course.

I saw something very strange today. The Minister of Sport made an announcement. It was a good thing for Manitoba. The second thing that the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) said, let us divide the communities here, see who is going to get what. Think it over: If it is good for Winnipeg, good for Manitoba, it is good for all of us. With that kind of a level of narrow thinking, which is very dangerous, are you going to put one facility in Thompson, one in Carman, one in Portage? We should do what is best for the people of Manitoba. It is so tough for them to say something good. It is amazing. It is very strange. [interjection] The member for Inkster

(Mr. Lamoureux) is saying it is not easy for them, that they do not understand, but I think they do understand to some extent.

It is so painful what we saw in the civic campaign. The NDP said, we have this WIN group. It was so-called very independent. Then we saw each and every MLA working hard in our area promoting ethnic rift, the kind of underhanded approach I have never seen in any part of the world. The candidate was saying, we have to fight and make sure that that kind of thing will not exist in north Winnipeg. It became so dirty that we had to get involved and say, let us hold it. We are in this game to help, not to exploit.

What has happened is exploitation, total exploitation of innocent Canadians, new Canadians. Do you know what they have done? What they have done, I have seen their multicultural policy. They did not appoint a single person on any board or commission where they had some responsible position. They did not appoint anybody, but at the same time, when somebody else is doing it, they are fearful. That is why I said, they are not fearful that people are not going to get the benefit; they are fearful of the success of others. That is their problem. That is their trouble.

Everybody is spending so much time and effort and working hard to make sure that people have jobs, people will have their livelihood, they will work together, but you see some of the politicians going and exploiting them. Madam Deputy Speaker, I have to speak on this issue. It may not be part of the throne speech, but it is part of my constituency's code. It is basically what has happened in the civic campaign, it was very dangerous but we were able to stop it. It is not putting new versus old, yellow versus brown, colour versus noncolour. That kind of politics has to stop, underhanded below-the-belt kind of approach—very dangerous.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I know that some of them are not going to be very happy, but people have to be told what they are up to. If we can even do it, that is a risk I think will save disasters to happen. Some of the members in this House have done very well, but we are talking about the whole structure, the kind of planning that goes into the communities to make sure they are being exploited, that kind of politics has to stop.

That is why it is so important for people like me or somebody else to come here and speak on the issues. I do not want to sit at the back and just clap

when somebody stands up. I want to do something that is right, but they are not interested for people who would like to come and sit in this House, they want to exploit them. That has to be stopped.

It is so sad because they want to go out in the communities and say, well, you know, we are going to say we are the socialists, we have a social conscience. We are the social conscience of this province, but that is not fact. That is not fact. If you had such a social conscience, how come you could not get even one ethnic candidate to run in a winnable riding? Not even one.

It is good to put the names on the ballot paper and say, oh, we are going to have you, we are going to have you, but not get them in a winnable riding, because when they come, they are going to see what you are up to. That is the tragedy.

It is the kind of policy that is so deep-rooted, and Madam Deputy Speaker, I will speak against that policy anytime inside this House, outside this House. I spoke about that policy in the temple very openly because that is where these kinds of things were being said.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the most important thing from all of us and from our party, we want to make sure that the people of Manitoba are given a good government, an honest government and a government that believes in the ethical standards of the politician, and that is what we are expecting from our Premier (Mr. Filmon) and from our ministers. So far we have not seen a single scandal. It has been five years. That is an achievement—five years.

* (2050)

Madam Deputy Speaker, because these kinds of things when you go door to door, these kinds of things when we get the constituents to phone me or write to me, these are the things they are asking me. They are not asking me more than that. They are simply asking me, are you doing the right things for them? This question comes up every day: Are you guys doing the right things for us? Because once they see the Question Period and somebody has a 30-second clip—oh, it is terrible, everything is falling apart, the province is going down the drain. Really that demoralizes people more.

What we have to do in tough economic times is to make sure that we say some positive things to make sure people's confidence is there so that they can work because, without their work, we will not be here. We will not be able to afford anything. So you

have to go back to the people, make sure you take the best advantage of their positive attitude, their abilities, their functions and really work with them in a more open and co-operative fashion, but not have the social warfare or ethnic warfare or a class warfare which will divide people. That will not work in this country and in this province.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that is why we want the government to have the openness for people to come and talk to the ministers. We have good success with some of the ministers. If anything needs to be done in my constituency, we go to them and it is being done, and we are not sending a note there that, you know, we got it and so vote for us. We are simply saying, this is right for you. It does not matter which party you voted for in the past. As constituents you deserve the fair share of resources, and that is why we are going to request even from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that in my constituency, which has the Seven Oaks Hospital—and the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) is asking the government to relocate the ophthalmology program, a teaching program which could be a very valuable asset to the Seven Oaks Hospital and will fit the health care reform package. That will show that the government is interested in terms of setting each and every hospital as a specialty hospital. That will fit that kind of role.

I know that the hospital has made the submission to the minister's office, and I have advocated for the same thing as of 1988. It is not the first time I am doing it. So, we will ask the minister to look at the ophthalmology program to make sure that program is established at Seven Oaks Hospital. I have spoken to the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), and we are both going to work together and request the minister to make sure we get the program there that will be good for the north end. It will be good for the province, because we have the facility, we have the resources and we have the people and we will fit into the health action plan. We can assure the minister, we will not take the credit. We will give them the credit, but it is a good thing for the hospital. [interjection]

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is saying, share the care. I do not know, but I will share with the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), definitely, and I think we will work together on this issue. I will share with the minister also all the good things which are going to come out of this health action plan.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to just end up by saying that we have to do what is right for the people of Manitoba, and if that means sometimes taking a risk, we will take the risk.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

We will be honest, we will be direct, and we will make sure that the Minister of Health will follow the Health Action Plan so that we can have a health care system which is going to be good for the province, which is going to be good for the people of Manitoba, and which is setting up a standard for the rest of the country.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us not be afraid of success. Let us take the success and run with it. Thank you.

Mrs. Shirley Render (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to reply to the throne speech as it is to say how nice it is to see you back in the Speaker's Chair.

The first time I replied to a throne speech, I said all the right things about the Speaker. I understand it is traditional to compliment the Speaker, but this time I can speak from two years' experience. I think all of us sort of recognized that we enjoyed the fact that you used a little bit of humour when it is necessary, a small frown, a shake of the hand, or a wee bit of exasperation maybe creeps into your voice when you try to keep order in this House.

I would like to take this moment to thank the new Pages who have joined us this session and also to thank the new Clerk.

I would also like to take this time just to say to the Lieutenant-Governor I wish him a speedy recovery and many, many years of good health ahead of him.

This is my first opportunity really to officially acknowledge, I guess, I would say the loss of our former member from Portage and just to say that I had always enjoyed talking with him.

An Honourable Member: And the smell of his cigars.

Mrs. Render: Yes, and the smell of his cigars which wafted down to the end of the hallway.

I would also like to wish the former member for Rupertsland all the best in whatever he does with his future.

Reference was made to another member who is no longer here, and I too would just like to say that I enjoyed working with him, and that is the former member for Crescentwood, Jim Carr. I had the

pleasure of working with him on the Manitoba Constitutional Task Force. I found him to be very fair-minded, a very objective person, and very easy to work with—and very liberal too.

I would like to say at this moment that I am very sorry that the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has decided that it is time to step down. I have not had any direct dealings with her, but I think one of the things that I found very interesting about any of her comments here in the House is that she spoke from the heart, and I think of a comment that she made just today, whenever she speaks off the cuff.

Today she made reference to the Halifax explosion, and when she makes these kinds of comments, I notice that she usually sort of harkens back into her own life or maybe talks about her parents, and that makes her comments very personal and very—

An Honourable Member: If you keep this up, she is not going to quit.

Mrs. Render: Definitely. At any rate, I just want to say that she has been a good Leader for the Liberals. She has brought the Liberal Party back to life, and I think she has made a valuable contribution to this House and to the province.

Of course, I would like to welcome the two new members here: the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) whose background I know will be a valuable asset to this House; and, of course, the new member for Portage (Mr. Pallister), my seatmate, so to speak, who is very visible, and somebody I will never overlook, and yes, I do have to say I look up to him. Although he may find the chair legs of his chair are going to be cut off so we can look eyeball to eyeball.

Now, a subject that most of us have put behind us and nobody has even talked about so far in the throne speech is the Constitution. I would just like to resurrect that subject for just a moment because I think we should acknowledge the great amount of time that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) devoted to trying to make a good deal for Manitoba and trying to make a good deal for Canada.

Now, before I get into my comments on the throne speech, I would just like to bring members up to date with what has been happening in St. Vital. The Windsor School is a school in the heart of old St. Vital, a school which has seen a resurgence in its numbers. Last June, under the direction of Terri

Roese, a professional artist and also one of the parents from this school, designed a mural and along with the students painted this mural on the walls of the entrance of the school. This mural was painted to commemorate Canada's 125th birthday.

I just had a letter from the principal of the school today, and he tells me that Windsor School was presented with a special award by the Governor-General in the area of visual arts for the mural which is in this hallway. I think these students and Terri Roese are to be commended.

* (2100)

Windsor School also has two students who are very, very talented students. Their names are Suzanne Gadd and Darla Kraigsley. They are both Grade 9 students from last year, and they have had their submissions to the Governor-General's regional celebrations accepted for inclusion in the special anthology, *Who I Am Is Who We Are: Growing Up Canadian*. Both students received a certificate of merit from the Governor-General, and as well, Suzanne's writing was identified by the judges as deserving special recognition, and so was invited to receive a special award presented by the Governor-General on October 23, when he was here in Manitoba.

I think a great deal of credit has to go to a couple of teachers at Windsor School, and they are Al Friesen, who is in charge of the gifted students, and Betty Halstead, who is the junior high Language Arts teacher. Both these teachers worked very, very hard with the students.

Now sharing the same grounds with the school is the Windsor community centre. Like the school, the community centre has a dynamic group of parents and children. These parents have successfully seen the completion of a new clubhouse to replace what was affectionately known as "the castle."

I was really very pleased to have been able to work with some of my colleagues here to help secure them a Community Places grant to ensure the funding for the building of this new clubhouse went through. Just yesterday, I was out at the Windsor community centre and the new clubhouse is just beautiful. Now I just want to congratulate the parents who spent so much time seeing this project through to completion and wish them the best in their fundraising efforts. I know that they will be successful because of the spirit which so characterizes this area.

Now funding through the Community Places Program has also paved the way for a couple of other Community Places projects in St. Vital. One of them is the St. Vital Y, which, of course, all of us know offers a huge selection of programs and services to the community. They needed some major renovations done and again through a Community Places grant they were able to do this. Another group, which I do not know whether any of you on the other side of the House are aware of, is a group called the Save Our Seine group and the core group of the Save Our Seine group is made up of residents who live along the Seine River.

I have been working with this group since I was elected in September 1990, and along with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) and Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), some of my colleagues again have been able to secure funding to help this group in their task of, quite literally, saving the Seine River. Of course, their prime wish is really to restore the water quality and the quantity to the Seine River.

I just have to say, I have really enjoyed working with this group of volunteers because they just do not stand around wringing their hands and waiting for somebody else to do the work. They are out there doing much of the hard, dirty work themselves. In fact, their last cleanup took place, oh, about four weeks ago on a very, very cold day.

Okay, now on to the throne speech. All of us know that the rationale, the reason behind the throne speech, is for the government to provide a blueprint, a framework so to speak as to how it is going to approach the upcoming Legislative session and beyond. Now, to have effective and realistic policies, it is vital that governments know when to strike a balance by looking at what is happening within its own boundaries and what is happening outside of its boundaries.

I think it is significant that the very first sentence of the main paragraph shows that this government is not ignoring, as some in this Chamber think that they can do, what is happening on the world scene. This government recognizes the dramatic changes that have occurred in the world. Now, just to refresh your memory, I will just read that first sentence. The winds of change are sweeping the globe, and the throne speech goes on to say that history teaches us that the most durable and enduring societies are those best able to cope with change, adapt their way of life and take advantage of new opportunities.

How very important these words are, and we have put them front and centre so that people know that this government understands that our policies must take into consideration the global picture.

I think it is very significant also that the next three headings of the throne speech immediately point out where this places Manitoba and how we are going to approach this. I will just refresh members' minds on this one. Those three headings are Manitoba at a Crossroads, New Ways for a New Age and Marketing Manitoba to the World.

I just want to focus on that last one for a moment. Our Premier (Mr. Filmon), our Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), in particular have been doing just that. They have been marketing Manitoba to the world. They know that in a global marketplace, businesses that do not adapt their marketing strategies to the social, technological, economic and political forces that affect consumer behaviour simply will not survive the '90s. They know that hype and gimmicks will not sell products, that marketing will involve educating the customer and providing solid value, and that businesses will have to offer high-tech services to their customers.

Having said that, I just want to remind all members here—although I think those on this side of the House very definitely know this government has been working since we have been elected to wipe out the regressive, antibusiness measures put into place by the previous administration—we have been very successful. No other government in this country can say that for five successive budgets they have not raised major business or personal taxes. We can, and that is a record that is unbeatable.

Now, actions I think speak louder than words, and our actions say that Manitoba is the place to live and Manitoba is the place to do business. The statistics prove this point. I will just tell you a couple of those stats. Recent Conference Board of Canada projections place Manitoba tied for second place in the country with respect to 1992 growth in gross domestic product and forecast of investment intentions also place Manitoba well above the national average. Also, Manitoba as most of us know is an export province, and I think we should all be encouraged by the fact that our world exports have risen by 13 percent in 1992.

Thus, this government does have a definite strategic plan of action:

(1) We look outward to assess what is happening in the wider scene and its relevance to Manitoba. We see that we cannot afford to ignore the global events, that it is absolutely vital in this day and age of advanced communications that we simply cannot strategize just within our own provincial boundaries. We must market Manitoba to the world, and that will be one of the prime focuses of this government.

(2) We critically assess where our strengths lie, and then we make a concerted effort to build on these strengths. That assessment is another heading in the throne speech called "Building on Our Strengths."

This province has a very diversified grouping of strengths that this government will focus on and expand the opportunities.

Some of those areas are the health care industries. How many members here know that the number of health product manufacturers in this sector has increased by 250 percent to more than 60 companies employing more than 1,000 Manitobans? I think this is a very enviable record. To build on this important infrastructure, this government has signed an agreement with the federal government to support health industry development for another five years.

Another area of great strength here in Manitoba is the information and telecommunications sector. Since we have taken office, we have taken many steps to strengthen this area. I think of the partnership with Linnet Graphics, competition in the provision of long distance telephone services by companies such as Hughes Acoustic Technology.

Special emphasis will be placed on the development of technologies and services to support the economic development of growth in both rural and northern Manitoba.

Tourism is another area of strength in this province, and this is an area of special importance and interest to me since I have spent over a dozen years with the Western Canada Aviation Museum. One of our goals at the museum was to market the museum not just here in Winnipeg, not just here in Manitoba, but across the country and indeed across North America and across the world. So I am very pleased with the increased emphasis that this government is placing on tourism, because I believe that Manitoba has a huge potential in this area.

Aerospace is another sector where we have a great many strengths, and again it is another area,

one in which I am very interested in. Manitoba has had an excellent reputation and a very long history of excellence in the aviation industry stemming back to 1926, when the well-known grain businessman James A. Richardson founded Western Canada Airways in 1926. His company was founded to open up the North for mineral development. The company was so successful that it expanded into another company called Canadian Airways Limited, which eventually became the foundation for Canadian Pacific Airlines, which, through the years and through many amalgamations, is now known as Canadian Airlines International.

* (2110)

During the years that this company was busy carving out a name for itself on the airways side of things, others here in Manitoba were developing ancillary industries to go along with it. We have such industries, MacDonald Bros., which is now Bristol Aerospace, Standard Aero, just to name a couple which have become world-renowned.

I think it is a credit to this province that Bristol Aerospace is located here. This company has over 60 years of experience in the repair and overhaul services for both fixed and rotary wing aircraft and precision manufacture of aero components for various air frames and gas turbine engines. Bristol's program for the modernization and life extension of the F-5 has earned that company international recognition, along with its world famous Black Brant rocket. I think it is very significant that Bristol just received what I think was—I do not have my figures here—a \$23-million contract to supply components for the Boeing 777.

Now a relative newcomer to the aviation industry here in Manitoba is GE Aerospace. I would just like to point out that the engineering team there very recently developed within a record-setting time of about 18 months an operational prototype of the digital acoustic receiver system. This is for surveillance applications, and the GE Aerospace facility here in Winnipeg has the world product mandate for DARS. I think this is a very important step in the development of Manitoba's aerospace sector. We can be proud that GE Aerospace chose Manitoba as its site.

Even the Winnipeg International Airport—members opposite throughout their responses to the throne speech have said we used the word "innovate" too much. What is innovate? Ah, there is nothing there. Everybody is innovating. What I

started to say was, even the Winnipeg International Airport, which we tend to think of as a place, you know, you just take off and land, they too are looking for new ways to remain viable in this changing world.

Just recently, under its general manager, Lynn Bishop, they have developed a brand new strategy to better utilize its space within the airport complex. This concept is called Market Avenue. It was just unveiled last week. New approaches, new-think, as we often call the innovative and creative approaches which, as I just said, regrettably, the opposition seems to take exception to, very definitely epitomizes the way this government looks at things.

It also epitomizes the approach that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and this government have chosen to ensure that Manitobans have quality health care in the future. It is no longer viable simply to pour more money into the system. One, we simply do not have the resources to continue doing that; and secondly, there is just simply no automatic guarantee that putting more money into something is going to make it any better.

This government and the Minister of Health have had the courage to say that we have to change the approach to the way we just deliver our health care. To that end, the Minister of Health has spent countless hours consulting with professionals in a wide variety of health care fields to come up with the quality health plan for Manitobans.

Some of the main tenets of this plan, and I am sure members here on this side are very familiar and hopefully members on the other side are very familiar with it, are that we have to strike a better balance between prevention and community-based and institutional services. We must also shift services away from higher-cost institutions to more personal methods of health care delivery. We must also move more toward health promotion, illness prevention and disability. We must allow patients and their families more opportunities to make decisions regarding what is going to happen with them as far as their health care and where they want their placement to be.

Now another area that I am very interested in because I have two children—I really should not call them children, one is 18 and in first year of university, and the other is 23, but I also have two little nieces who are just entering the school system. So I am very interested in the education and training area, and I know that we have to make changes. I

also know from also listening to many of my constituents that they too know that changes have to be made in this area.

I am very pleased that the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) has spent a great deal of time going out into the community, talking with teachers, talking with those in the school, talking with parents. I am pleased that she will be examining options to improve standards and increasing province-wide testing and evaluation in such very important areas as language arts, mathematics and science, sort of the basis, the crux of our educational system.

I am happy to see that College Governance is preceding on schedule. It was absolutely vital that changes in this area be made, because what was happening was that in some instances the college was offering courses that had been on the books for a long time, but there were no jobs out there. So here these students were, putting in time and effort and money to take courses, and they would get out into the real world and find that there was not a job out there. So College Governance will help make the college more relevant to what the marketplace needs.

I think one of the most interesting and successful innovative programs that this government has introduced is Workforce 2000, and that is now going into its second year. The Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) has spoken of this program, so I will not go into a lot of detail right now. I will just mention one aspect. Again, an aspect that interests me, and that is the one that shows that this government does not just sort of do something for the sake of doing.

As I said earlier, this government identifies our areas of strength, and one that I mentioned earlier was the aerospace sector. So here we have got this area that is building up in this province, but do we have the people who are going to be able to fill the jobs? We do not. So what has the Minister of Education in conjunction with some of her colleagues done? She has instituted a program to make sure that we are going to be training our students so that when the aerospace industry needs people, whether it is avionics experts, airframe experts, whatever it is, we are going to have the students coming out of the schools who are going to be able to walk into those jobs and fill those jobs and make this province a dynamic province.

Mr. Speaker, I have not covered all the areas mentioned in the throne speech, but I think there is absolutely no doubt that this government is

committed to building a competitive economy, protecting vital services, and working with all the sectors to ensure that we have a strong and prosperous province. But, as I said earlier, there will have to be some hard decisions coming down the line. It is absolutely essential that people realize that government cannot and indeed should not be everything to everyone; rather, our role is to provide a good basis, a framework in some instances, and work in partnerships in other cases.

None of us can go it alone, and government is no exception. As a member said earlier, all of us spend too much money. We spend more than we take in, and the day of reckoning has come. However, this government is prepared to look at new and better ways of spending our money, and we know where the opportunities exist, and we know how to take advantage of those opportunities. That is why, Mr. Speaker, our Premier (Mr. Filmon) has said that he will go anywhere in the world to seek out new markets, to seek out new initiatives to provide jobs for Manitobans. That is why we will also build upon our strengths and we will look critically at how our dollars are being spent. Thank you very much.

* (2120)

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas): (Cree was spoken)

I want to start off by saying that I am pleased to be able to say a few words again in response to the throne speech. Like everybody else, I want to start off by—it is a tradition here—saying to you, Mr. Speaker, congratulations for being in that seat again. I know when I first—[interjection] In that big Chair, right. I know when I first came here just a little over two years ago I was, of course, a little bit intimidated by the surroundings, although I had been used to public speaking before in my other role prior to coming here. Nevertheless, I was a little apprehensive when I first got up to speak in the House here a little over two years ago.

I know with the way you handle new members, you made my job a little bit easier at the time and I am always grateful for that. So I wish you well, and your family, during the upcoming festive season. Health, peace of mind and contentment for you and your family, Mr. Speaker.

Next, I want to also welcome all members back to the Legislature. It is nice to see members in the House again. I also want to offer my congratulations to the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) who was elected in a by-election. In

addition, I want to mention also the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) who was elected again to the Legislature in the last by-election. I want to congratulate those two individuals and I wish them well and I look forward to working with them in the House as time goes on.

I also want to congratulate all the new Pages who have been appointed to the Legislature. I wish them well. I also want to say that I admire the young people who have been appointed to be Pages for the session here, Mr. Speaker, because I know at the same time they have to go to school and it takes a lot of dedication and hard work to be able to do both. So congratulations to all of them.

Also, at this time, Mr. Speaker, before I go on to the main part of my presentation, I want to mention my constituency. It consists of The Pas, Moose Lake, Cormorant, Easterville, Grand Rapids, Cross Lake, Norway House and, of course, The Pas Band where I come from.

I want to say a few words also about a good friend of mine who comes from The Pas, the former mayor of the Town of The Pas, Bruce Unfried. Bruce Unfried, after having served 16 years to the Town of The Pas as both a councillor and a mayor, decided after 16 years of service to the citizens of the town of The Pas that he was not going to be seeking public office in the last civic election. Bruce decided to retire from public office and he is going to be concentrating on his job as an official in the Child and Family Services department.

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

Mr. Acting Speaker, Bruce and I have quite a history. I had the opportunity to work with Bruce when I was chief of my band. I had known Bruce before that, of course, before he became a councillor and a mayor. I was able to work well with Bruce mainly because I knew that he was genuine, that he is a decent individual. He and I became more than just colleagues. We became, I am proud to say, very good friends, so I want to wish Bruce and his family well in whatever it is that they are going to be doing in the future.

I also want to say at this point, Mr. Acting Speaker, that I was listening to the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) talking about the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) and praising the good work that the Leader of the Liberal Party had done in Manitoba.

I sometimes think, as I listen to the chatter that goes back and forth here, not only in the Assembly but also outside the Assembly, in my home community included, that when people have passed on, that is when we always like to come out and say all kinds of good things about the people who have passed on. I sometimes think that is too late.

You know, it is too late for us to say good things about people after they have passed on. So I think it is good for us, it is much more meaningful for us to say good things about people, to praise people for the work that they have done, while they were still living. So that is why I felt pretty good about what was going on earlier this evening.

I also want to say something about the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs). We all know that she has announced her intentions to retire in the not too distant future. The Leader of the Liberal Party, in my mind, has contributed immensely, not only to her party but without a doubt I think she has contributed tremendously to this Legislature and to the people of Manitoba.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I admire the Leader of the Liberal Party in the way that she establishes her position and maintains her position. I think the Leader of the Liberal Party is a very principled person and for that I admire her. I wish her and her family all the very best with whatever endeavours she will pursue after she retires.

May the Creator be kind to her wherever she goes. May the Creator give her peace of mind, contentment, good health, happiness and a good family life. Quite often, the Leader of the Liberal Party spoke about family, early family and so on. That is what I value in people. I regarded Jim Carr, the former member for Crescentwood, in the same way. I think these people know that I mean what I say.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a few words about Elijah Harper, the former member for Rupertsland. I, for one, truly appreciate Elijah's contribution to aboriginal people and their fight for justice.

When I was faced with the task of deciding whether I should seek nomination in the provincial election last, Elijah Harper became one of those people who had quite a profound effect on me during the three weeks that I spent in Winnipeg in June of 1990, the events leading up to June 23, 1990.

It was during that time that I eventually made a decision that I would enter provincial politics. It took me about a year to decide, Mr. Speaker, but after spending three weeks here in Winnipeg with one of the chiefs and the people of this Legislature in June 1990, and while I was at the Peguis pow-wow in July of 1990, that is when I decided that I was going to enter my name for consideration in the nomination of the election.

I found Elijah Harper a source of inspiration, Mr. Speaker, so he helped me decide in the end that I was going to run for provincial politics.

I want to go on to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. I was always of the impression that the throne speech was really a blueprint for whatever the government is going to be doing in the Legislature for that session. It was explained to me that that was what the throne speech was all about, to provide a blueprint.

* (2130)

Mr. Speaker, this paper, this throne speech that was presented to this Legislature a week ago is extremely vague. It contains language that is very general, contains lots of very vague statements about activities that the provincial government is going to be pursuing in this session. It mentions more studies, more reviews, and it even contains language that I for one find hard to know what they mean. For example: "Specific approvals processes will be reviewed with a view to streamlining and better co-ordinating the efforts of provincial regulatory bodies." Language of that kind is prevalent throughout the document and that is why I am disappointed in the document. Overall, it is a very disappointing document.

The more I look at the throne speech, the more I wonder why the Premier even attempted to distance himself from the Prime Minister last week. This document is a do-nothing document. When I was chief of my band, I used to get criticized sometimes for making mistakes—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Rule 35(3), I am interrupting the proceedings in order to put the question on the motion of the honourable Leader of the Opposition, that is the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Do members wish to have the amendment read?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Leader of the Opposition, and the amendment thereto, as follows:

THAT the motion be amended by adding to it the following words:

But this House regrets that:

1. this government has lost touch with the concerns of the people of Manitoba and failed to acknowledge the recession and the pain and suffering it is inflicting today on thousands of Manitoba families;

2. this government's step aside economic approach has resulted in Manitoba performing in last place in 1991 with a decline in growth of 3.3 percent and a predicted growth below the national average in 1993, resulting in the loss of more Manitoba jobs and massive increases of social assistance cases;

3. this government has not been forthright with the people of Manitoba in outlining its plans for health reform leading to uncertainty amongst patients and health care providers and cutbacks in health services and lost jobs;

4. this government criticizes the federal government for off-loading health, post-secondary education and agriculture payments while at the same time off-loading its responsibilities to municipalities and school divisions forcing them to increase taxes and reduce services and cut jobs;

5. this government has failed to make public the results of its studies and consultations on the North American Free Trade Agreement or its own final position on the proposed trade agreement and its impact on Manitoba jobs; and therefore,

this government has thereby lost the trust and confidence of this House and the people of Manitoba.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, please.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms will call in the members.

The question before the House is a motion of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer). That is the amendment to the motion for the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Do members wish to have the motion reread?

Some Honourable Members: No.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carstairs, Cerilli, Cheema, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Edwards, Evans (Brandon East), Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Gaudry, Gray, Hickes, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wasylycia-Leis, Wowchuk.

Nays

Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Pallister, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 26, Nays 29.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it ten o'clock? [agreed]

The hour being 10 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Monday, December 7, 1992

CONTENTS

Throne Speech Debate

(Seventh Day of Debate)

Ashton	315
Cheema	318
Render	324
Lathin	328