



Second Session - Thirty-Sixth Legislature

of the

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(Hansard)**

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



Vol. XLVI No. 11 - 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 3, 1996

ISSN 0542-5492

**MANTOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Sixth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Party</u>
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.	St. 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, Hon.	Steinbach	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	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	Sturgeon 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	Riel	P.C.
PALLISTER, Brian, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PITURA, Frank	Morris	P.C.
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
RADCLIFFE, Mike	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

Wednesday, April 3, 1996

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

#### Licensed Practical Nurses

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of R. Allingham, Vanessa Farrow, J. Bilawka and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) to recognize the value of LPNs and to consider reversing the decision to cut LPNs in Manitoba.

#### Retention of Hogs Single-Desk Selling

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Ron Rempel, Marg Rempel, William Rolsky and others requesting that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) consider reversing his decision and retain a system for orderly marketing of hogs in Manitoba under Manitoba Pork.

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report under The Trade Practices Inquiry Act.

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Eye Examinations Deinsurance

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, my question is to the First Minister.

During the election campaign, the Premier had a number of ads on health care in the province of Manitoba, and he stated in the election campaign on those ads that he would not allow anyone to take away

health care services here in the province of Manitoba. He would not allow this to happen.

Since that time we have had a number of reductions in health care services here in the province of Manitoba, contrary to the word of the Premier, and just yesterday, again, we learned that a preventative health care program with eye examinations was now going to be taken away from many Manitobans and be deinsured.

I would like to ask the Premier, will he keep his word and not allow the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) to take away those eye examinations and reinstate it, as he promised in his ads during the election campaign?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, indeed the services continue to be available for Manitobans. Manitobans in this respect are, because of the federal reductions in transfers for health and post-secondary education, having to re-examine, we are having to re-examine how we fund so many of the different matters that are a part of this system. Quite honestly, these are not easy choices and we have to examine how we fare versus the rest of the country.

In the change that was brought in in the budget yesterday, in response to that \$116-million reduction in transfer payment cuts from Ottawa, Manitoba joins seven other provinces that provide this kind of service coverage to their people with respect to eye examinations. In fact, I believe four of those provinces do not even provide insured services for those under 19 and those over 64. These are difficult choices, but in making these choices we obviously join provinces like Saskatchewan which, under the New Democrats, provide this same level of service.

\* (1335)

#### Pharmacare Reductions

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, the Premier will know that his promises were made after the federal budget was presented. I would

also quote that these ads and the policy or platform or the alleged platform of the Filmon government or the Conservative government stated that they would maintain spending at \$4.465 billion—and this is on page 10 of the Premier's promises—he would maintain spending right through the years '98 and '99 and that they would make different decisions on cutting red tape and bureaucracy, not cutting on vital health care services.

I want to table a letter today from the Manitoba Society of Seniors, which the Premier has received, wherein the letter states that this government has acted, and I quote and I want to get the quotes properly, in a very, very radical way in cutting the Pharmacare services. These leaner and meaner changes that have been made by the government have raised concerns with thousands of seniors of Manitoba, and the seniors are in shock. They are outraged, they feel betrayed by this Premier and this government and they have deep fear about the changes.

I would like to ask the Premier, will he keep his word to the seniors of this province and reinstate the Pharmacare program that he had promised to maintain?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that this province spends a greater proportion of its budget on health care than any other province in Canada, almost 34 percent of the budget. He need only read coverage in today's paper of the fact that this province has increased its commitment to health care under a Conservative administration versus that which was provided under the Pawley-Doer administration of the 1980s, 33.8 percent of our budget on health care versus 31.4 percent on health care throughout the years of the Pawley-Doer New Democratic administration. In fact, our commitment to spending on health care is a half billion dollars a year more than it was when we took office. That is the kind of commitment we make to health care and we make no apologies for it.

**Mr. Doer:** Madam Speaker, of course the Premier also had ads, I believe at the Children's Museum, talking about seniors, about what a nice and kind government this would be. It is too bad he did not tell them the truth that he was going to radically cut Pharmacare in

Manitoba. They may have voted a different way then by knowing the truth of what this government was going to do.

Madam Speaker, the Manitoba seniors association further goes on to say that many seniors may not be able to participate in this program or may buy cheaper or less effective drugs. They further say and ask the Premier to rethink the radical changes that his government has made, contrary to their election promises on page 10 of their election campaign platform book, to rethink their radical changes.

I would like to ask the Premier, will he keep his word that he made in those ads and in his platform, or is he going to continue to break his word and break his promise to the people of Manitoba?

\* (1340)

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, first and foremost, this party and this government ran on a balanced budget as being the cornerstone to all of our future programming in Manitoba. That was the basis on which people voted for us. We even took the unprecedented step of having the balanced budget as part of our lawn signs. It was the cornerstone. It was the fundamental No. 1 issue upon which we ran in that campaign.

I say, Madam Speaker, that the seniors, like everyone else in this province, know the value of a balanced budget. The only people who are out of step with that are New Democrats and their friends. They are the people who will not acknowledge that every province in Canada is moving towards the balanced budget. Every area, including New Democrats in this country, are committed to trying to keep our finances in order and to keeping taxes down. The only people who are out of step with all of society are of course the New Democrats who would tax more, spend more and run up deficits indiscriminately as they did when they were in office. They share an ideology that has been discredited and failed in every area of this country. Yet, they cling to it ideologically and they cling to it without the responsibility of being in government, and Manitobans leave them there in opposition because they know that their ideas would not work.

### Health Care System Service Reductions

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier, and the Premier knows this, that this government is forcing individuals to pay millions of dollars more in drug costs. It is charging nursing home residents more money to stay in nursing homes. They are charging individuals to pay for eye examinations and probably physical examinations.

Will the Premier not admit that his tax grab, his tax on the sick, his tax on medicare, is offloading the cost of medicare and is a tax on the sick and is the largest tax grab on the sick and elderly in Manitoba history?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** If the honourable member would review the budgets brought down between 1981 and 1988 he would know what real tax grabs are all about, Madam Speaker. Those are the tax grabs that were brought to us by the government of which his colleagues were members and that is the opposite direction that we have been going in since that time. There have been increase-free budgets for eight years and Manitobans have moved from a position of being amongst the highest taxed people in Canada to being amongst the lowest taxed people of Canada, all the while keeping spending for health, social services and education at levels that reflect appropriate priorities of Manitobans. That is what the budgets have been doing for the last eight years.

I remind the honourable member, as the First Minister has already done, that at 33.8 percent of all of our spending being on health care in Manitoba, that provides services to Manitobans at levels that are unparalleled anywhere else in the country, so that the commitment to the health care system is certainly clear. Sometimes we differ on how we should achieve those ends.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Madam Speaker, how can this First Minister (Mr. Filmon), this Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) or this Minister of Health give millions of dollars in this budget to private nursing companies that are friends of the government, give a \$26-million line of credit to the Royal Bank of Canada and charge the sick, the elderly, user fees for Pharmacare, increased

fees for nursing homes, have to pay for their own eye exams and probably have to pay for their own physical examinations? How can they do that?

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, the honourable member referred to nursing homes. The changes that are in the budget will be of benefit to some 80 percent of the nursing home population in our province. It is true that some 20 percent will face adjustments but about 80 percent will face downward adjustments in their per diem rates. That was one matter that was incorrectly reported in today's news, but they got the 80 percent and the 20 percent turned around.

The honourable member knows, like I know—he has been around to many, many meetings just like I have—that we in Canada face very challenging times. We face some great opportunities as well. These are times when we are forced, whether we want to or not, I think we should want to, but it is a time for us to adjust our systems so that we can sustain them for the future.

If I listened to everything that the honourable member told me to do, we would offer nothing to generations of the future, which would be a terrible legacy.

\* (1345)

**Mr. Chomiak:** We are only asking the minister to listen to the people of Manitoba—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Kildonan, with a final supplementary question.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Madam Speaker, can the minister explain how they are giving money to home care that is going to go to private nursing home companies, having the minister's salary increased by 11 percent, giving \$26 million to the Royal Bank of Canada, and then going to the seniors of Manitoba and the sick and saying, oh, but you are going to have to pay \$20 million more for your drugs, you are going to have to pay more money for your nursing homes, you are going to have to pay for your eye examinations and you are probably going to have to pay for your physical

examinations? How can the minister say that and state that they are actually working on behalf of the citizens of Manitoba?

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, we have been working for the people of Manitoba for eight years on this side of the House. Up until yesterday, we were proud to be able to say that we have increased home care spending by 93 percent. As a result of the announcement in yesterday's budget, we are now over a 100 percent increase in home care expenditures since 1988 when this government took office. There is \$8 million more going into home care this coming year. That reflects the need that is going to be there, reflects the shift that is going to be taking place from institutional care to the community. We are going to need that \$8 million to provide for the increased pressure that is going to result from changes in our hospitals and from an aging population.

Madam Speaker, the honourable member would rather we not make any allowances for those kinds of changes which would leave us with nothing but chaos in the future in terms of looking after the elderly people of our province. That is not good enough for us. It might be good enough for honourable members opposite, but it is not good enough for us and it is not good enough for Manitobans.

### **Home Care Program Privatization**

**Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood):** Madam Speaker, my questions are also for the Minister of Health.

Why is this minister bent on privatizing home care to American-style multinational corporations, temporary-help corporations like Drake Medox, when every affected group is telling you and telling us that this will hurt their care, their quality of care, the consistency and continuity of that care? Why are you so hellbent on doing it so fast?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, if the honourable member had listened to my last answer he might remember that I said that there is going to be increasing pressure on our home care system. I think the funding for home care of the past

demonstrates we have responded to the pressures that have been there. [interjection]

Madam Speaker, does the honourable member want to listen to the answer or does he want to interrupt from his seat? We have made very significant increases to appropriations for home care in the past. This budget demonstrates that trend is continuing because we have been talking about a shift from institutional care to community care. The proof of that is in the budgets of the last eight years and certainly in this last budget.

The honourable member has a philosophical problem about who it is that delivers the service. My problem is to make sure that the clients get service. Madam Speaker, that is the bottom line here. The honourable member would sacrifice services to clients so that he and his union boss friends can have it their way. I will not sacrifice client services. We will offer clients services at levels that are equal to or surpassing those of the past, and we will not charge user fees, as honourable members opposite would have people believe.

### **Role of VONs**

**Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood):** Why is this minister destroying a hundred-year-old nonprofit agency, VON Winnipeg, by taking away the VON's role in providing nursing services to sick, homebound Manitobans? Why are you doing that?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, for a long, long time the Victorian Order of Nurses has provided good services, excellent services to the people of Manitoba. We think that the Victorian Order of Nurses is prepared to enter into a competitive environment and improve services if that is what is going to result from that, which is what we fully expect. We expect that the Victorian Order of Nurses—not unlike what it did recently when we contracted for home intravenous therapy at the St. Boniface Hospital, the Victorian Order of Nurses lined up with the other private vendors of services and won that contract. So I fully expect the Victorian Order of Nurses' contribution to the people of Manitoba to continue for many, many more years.

\* (1350)

### Privatization

**Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood):** Madam Speaker, why is this minister prepared to give away millions in profits, including the new \$8 million in funding, to a few owners like the McMasters while you confiscate even more millions in wages from already low-paid workers who face wage cuts of 40 percent and more, making it virtually impossible to recruit, train and keep dedicated and qualified staff? Why are you doing that?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, we have a lot of clients in our home care system and we are going to have a lot more. We are going to have to be able to provide them with quality services in greater volumes than we have in the past, and we have to do it in a cost-effective manner. We have to do it with quality always in mind to ensure that the clients are not left the way they have been in the past where we were not able to guarantee services to them. We were not able to provide the services, if needed, on a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week basis; we are able to do that now. Peter Olfert said so. It is quoted in the newspaper saying that he is delighted with that kind of service. The honourable member opposite knows how we got that service. We got it by letting tenders and taking bids for the service and a private company in that situation got the contract, but now we are able to provide those services in a more improved manner.

### Pharmacare Reductions

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Madam Speaker, the actions of this government on Pharmacare show a number of things. It shows the incompetence of this minister and government, the way they bungled the handling of the changes. It shows very clearly that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and this government ran a fraudulent election campaign and their word means very little in terms of health care.

### Point of Order

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, from time to time the use of words in

this House create some difficulties. Some are included on both unparliamentary and parliamentary sides. So the member for Thompson using the word "fraudulence," I think borders on unparliamentary, if not unparliamentary, and I would ask him to consider his words carefully.

**Mr. Ashton:** On the same point of order, Madam Speaker, I chose my words very carefully. I did not use unparliamentary terms such as "lie" or "dishonest"; I used "fraudulent," which is listed in Beauchesne, page 147, as having been ruled as being parliamentary.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. On the point of order, the honourable government House leader does not have a point of order. Indeed the word "fraudulent" has appeared as being parliamentary. If there is direct reference to a member, such as character, then indeed the word is unparliamentary.

**Mr. Ernst:** Madam Speaker, while the member for Thompson is correct, I might also point out Beauchesne Citation 489, which rules unparliamentary the use of the word "fraud."

**Mr. Ashton:** I want to make it very clear, Madam Speaker, that I said that this government ran a fraudulent election campaign. That is a parliamentary word and it is also true.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I had previously ruled on the point of order, but I would caution all honourable members that they should exercise discretion in the choice of their words. Quite often just the choice of the words constitutes a lot of disturbance in this Chamber, and I was hopeful that all members were going to attempt not to provoke debate and cause unnecessary disturbances.

\* \* \*

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Thompson, to quickly pose his question.

**Mr. Ashton:** Madam Speaker, as I was indicating, the worst fact is the fact this government has no idea how much pain it is inflicting on many Manitoba families.

I would like to ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) if he could indicate how many Manitoba families will be cut off Pharmacare and how many others will be faced with huge increases in drug costs because of the heartless decision of this government to slash Pharmacare.

**Mr. McCrae:** Contrary to what the honourable member has said, Madam Speaker, we approached this difficult task very, very carefully and every step of the way reminded ourselves that there are people in Manitoba who are in very vulnerable circumstances. They are either very poor or they are very much in need of prescription drugs—in some cases, large amounts of prescription drugs which cost a lot of money.

We also had to be aware that we are facing, as has been pointed out on one or two occasions, the reality that the federal government's funding for health, social services and higher education is declining very, very significantly. We could not just wish that fact away. Would it not be nice if we could, and would it not be nice if our friends here with the Liberal Party had done more to help us in that regard? But that all being a reality, we had to deal with some difficult realities.

So one of the things we did in order to ensure that we could protect those who needed protection most was to say that anyone who had an income over \$15,000 should not have to pay more than 3 percent of their income for prescription drugs; anybody with an income under \$15,000 should not have to pay more than 2 percent of their income for prescription drugs. Those are the kinds of considerations that went into it, Madam Speaker.

\*(1355)

#### Reductions—Consultations

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** If the minister cannot or will not indicate how many Manitoba families will be impacted by the changes, will he then indicate to this House who was consulted, Madam Speaker? Since the government did not raise this in the election, who was consulted about this drastic change to the Pharmacare program?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, no one on this side of the House or anywhere else would try to get away from the idea that changes like this are not going to have an impact on people. We know they will. All we try to do is to ensure that those who are able to absorb the impact of these kinds of changes are going to be in a position to absorb them. Those who are not so able to do so are given appropriate protection. The income-based Pharmacare program is not unlike the health care program, which honourable members opposite support, which is based on ability to pay through the tax system. There is really not much difference in principle in those things.

We have people in the New Democratic Party, lots of them, who want to have two kinds of systems at work at the same time. We are trying very hard to protect those people who need the protection through programs like this and still have a program, which, I remind honourable members opposite, is still amongst the richest of Pharmacare programs anywhere in this country.

#### Reductions

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** My final supplementary is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon).

Since we are getting absolutely no answers from this minister, who is proving again the incompetence of this government in handling health care, will the Premier do the right thing and withdraw the Pharmacare changes now?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** I did not hear the last part of the honourable member's question, which contained the question, but I assume it was a general condemnation of the policies of the government. We are going to have an opportunity to debate that during the Budget Debate.

#### Eye Examinations Deinsurance

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. We, in the Liberal Party, have found it most unfortunate that the government has decided to deinsure eye examinations.



The question that I have for the minister is: If an individual has a referral from a doctor to get an eye exam, is the government prepared to cover that sort of a cost?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** I just missed the last part of the honourable member's question.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Inkster, to quickly rephrase the question.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Will this government pay for the cost if there is a deferral or a referral from a doctor to get your eyes checked?

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, the reduction here has to do with the routine eye examination where a patient is not known to be symptomatic, and so it would depend. It seems to me that the way the policy works is that if there is a change in your vision of .5 or more, then that is covered under the program. If, by referral for medical reasons, one is referred for an eye examination, that too is covered.

### Optometrist Charges

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, I am wondering if the Minister of Health can give clarification to the Chamber. I have a document, and I will table a copy for the minister, and it comes from the Association of Optometrists, which has suggested a retail, if you like, price for the routine eye examination of \$46. So now Manitobans who want to get their eyes examined can anticipate receiving a bill in the nature of \$46, whereas with the province, formerly it cost \$28 for that same routine procedure.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, the examination that was under the insured program covered the fee charged to the government by the optometrist. The fee has now been deinsured for those between the ages of 19 and 64 years of age. Optometrists will charge fees to those not covered under the program, and I am sure that any fees that are exorbitant will be dealt with appropriately.

\* (1400)

### Physical Examinations Deinsurance

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, my final supplementary question is to the Premier, and that is to ask the Premier to give Manitobans the assurance when it comes to physical exams that he is not going to allow the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) to do what he has done with the deindexing of eye examinations, to assure Manitobans that the physical exam will in fact be at no cost to our patients.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, you know, when it comes to protecting the health care system I find it difficult to accept the kind of criticism that is implied by the Liberal member for Inkster when just about 15 months ago his own Prime Minister said that medicare now was only available for catastrophic illness and hospital coverage. So he has little to instruct us about protecting the health care system in this province.

### Health Care Facilities Funding Reductions

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Madam Speaker, one of the biggest cuts that we saw in the budget yesterday was \$53 million that was cut from hospitals. This is a devastating cut that will have ramifications right across the province.

Can the Minister of Health tell this House what the impact of this will be on Manitoba hospitals? For example, does it now mean that Seven Oaks and Misericordia will no longer be operating as full-service hospitals?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, I know the honourable member and her colleagues have been watching with interest the work of the design teams and the urban planning partnership. The honourable member knows—I think agrees—that an integrated approach to health service delivery in the city of Winnipeg is the way to go. They will continue, however, to tell other people something else which is a little disturbing and troubling. However, the reduction in the hospital line in the budget is offset by a \$38-

million transitional fund that will assist in making an orderly change to the new system.

The honourable member is specific about a couple of hospitals, and as I said yesterday, those decisions have not been made, decisions about recommendations that have come forward about, for example, Seven Oaks Hospital or Misericordia Hospital. Those recommendations are still being looked at for cost-benefit analysis. It was incorrectly reported recently in the newspaper, Madam Speaker, that those analyses were completed and they are not.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Since the minister has not told us what is going to be happening in the city, can he tell rural Manitobans how much of that \$53 million is going to be coming out of rural hospitals? How many hospitals can we expect to be closed? Will Winnipegosis be closed? Will Grandview be closed? Will Shoal Lake be closed? Which hospitals in rural Manitoba are going to be closed because of this cut?

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, I remind the honourable member that this is the Filmon Manitoba, not the NDP Saskatchewan where they shut down 52 hospitals. I remind the honourable member that this is not Bob Rae's Ontario where Bob Rae shut down 10,000 acute care hospital beds. This is Manitoba where we take an approach that has more to do with making decisions that are evidence based, and it has more to do with consultation than we have seen anywhere else in this country.

The honourable member names three rural hospitals, none of which have been targeted, as suggested by the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) in his mischievous way of working with the so-called informing the public.

### Point of Order

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Madam Speaker, Beauséjour Citation 417 is very clear that answers to questions should be as brief as possible, deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate.

Madam Speaker, all throughout today we have been asking questions to this same minister about health care. We have not received one answer yet. This latest non-answer is a clear indication of that.

I would ask, Madam Speaker, that you ask the Minister of Health to answer the questions, or do the right thing and resign.

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, it may save you the trouble of having to do any research. I would say I am sorry to the honourable member for Brandon East for my comment. He has put out information, and only he knows what his motivations are. I should not speculate on what they might have been.

The honourable member has named three hospitals. Are they slated for closure? No, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** I thank the honourable Minister of Health.

\* \* \*

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

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Will the minister tell us then, does he have a plan or does he not have a plan? There is a cut of \$38 million, there is money for transition for \$58 million—\$30 million for transition, and yet he is saying there are not going to be any hospitals closed.

**Mr. McCrae:** Rather than doing it like the honourable member's counterparts in other NDP jurisdictions, that I should go around and just sort of pick out a hospital here and a hospital there and shut it down, we have chosen to ask the regional health associations to get involved in needs assessments. So the honourable member thinks that we do things the way New Democrats do. We do not. That is why we are here, and they are over there.

### Social Assistance Funding Reductions

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) in his budget

stated that his budget protects priority social programs. This statement is a bold-faced lie, because the largest cut is to social assistance—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I would ask the honourable member for Burrows to withdraw his comment “bold-faced lie.”

**Mr. Martindale:** I withdraw the word “lie.”

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

\* \* \*

**Madam Speaker:** Does the honourable member for Burrows have a question?

**Mr. Martindale:** I would like to ask the Minister of Family Services how she can be a participant in this budget and statements that prove that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) and his government are strangers to the truth, because the largest cut of any program was to social assistance, \$23 million.

How can she and her government justify this when there is a \$120-million surplus? What is she going to tell to those people today?

\* (1410)

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Family Services):** I do thank my honourable friend for the question. The tone of the question I do not appreciate, but I do thank him for the question, because it does allow me the opportunity to tell Manitobans that we have taken a very balanced approach to our welfare reform in the province of Manitoba, where in fact we have protected those that are most in need in our province: those single parents with children under six years of age, those women that are in abuse shelters and their children, seniors in Manitoba. And those with mental disabilities, with disabilities right throughout the province, have been protected and the rates have been maintained.

We have said as a government the best form of social security is a job, and we have taken a very proactive

approach, along with the Department of Education and Training, to develop new initiatives that will help find work opportunities for people in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, and ensure that they have the opportunity to move up into a meaningful job that will take them off the dependent system of welfare that they presently see today.

### Food Allowance

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, I would like to table articles from the Scientific American of February 1996, entitled Malnutrition, Poverty and Intellectual Development, which show that malnutrition affects brain development from birth to two years and many other harmful effects of poverty, and I would like to ask the Minister of Family Services if she can tell parents what they should cut out of their greatly reduced budget? Should they cut out breads and cereals or vegetables or fruits or meats or poultry or fish—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The question has been put.

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Family Services):** Madam Speaker, I again thank my honourable friend for the question, although the information that he provided obviously was wrong.

I indicated very clearly that the support for single parents with children under the age of six, the children that he was referring to in the document that he tabled, was maintained. So we did not reduce the rates for families, for single parents with children under the age of six. I think he should maybe go back and look at the announcement in some detail again and gain a clear understanding of the people that we protected in Manitoba as a result of our welfare reform and welfare changes.

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

**Mr. Martindale:** I would like to ask the Minister of Family Services why she is reducing the food allowance for children on city welfare as a result of her

policy of standardization which took effect on April 1 when the health of Manitoba's children report recommends that there be an increase in social allowance to provide for adequate nutrition. Why is she not listening to the Department of Health's own recommendation and reducing the food—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The question has been put.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Madam Speaker, again, my honourable friend is bending the truth considerably when he indicates that children that are on the City of Winnipeg's caseloads have been reduced by the provincial government. He only needs to look to his cousins sitting in opposition, members of the Liberal Party and the federal government—[interjection]

Well, his cousins in opposition in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, and the federal Liberal government who has said that it will no longer contribute to the City of Winnipeg's higher rates. We made no reductions; it was a decision of the City Council of the City of Winnipeg, and they have to accept responsibility for their decisions.

### **Sarah Kelly Inquest Report Recommendations**

**Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns):** Madam Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Justice.

Yesterday the report of the inquest into the tragic murder of Sarah Kelly was released, citing among other things, and I quote: Within the provincial sphere a patchwork of services, fragmented and poorly coordinated, leaving substantial gaps.

Indeed, the recommendations as a whole, Madam Speaker, say that sex offenders are not being treated seriously by this government.

My question to the minister: Explain please why it had to take an inquest to tell Manitobans how abysmally this government, in particular the Justice department and Community Mental Services, is failing to protect the safety of Manitoba's women and

children, in particular, contrary to this government's talk.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Acting Minister of Justice):** Madam Speaker, first of all, I think the member for St. Johns has probably misrepresented to some degree that information, as is usually the case in what is brought to this Chamber. I know that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) would be more than pleased, upon return, to provide a full answer, a complete answer to the member for St. Johns.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Would the minister, rather than reading Covey, read this report? Would the minister commit to ensuring that the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey) take all steps to ensure that each and every recommendation in this report is implemented and not thrown on the trash heap with the AJI report, the summit on youth crime and violence, the War on Drugs Report? That was a lulu.

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, the member for St. Johns does a great disservice to a very serious and important issue. Our Minister of Justice in this province is very much deeply committed to working on solid answers to many of those issues that are faced by our society. She is deeply committed to that, and when he comes to this House to talk about a very complex and difficult issue, he does it a great disservice to try to simplify it in such a way.

He mentioned the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry. I can tell the member that this government has done more than any government in the history of this province to settle many of the long-outstanding grievances of our aboriginal community, and this was not the case when his party was in government, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Would the minister at least do this: Would he at least straighten out the Minister of Justice who yesterday was up to her old tricks blaming the federal government and saying it was the federal government's responsibility to make change when 22 of the 25 recommendations in this report are directed at this government to implement?

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, I think it is very clear that the only member who needs straightening out is

the member for St. Johns, and I think a certain reporter of the Winnipeg Sun did that some time ago.

\* (1420)

### **Social Assistance Funding Reduction**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. This budget cut \$7.7 million from the poorest people in this province by eliminating property and cost of living tax credits. At the same time, this minister and this government is prepared to give millions of dollars in tax credits to corporations.

How can this minister, in all conscience, reduce the welfare assistance to the poorest people in Manitoba while at the same time maintaining corporation welfare assistance?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, it is an interesting approach that the member for Brandon East brings with that question. Firstly, the issue of the tax credits for welfare recipients, I think we have to acknowledge that their occupancy costs are paid for by the taxpayer, unlike individuals who pay for their own rent or pay for their own property taxes in terms of entitlement to a property tax credit. As well, as the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) has outlined, we have also looked at our total package of rates in a relative basis across Canada.

The other link he makes is the whole link to economic development. I would suggest that if you talk to anybody in the business community they will speak very positively about initiatives like, if he is referring to, the manufacturing investment credit. That is one of the reasons that we are seeing 10,000 more jobs in Manitoba. That is one of the reasons we are seeing record levels of investment in our province. That is one reason we are seeing a 58 percent increase in manufacturing shipments and so on. That is important for individual Manitobans in terms of job opportunities and obviously that also adds to our treasury here in Manitoba.

**Madam Speaker:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

### **Introduction of Guests**

**Madam Speaker:** I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us this afternoon sixteen Grades 5 to 10 students from Oakbank, Transcona and North Kildonan Home Schoolers under the direction of Mrs. Gwen Neufeld. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay).

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

### **MEMBERS' STATEMENTS**

#### **Senior Curling Championship**

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Do I have leave to make a member's statement? [interjection] I don't need leave?

Madam Speaker, Gimli Branch No. 182 of the Royal Canadian Legion is currently hosting the Senior Curling Championship in Gimli. The championship started on March 30 and will wind up on April 6.

As most members in this House know, curling has a long history and tradition in this province. Many a cold harsh winter has been made shorter and brighter by the companionship of others whose involvement was motivated only by the love of the game. However, curlers are no longer as bound by the weather as they used to be. Instead of having their games on frozen ponds, rivers and streams, curling has moved indoors. This, however, has not lessened the appeal of the game or the thrill of a perfect draw to the button.

It is this spirit which is evident in Gimli today as curling enthusiasts from across the country come together in order to share their love of the sport. The game of curling is well known for its camaraderie and hospitality, and I know that all the curlers competing today will find the same qualities evident in the town of Gimli and in our wonderful province. Our province and the community of Gimli have a variety of interesting tourist attractions, great restaurants and dining establishments and the most spectacular scenery to be found anywhere in Canada. I hope all

participants will have the opportunity to enjoy and experience the many wonderful features of this province which make Manitoba such a great place to live.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the volunteers and organizers who have worked so hard to make this event a reality. Legion Branch No. 182 also deserves the recognition for their efforts. They have worked many long hours planning and organizing this event. The success of events such as this is due in large part to the dedicated and committed community members.

I know that all members of this House join me in welcoming all curlers taking part in the legion's Senior Curling Championship in our province and wishing them good luck. Thank you.

\* (1430)

### **Misericordia General Hospital**

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** Madam Speaker, I would like to make a statement in the House about the role of the Misericordia Hospital in my community. This government has put the place of that Misericordia Hospital in jeopardy. It has led to serious concerns and very difficult times for patients and staff in that hospital, and I want to draw the attention of both the government and all of this House to the situation that is occurring there.

Madam Speaker, for nearly a century the Misericordia has been the hospital that Wolseley and west Broadway residents have depended upon. It is where we have gone in emergencies. It is the hospital that local doctors use. It is where many of our children were born. This community serves patients from many disadvantaged circumstances. They have more severe illnesses. The local community service is essential for those without cars, and there are many in my constituency who do not have cars and who do not have phones, people who may be new to Canada or who have very serious issues that need dealing with both during the day and in the evening and nighttime.

Madam Speaker, compared with other Winnipeg hospitals, the Misericordia Hospital's emergency department deals with more serious emergencies. It sees more elderly patients. It has a much higher admittance rate than many other hospitals and indeed that admittance rate is increasing. It is clearly serving a growing need in this community, and as poverty increases—and this government through its last budget is doing what it can to see that poverty increases in Manitoba—indeed, I found today that one of my constituents is being asked to live on \$7 a day. Those are the people who are using the Misericordia Hospital.

Madam Speaker, this hospital does not know whether its future is going to be in the community. It does not know whether it can play the dynamic preventative role that it has played in the past. It has tried as a community to strengthen its links with the community, to create a mobile clinic, to develop other centres such as the eye care centre, the Easy Street program, the breast disease clinic, and so I want to urge the government again—I have done it many times in this House—on behalf of my constituents, some of whom are the poorest in the society, to tell us what the role of that community hospital will be and to maintain for the use of my constituents that community hospital.

### **Budget—Rural Manitoba**

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** Madam Speaker, first of all, before I make a statement I want to say one thing to the House today. Today I was not proud to be a member of this House. The language that I heard coming from two members opposite, both men of the cloth, did not make me proud to sit here.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate our Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) for the budget that he presented, recognizing the needs of many communities in rural Manitoba, especially after two of my colleagues and I had the opportunity for almost two months of straight meetings across the province to hear literally thousands of people and talk to thousands of people about what the needs of those communities are and how to reflect on value-added initiatives. I want to recognize one couple today. They operate the RCS Greenhouses in Waskada and their names are Roy and Candice Consi. These people developed and built, as

our initiative states, a greenhouse that covers an acre of land. They are currently employing a dozen or more people to work this greenhouse, providing those kinds of jobs to those kinds of communities, and it is in recognition of the adjustments that have been made through MACC to allow for the funding and financing of those kinds of operations.

It also recognizes that there are a tremendous number of initiatives that rural Manitobans want to get involved in. They have asked for program changes which have been recognized in part today by this Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) in the budget that he presented yesterday and it will allow those communities and individuals in communities such as Waskada and others to move towards the diversification that is badly needed.

There is another couple, the Marc Summersfields at Stuartburn, that are currently initiating the establishment of an organic vegetable processing plant in the Stuartburn area that is very similar, and the irrigation initiative that was identified through this budget yesterday is the kind of thing that Manitobans and rural Manitobans especially have been asking for.

We should congratulate the Minister of Finance for a fine budget.

### Seven Oaks Hospital

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, Seven Oaks Hospital is too good to lose. Residents of north Winnipeg waited many years to have their own full-service hospital and we will not give it up without a fight. We want the same access to emergency services, psychiatric services and all the other services that people in other parts of Winnipeg receive in our own community. No one has said we deserve more and we certainly will not accept less. We hope that the Filmon government has been listening to the phone calls and reading the letters, petitions and news coverage of rallies whereby thousands of outraged ordinary citizens are trying to convey a simple message. Do not convert Seven Oaks to a geriatric centre, not now, not ever. Seven Oaks is too good to lose as a full-service community hospital.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, as a political party we have great concern in terms of the general direction this government is taking towards hospitals and their roles well into the future.

Madam Speaker, what I would like to comment on very briefly is the Seven Oaks Hospital. This is a hospital in which both I and the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) have invested a great deal of time and energy in terms of trying to do what we can to bring to light to the constituents that we represent our feelings and thoughts of how important this institution, our hospital, our community centre really and truly is.

Having said that, we want to acknowledge jointly the efforts that so many people, in particular the grassroots members, have put in a phenomenal amount of effort at trying to bring this issue to the government's attention. The staff, the grassroots members have gathered 30,000-some signatures on petitions; they have gathered thousands of letters of protest. The efforts have been overwhelming. We have seen three very successful rallies: one in the community of Kildonan, another one at the steps of the Legislature, yet another one at the hospital itself. And we have heard, Madam Speaker, from the community itself in terms of how important this hospital is, again from a wide spectrum of individuals. The other day, for example, we heard of an individual who attributed to the Seven Oaks Hospital saving of her life. We heard of another that had a child there at the Seven Oaks Hospital. We have heard the passion for the need to keep this hospital from the grassroots, from the community, and we—when I am referring to we, not only the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) and I, but those individuals in the north end community and outside the community appeal to this government to do the right thing and keep the Seven Oaks Hospital open.

\* (1440)

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### BUDGET DEBATE (Second Day of Debate)

**Madam Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) that

this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government, standing in the name of the honourable leader of the official opposition.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I rise today really with a sense of regret about comments I am going to be making on the provincial budget today.

I have had the opportunity and honour to speak on the budget and have some feisty debates about what we agree with and disagree with. I have had the honour of rising in this House and supporting a budget in 1989 when the promises in the budget on family tax credits were exactly the same as what we had campaigned on in '88, or what I had campaigned on in '88, and today regrettably I do not find this a very happy occasion.

I cannot understand how people and human beings in a government can participate in a cut of some 33 percent for babies under the age of one year of age and stand up and give their Minister of Finance a standing ovation. I cannot understand any political party that has as its philosophy that somebody under a year of age would be the hardest hit in a budget, and I cannot understand people that cheer about it.

I did not have anything to cheer about yesterday, and I do not think any of us did. I do not care, as I say, what your political belief system is, but to have babies under one year of age get cut by 33 percent by a government in a budget by having people that are the most vulnerable, and through their own circumstances in life are born to families that unfortunately receive social assistance, have their food cut by 33 percent.

I do not believe that is the tradition of premiers and governments in this province. I do not believe that is the tradition of people I have followed through my years of watching legislative debate. I do not believe it is the tradition of Duff Roblin. I do not believe it is the tradition of Walter Weir. I do not believe it is the tradition of Ed Schreyer. I do not believe it was the tradition of Sterling Lyon. I do not believe it was the tradition of Howard Pawley. I cannot understand how it has become the tradition and values of the member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) and his group of individuals who are in his cabinet.

Who is standing up for babies? I mean, it is not as if they chose to be born in a family that unfortunately is on social assistance. It is not as if they refuse to go to work. It is not as if they refuse to go to school. It is not as if they made choices in their lives. They are under one year of age. And the Tories were cheering. The Tories were clapping. They were guffawing and thinking that, of course, this was a very, very good budget yesterday.

Madam Speaker, many members opposite, many members on this side, are fortunate enough to have been born in families that, yes, may be poor, may be wealthy, may be in between, but I think there is a social obligation, as all of us as members of a community beyond political parties, that we do not have a situation where people who are born to wealth or individuals across the way or all of us who may be married to wealth or inherited wealth have chosen to hit the most vulnerable in our society with this massive cut.

It defies any health care policy of any government, because we all know—and the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) quoted today, the Scientific American study of February 1996—that your first year is your formative year. We all know that nutrition can make a difference in the whole life of that human being if they get a decent start. With food, they may have a chance in school, they may have a chance at work, they may have a chance in society.

I believe that this cut says more about the kind of capricious, mean-spirited values of this Premier (Mr. Filmon) and this government than anything I have seen and witnessed and experienced in the last eight years in this Chamber.

How can you increase corporate welfare, corporate assistance, and decrease the assistance to babies? How can you make these kind of decisions in your budget, because a budget is after all a question of choices? How do you sleep at night making those kind of cuts? I mean this, and I have never said that before. There are decisions I have not supported in the past, but how do you basically live with yourself with taking babies at, I say, one year of age, and cutting them so dramatically?



Madam Speaker, David Northcott yesterday was quoted as saying there is a 19 percent increase in the utilization of food banks by children. Now that is not some esoteric debate, some intellectual disagreement between us—a 19 percent increase in one year.

I heard members earlier talk about the cloth. Well, our values of community, our values of sharing, our values of co-operation, our values as a society that have been rooted in the Christian-Judeo values and have latterly been influenced by other cultures that have come to our great North America, and our first cultures, First Nations, which were societies of co-operation and sharing, there is nothing in that cut of 33 percent for babies that is consistent with the spiritual and cultural values of anybody in this Chamber, I would suggest.

They tell us to examine our conscience if there are things that go not according to what we believe. They tell us to stand up and be counted when there are things in a budget that you do not spiritually believe in or culturally or community-wise believe in, and if ever there was a time for members across this Chamber to stand up, it is to vote against this budget, as we will with sorrow, in the next eight days.

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

Of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been seeing this trend, this sort of Darwinian trend developing with the previous governments of the so-called Filmon team, the member for Tuxedo's values slowly creeping into our societal values in these budgets. We have seen cuts in work, not welfare. We have seen cuts in Student Social Allowances. We have seen cuts in previous budgets in Access programs and New Careers programs and apprenticeship programs. Any program that allows people to get a hand up to get out of dependency and become independent has been cut by the Conservatives. All the rungs of the ladder that allows people to climb out of a situation of dependency are being cut off by the government opposite.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe, and I believe Manitobans believe, that we should be establishing bridges for people to get out of dependency to independence, not bombing those bridges with policies

that do not make sense in the long term for our province and for our economy. I cannot see how anybody on this weekend, which may have a religious meaning to a lot of us, can really square those cuts to children and babies that the government has announced.

That is why we said yesterday and we are saying it right now that we do not believe you care about people anymore and you do not care about Manitobans who are most vulnerable. You may care about your own political fortunes, getting your spin out, getting your ads out, getting your sort of promises out. You may care about how the media plays the budget and you may analyse all the press coverage, et cetera, but you have lost your rudder. You have lost your steerage, you have lost your sense of purpose, you have lost your sense of values, you have lost your sense of community, and unfortunately Manitobans have lost a government that cares about them anymore. They only care about themselves.

So beyond all the political anticipation of the session, I am not very happy today, and I do not think anybody should be. I really do not believe anybody should be. Maybe we have been watching this come for some time. I actually sense that this government during its minority years tried to keep in touch with people, was not too arrogant, had some energy, had some purpose. I saw slippages of that, in my opinion—their concern—midway through the '90 to '95 regime, but I think since this election this government—and it is not just my words—has become very, very arrogant, starting with the person who runs this government. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) is becoming and, in my opinion, has become extremely arrogant.

We know in the past when political leaders become arrogant—members should harken back to the Mulroney years when they received also a second majority government—even if it is just after an election campaign will be treated by the public properly. They do not forget arrogance; they do not forget contempt to themselves and the public will never ever forget, I believe, the sharp right ideological turn of this government and the arrogance they are displaying. They are almost like a country-club government now, run by a country-club Premier if he is in town. If he is

in town, it is a very, very arrogant group of individuals. [interjection] Well, if you can defend cutting kids back by 33 percent, you are not the person I thought you were.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been reading and meeting with people across the province. Let me read an editorial that was just in the Interlake Spectator, the last paragraph of the Interlake Spectator. The Filmon government? It is not a government at all. It is rather an aging men's club, the roomy-eyed members of which are bereft of passion and devoid of vision, a collection of tired, calloused, veteran politicians, many of whom are likely to retire before the next election campaign.

I can only say, for the sake of many Manitobans, I hope many of you do retire because you have lost your compass and you have lost your compassion for Manitobans that are most vulnerable in our society.

I also believe that this is a government that cannot keep its promises. It is a government that said repeatedly throughout the budget that they have a "mandate" to proceed with certain changes. They have a mandate to proceed with this. They have a mandate to proceed with that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you read back to your election promises and the commitments you have made, you do not have a mandate to break your word and break your promises because this Premier (Mr. Filmon), in his ads and in his election campaign, promised a totally different set of priorities than we are seeing right now in the budget that they have released. Harken back to the election campaign. Harken back to the budget presented before the election campaign.

We ask the government how would they deal with the federal cutbacks in their three-year projections because they promised that they would not decrease spending in spite of the federal cutbacks. They had in their budget, weeks after the federal budget, that they would spend \$4.465 billion in '96-97; \$4.465 billion in '97-98; and \$4.465 billion in '98-99. Not only did you have that in your budget document that was tabled in this Legislature, but on page 10 of your own election document, the document that all of you walked around

the province with. You also said, we will not cut the spending in Manitoba. We will cut red tape, we will cut duplication, but we are not going to cut the vital health and education services here in this province. No wonder people are so cynical about members opposite and the Premier. You gave your word to people, and you broke it. You said something in a budget and in an election document and in ads, and this budget confirms now that you did not mean what you said in the election campaign. You did not mean what you said last year in your budget, and I think that is a total disgrace, an absolute total disgrace. This budget does contain spending cuts, and in spite of the fact that the federal government's reduction in revenue, which we have joined with members opposite to condemn, is less than what you had in your budget last year.

The federal government budget reductions are less than what was in your Speech from the Throne last November, where you quoted \$147 million because equalization went up last year after the election campaign. We knew and you knew, when you wrote that Speech from the Throne, that it was not \$147 million. We had the equalization numbers. You had the equalization numbers. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) put something in the Speech from the Throne that he knew was not true because, when you subtract the increase in equalization from the decrease in the Speech from the Throne, it is unfortunately—and fortunately I am glad it is less cuts, and I would hope that members opposite are too.

You know you cannot deal with people—the Premier apparently is reading this Seven Features of Good Managers. One of the first features is being honest. Now, I read the book four or five years ago or maybe three years ago—[interjection]

The only person not practising it is the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh), the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) and the Premier because it is a tell-the-truth. [interjection]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Could I ask the honourable members to keep it down just a little bit. I would like to hear the honourable member's presentation at this time.

**Mr. Doer:** The spending reductions are \$52 million minimum this year. We do not know how the so-called transition fund will operate. It may be even greater in funding decreases. For all we know, the transition fund could be used for another Barbara Biggar public relations campaign.

It was obvious today in Question Period; they do not have a plan. They do not know what is going to be open, what is going to be closed and how we are going to get there. The only plan they have is to pluck \$52 million out of hospitals without being able to tell anybody why they got \$52 million or \$53 million and where it is going to come from and how they are going to do it and how this fits with the transition plan.

This is the only government I know that has been in office for eight years and needs a transition plan because they do not have a plan after eight years. They bumble along from one minister to another, and the only thing that is constant is the Premier (Mr. Filmon) who cannot plan from one moment to the other. The only thing he can plan to do is, which way is he going to point his finger to blame somebody? He whines and he blames and he points fingers, but he never ever takes responsibility for the fact that he does not know today where they are going tomorrow in the most vital services here in Manitoba, and that is health care.

It is a good thing this Premier inherited his businesses because he does not know where to go in terms of the future of this province.

Madam Speaker, \$56-million cut in this budget and \$150 million next year, with no plan. This is not in your budget. This is not in your election document. I would refer—[interjection]

Do you not care about the truth, the member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger)? Is that not a value? Page 10, read it and apologize for not telling people the truth in the last campaign.

We do not know where this government is going to get \$366 million over the next three years that it has promised to cut when they promised in the election campaign they would not cut one dollar. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) knows that. Maybe the Minister of Finance has spent too much time at City

Hall. Maybe that is what happens. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister of Finance come from City Hall. That is that great budgeting place that was trying to find \$7 million for four or five weeks; then, presto, they can find \$57 million in seven minutes. It is amazing. It is magic.[interjection] Well, not quite. So maybe this is what the Minister of Finance does, you know, money here, money there, hidden agenda, hidden agenda.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$366 million, can the Minister of Finance tell us today what those cuts are going to be? What does it mean for health care? What is the plan? What are the changes? Why do you need a transition plan eight years after being in government? Usually you have a transition plan a couple of weeks after you form government, not eight years later.

This last election is broken promise after broken promise after broken promise, and we see that in the budget.

\* (1450)

Now, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) last year said, oh, we are going to go back and talk to Paul Martin, and we are going to go get that money back. That was his line in the election. Did he really believe that? Did the Premier (Mr. Filmon) really believe him when he said that? Then how are we to believe the Minister of Finance and the Premier, those City Hall trained financiers? How are we supposed to believe the Minister of Finance and the Premier when they do not even show up for the bill that cuts the money out of Manitoba? They had three ministers led by the Deputy Premier out on the gun control legislation. Why did they not send one minister to the gun control registration legislation and two ministers to protect health care and education here in the province of Manitoba? Then we would have started to believe what you were actually saying.

You had no ministers to do the job, no ministers. We would have been satisfied with one minister. You had no ministers. You surrendered with a little white flag. Here in Manitoba you put up absolutely no fight because you did not care about health and post-secondary education, and I am surprised that the member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe) would be so

critical of his Minister of Finance, his Premier, his Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) and his Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae). I know he has been going out there taking the flak for the Minister of Health, trying to ingratiate himself with the Premier, and I am disappointed he would make such a slip, to criticize the Premier here today.

So you do not have a mandate. You do not have a mandate to proceed with these cuts. If you are going to keep your word, you have to maintain spending at \$4.465 billion. That is your promise. You did not promise to cut programs here in the province of Manitoba.

Of course, we have already heard what this ideological switch has meant to the seniors of this province. How does the Premier (Mr. Filmon) go and do an ad in a railway car at the Manitoba Children's Museum, a program, of course, established by the NDP? He does an ad at the Manitoba Children's Museum in a railway car with seniors, saying, oh, you can trust us. We are really good for seniors. We are not going to hurt seniors who have built this province. Why did you not tell them that the truth that was sitting underneath your briefcase and your briefing book was a 37 percent cut to seniors and Pharmacare? Why did you not tell those seniors in your little puppy ad that you planned on reducing their programs and Pharmacare by \$20 million to \$25 million?

Why do you not have any integrity? Does this Premier not have any integrity at all? I mean, at least you could have had the courtesy of not having an ad with seniors if he intended to shaft them after the election but, instead, you have taken this money out of Pharmacare, you have a minister who has botched it from Day One.

Pharmacists have said it, seniors have said it, health care professionals have said it. People who are recipients have said it and, of course, this Premier does not care. He wants accountability for teachers but no accountability for his own Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), who should have been fired after the debacle on emergency wards of hospitals last fall.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not NDP words. The Manitoba seniors have called this a radical change. They have said today it is scaring seniors, that it is going to hurt seniors. They have said today it is meanspirited.

**An Honourable Member:** The only people who are scaring seniors are the NDP.

**Mr. Doer:** Perhaps the member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe) should wait until he has a good comment to make instead of a dumb comment, because the member for River Heights should not be insulting the seniors organization. The co-chair and the vice-president of seniors are the ones that signed the letter, and I do not think you should insult them that way. I think you should apologize to the seniors of Manitoba.

Members phone us daily to express shock, outrage, betrayal and deep fear about how the greatly increased burden of prescription drugs will affect their budget and lives. They believe some seniors will decide not to buy prescribed drugs or will seek cheaper and perhaps less effective substitutes. It goes on to say that they want this radical change put on hold. This is a democratic system that provides for us to wait for the election. They do not feel that they can wait for the election campaign. They want you to keep your word that you made during the last election campaign. On behalf of the seniors, I would ask this Premier to get rid of his bumbling, fumbling, incompetent Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) and also reverse the decisions that have been made on Pharmacare.

The Premier, also during the election campaign, had an ad with him and his wife. He was walking along the riverbank in this ad and said, our health care is great and I will let no one take those health care services away from the people of Manitoba. What kind of words were those? Is it not a takeaway when you take an insured service and make it a deinsured service? Is that not breaking your word and your election campaign, a campaign promise made with your own spouse? You cannot keep the word with that ad? Cannot keep your word on an ad campaign that you made with your own family member?

What about the word to hospitals? In July of 1994, you promised not to cut the emergency wards in our acute care hospitals. In October of 1995, after the election, there go the emergency wards of five hospitals. In December, we finally find from the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), that brilliant planner that he is, that Christmas is coming. It is the holiday season. He is the only one in Manitoba that did not know in October that Christmas was coming in December, and then he opened four of the five emergency wards again.

Oh, that is real planning. We have real confidence that he can make intelligent decisions about the next \$55 million he has to cut. A Minister of Health that does not know that Christmas is coming. A Minister of Health that is in this sort of—how should I describe it?—kind of a lifestyle funk in terms of what is going on here in the decisions in this province, and that is just not good enough for the largest department in government. That is not good enough for Manitobans. That is not good enough for the Premier who gave his commitment on ads that he would not cut health care services here in the province of Manitoba. [interjection]

What was that again? I could not hear the mumbling from the member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe). He seems to be the junior Senator Foghorn for the Conservative Party, with the greatest of apologies to the senior member of same, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Of course, all members are honourable members.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a transition plan and no plan. We have \$52 million in spending cuts, but we do not know where it is going to come from. What does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) do, just pluck a number out of the air? Does he say eeny, meeny, miny, mo, I will take \$52 million out of this for health care and you people can figure it out later? I know that they did this at City Hall. I know they have got a lot of good training over there, but is this how they establish their budgets? No offence on the Deputy Speaker, who was never a part of the inner junta of City Hall, never head of the gang of 18 as my honourable friend the Minister of Finance was formerly in his past life. I still remember the cameras on that meeting in the Fort Garry Hotel, that the gang of 18 were meeting like the knights of the round table to

decide the kind of spoils of the civic budget of that year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we still do not know what the plan is for transition. How much money from that transition plan is going to go to Barb Biggar's public relations campaign? You know, we hear there is a big ad campaign coming. We hear that Barb Biggar has been hired to run a big ad campaign. In fact, we have been told that Barb Biggar now runs the Department of Health, and it would not surprise me, because you have got 102 committees over here, you got KPMG getting a million dollars over here, you have got the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae)—we do not know where the Minister of Health is—and you have got the Deputy Minister of Health. How can you get directions from a Minister of Health when he does not know what to do about emergency wards around Christmas season?

So who is running the Department of Health? It is Premier Filmon through Barb Biggar and the public relations campaign that inevitably will be thrust upon Manitobans. The good news is, you have got a great ad campaign coming. The bad news is, you cannot count on the Filmon government at all for a hospital bed down the road, because they do not care about hospital beds, they only care about their spin, their proverbial spin. So I guess Ed Connery was right. Barb Biggar is the co-Premier. She is running the largest department in government. Then she is the Premier, of course, and public relations plays much more of a part in this campaign than anything else in terms of service.

\* (1500)

This is the only government in Canada that does not have a plan one or two years after being elected on health care. It is the only government in Canada that did not take one year or two years or three years or four years to consult with Manitoba. They are now on their ninth year, fumbling and bumbling along, because the Premier (Mr. Filmon) says in '88 he is not going to cut any hospital beds. In 1990 he says he is not going to cut spending. He cuts massive spending based on Connie Curran in '93. He gets in trouble with the by-elections. He puts everything on a pre-election pause. He again promises not to cut. He has got no plan. He has got no idea. He has got no transition. We are not

doing the Healthy Child program. We are not doing enhancement of role of nurses. We are not moving to deal with the private labs that are costing us money.

We are not dealing with the kind of changes that are necessary in health care. Nobody disputes changes are necessary, but you have no idea what you are doing. Health Sciences Centre, \$10 million; St. Boniface, \$7 million—how much in rural Manitoba? How much in the city of Winnipeg and the rest of the facilities? What does it mean for Misericordia? What does it mean for Grace? What does it mean for Seven Oaks? What does it mean for Concordia? What does it mean for all our hospitals? You do not know.

When you talk about home care changes, and I will talk about those in a moment, the one area that you really could improve in is having a more integrated home care system with the hospitals. You do not have it. You are going to go from one or two home care systems, one run by the province and one run by the city; you are going to go from two to four systems. You are going to have more overlap. You are going to have more duplication. You are going to have more red tape because you want to have more profit for a few individuals. That is the problem with this government. It goes from one issue to another without any idea at all.

Again the Premier (Mr. Filmon) broke his promise on eye exams. He promised not to reduce the service. He said he would not take health care services away from people. That was his promise: I will not let anybody take it away from you. Well, what are the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) doing? Does he not care about what he said in his own ads? Do they not mean anything to you? Does your word not matter? I mean, we knew that you were not being straight with Manitobans about the Jets, but we thought you could be honest with them about health and education at least in terms of your integrity and your honesty and the honesty of the government of Manitoba. That should mean something to you. It should mean something to all of us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know that the change on eye examinations is a broken promise. When you go from an insured service to a deinsured service, it is less of a

service than we had before, clearly a broken promise, and we also know that this will create difficulty, according to Jane Thrall, an expert in this area. This will cause more costs in terms of eye examinations from people going from a medical doctor to the eye examination because they need to go through a referral now. They are going to end up paying more money, but you just see it in a different line, and you will have less prevention for people who really need those kinds of preventative services, again another poorly thought out idea and something that works totally against the Literacy Task Force report that was presented by the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey) in her previous role as running Tory committees, then writing good reports that never get acted upon by the Conservative government.

Personal care home rates are going to go up 20 percent. Northern patient rates are going up because of the clawback on third party, again another user fee, another tax on northerners and, of course, as I have said before, the Pharmacare program again is a major breach of their election campaigns.

Now, of course, we do not just stop at health care when we talk about this government on its broken election promises. They also promised to maintain spending in all areas of government, including education. On page 10 of the government's report about how they would maintain spending, they do not say that they are going to cut education. [interjection] Well, that is the page that includes spending. I know you have not read the page, or maybe you have. The Filmon government will freeze overall spending at a level until '98-99. We will reduce red tape. We will use innovative management techniques. I guess that is what they are using in health care. We will use information technology. I guess that is what they are using with Pharmacare. We have gone from computer cards to forms you have to sign. We are going to reduce red tape.

It does not say they are going to reduce spending in public education. It does not say you are going to reduce spending in health care and, of course, since the election campaign, we see another \$15 million cut out of public education six months or four months after they raise independent school funding by 11

percent—11 percent for one level of schools and a \$15-million reduction to another.

Here this government again is picking a war with teachers and parents advisory councils. They put out a paper full of errors and misinformation, and I know it was not released by the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh). It was probably released by the staff relations branch, and the minister of Treasury Board, I would imagine, just reading the document and reading the material, but how does the government explain this all misinformation in that document, called Accountability? How do they explain it? That document says Manitoba's economy is in eighth place. The Minister of Finance's own budget document says we are steamrolling ahead in the province of Manitoba in terms of our economic development and, of course, there are many other mistruths in that document, and rather than having a co-operative environment so that we can move our education system forward, rather than having an environment where teachers and parent advisory councils and trustees work together with the government to move us ahead to teach the basics of the 21st Century, this government and this Premier (Mr. Filmon) would rather break his promise on spending in the morning and pick a fight with teachers and parent advisory groups in the afternoon.

A system that has worked for 40 years, to have binding arbitration—yes, there have been years where the arbitration settlements have been higher than the private sector, but I dare say over 40 years in our study of it, there have been years when it has been behind the private sector settlements. It has been a system that means that we do not have a system which we saw at the university just recently when the professors proposed arbitration where students and parents are the ones who suffer because we have a strike or lockout system that is being proposed by this government. We agree with the trustees and teachers that say in a joint press release: This is a system that we established over 40 years. For God's sake, give us enough time to look at it and stop this fast track of getting legislation in in the next couple of weeks. Let us have a system that, if it is going to change, changes through consensus and partnership rather than through a system of confrontation and conflict. That is what we would propose as an alternative in education instead of this

kind of meanspirited fight that this government is picking in public education.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we also see that post-secondary education has been affected, apprenticeship programs have been affected, Access programs have been affected, New Careers Program has been affected, and community colleges have been affected. Again, people that are most vulnerable get the biggest hit from this government. A very consistent pattern of fairness.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we would suggest that the government read The Globe and Mail section on business last summer that tied the new education programs in the universities to the changing technologies and economies in Canada. They talked about the University of Saskatchewan and the great advances they were making in biotechnology that were affecting the attraction of biotechnological industries and agricultural industries to the community of Saskatoon, a community that is now booming relative to the province of Manitoba through the connection between smarter education, investment in post-secondary education and the economy. A connection this government does not see because their only economic vision is a race to the bottom and not a race to the top in terms of quality and investments.

We see funding cuts for people that again are most vulnerable in social assistance, and we have talked about that. We see reductions in adult literacy after the government promised to increase adult literacy programs. We see potentially user fees for libraries if the government follows through on the City of Winnipeg's request, which, I think, would be shameful in terms of promises on literacy. So it is broken promise after broken promise.

This is a government that has become quite arrogant and become quite ideologically extreme in their approach to the people of Manitoba. They kick the people that are down the most, and they give the people that have the most in our society the greatest benefits of government.

This is also a time when people are most concerned about what they see in our society to be increasing greed in some parts of our economic community and

increasing pain in other parts. Day after day, we hear about CEOs of major corporations getting major increases in their pay while people are getting laid off and cut back. We saw just recently six or seven major corporations, some of which do business here in Canada, having massive hundreds of thousands of people being laid off, and the CEOs of those corporations were getting hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars more in stock options and personal wealth.

\* (1510)

Middle income people are very concerned about this. They are very concerned about a mentality that has a few people getting more and more. The middle income group is getting less and less purchasing power, less and less job security, and less and less dignity in terms of the choices they can make in our society.

You know, the government talks about the CFIB as a surveyor, but the biggest impediment to job creation, they say in their latest survey, is not what the government cited in their budget of course, but consumer confidence in our society. We have to stop the insanity of corporations and companies laying off each other's customers. We have to have a mentality where good-paying jobs and job security will contribute to consumer confidence, which, in turn, will contribute to economic growth and economic quality of living.

Does this government not worry about the fact that there were only a thousand new housing starts last year in 1995, which is a relatively good year in terms of the economy relative to the other few years, compared to 6,000 or 7,000 new housing starts across Manitoba when we were in office?

I have met with these building people and they are quite concerned about the fact that it is a 40-year low in housing starts in Manitoba in 1995. Of course, this government does not really care about it because, if it goes up 100 houses in this year or 200 houses or hopefully it will double, they will only care about putting out a press release saying, 10 percent increase in housing starts in Manitoba. They do not want to talk about, there is a 500 percent housing decrease from the

time they came in office in 1988. You could check those figures; I would recommend strongly that all of you check those figures.

The member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe) talked about, in his world. Let us talk about the world of people dealing with home care and how it illustrates the philosophy of this government. You know, this contributes to this whole insecurity that is out there. Look at this economic agenda from this government. Are they not right up there where the kind of low-wage policies that we see from some of the corporate heads and some of the people that I believe are contributing to the real insecurity of average wage earners here across North America? What a policy: Take 1,400 people, give them a 40 percent wage decrease, make them beg for their own jobs so we can make four people, some of whom are close personal friends of the Minister of Health, to make four people millionaires. What kind of economic agenda is that? It is absolutely pitiful that this Premier would allow that to happen.

This home care system was evaluated to be the best home care system in North America, providing the best quality of care. One of the reasons it provides the best quality of care is that it is nonprofit and pays decent wages, and paying decent wages means the people have continuity of service. If you have massive changes in the wage structures so you want to give a few people more money, you are going to have higher turnover, and higher turnover will lead to greater deficiencies and weaknesses in the quality of home care because, again, any study, and I know the government does not like to look at studies, but any studies on home care tell you that elderly people or disabled people need a continuity of care, need a continuity of trust, need a continuity of a person that comes into their home to share with them on their health care needs.

You will not provide that continuity of care. You are just going to decimate the best program in North America. Again, the Premier should overrule his Minister of Health, who is too captured unfortunately by the owners of these corporations and is not captured by the people that receive health care services and home care services in Manitoba. We do not want to see a home care system in Manitoba that eventually has the size of your purse or the size of the wallet dictate



the quality of your care. We are going to get rid of profit in health care when we are elected after the next election, and we are going to take that program back for Manitobans. I can guarantee you that.

So we see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government is now got in extreme—and the seniors have said radical, mean ideology. Those are not our words—radical, meanspirited. Those are not are our words. Those are seniors that you try to appeal to in the first week of the campaign, because they are a little unsure of your priorities after having Minister Orchard cut back and have Connie Curran in our health care system. What a way to appeal to people's insecurities, giving them a promise you do not intend on keeping, some way to deal with insecurities of people that have built this province and built this province to be one of the greatest provinces in Canada, if not the greatest province in Canada, some way to handle those people with your changes.

The Filmon government is going to reduce the programs in social assistance for welfare work down 26 percent. You know, the Free Press today said—the government likes quoting the Free Press—the Free Press said today that social assistance is up under the Conservative government. Well, of course it is up. You have twice as many people on welfare rather than working under a Tory economic regime. I was surprised that the editorial bragged about this as an economic virtue. We thought having half as many people on social assistance is a positive thing. This is the only government I know that can double the amount of people on welfare and call it a virtue in spending. Of course, that is what we see with this government in terms of the people, the property tax credit. The member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) has already pointed out the hypocrisy of corporate welfare versus the cutback to the people that are most vulnerable.

Handi-Transit programs, we established the 50-50 funding for Handi-Transit. The member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst) was quite concerned about Handi-Transit programs. In fact, I warned him one year when he cut out all the Handi-Transit programs with a motion he made in the Legislature that it was not such a good idea. Members opposite when they were

at City Hall helped negotiate 50-50 Handi-Transit, but I guess they forgot where they came from because we now see the investment in Handi-Transit down to 33 percent. Of course, we will see the privatization of that service and a few more Tories become millionaires on the people, again, that need that kind of transportation service and need it to be nonprofit.

Immigrant support has been cut. We will have to see what that means. Again, it belies the words of the government about immigration and the need for immigration here in this province. Workplace Safety and Health, a 17 percent increase in the number of injuries reported in Manitoba. How do you solve that? You cut back the prevention. You cut back the inspectors. You increase the injury, the carnage at the workplace through the lack of backup and follow-up and inspection services. Mining safety, cut back. This is after, two years ago, having two injuries and deaths that took place after four deaths before it because there was inadequate follow-up from the provincial government and the former Minister of Labour from one mine site to another mine site to help prevent injuries of a similar nature through enforcement and through tough, tough measures to protect working people.

In the middle of the Westray mining incident where we have horror story after horror story after horror story going on about the lack of backup for working people who had to make the choice of whether to potentially get killed in a mine shaft versus getting food for their children. Unfortunately, they had to make a decision to put their own life at risk, and some of them—for 26 or 28—unfortunately lost their life because they needed the pay and needed the support. How can you do it? Where does it make sense? Well, you have not had the inquest yet, two years since the death in Flin Flon. We do not know what will come out of the court case. We do not know what will come out of the inquest. We only know that the Tories would rather give money to their corporate friends rather than protect working people and their families from dying in the workplace, and I say shame on you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, decreases to community living programs, and as a volunteer for Special Olympics I want to know what this means for St. Amant. I want to

know what it means to the real programs for community living people. We will check that out, we will follow that up because again we do not trust the Tory priorities of protecting those who need the greatest support from government. Reductions in daycare. One year they make it more impossible to get into daycare and the next year they take the money out of daycare programs because of the reduction in investments. We will have a lot more to say about that later, but we know the policies of this government have been aimed at eroding universal daycare and, according to our studies, decreasing the enrollment in daycare programs here in the province of Manitoba.

\* (1520)

The Justice department has a decrease in spending, and after the Kelly inquiry yesterday and the comments made by the member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh), we will want to know what crime prevention programs have been affected, what prosecution programs have been affected, what programs of Legal Aid will affect the backlog in our courts. Our courts are too backlogged, people take too long, particularly young offenders, to get to court and we see more cuts and reductions. We will have to pursue that later.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will be dealing with the whole issue of the credibility in this budget of your numbers. Now, again, this Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) unfortunately, and I say this, unfortunately, has not been straight with this House before on the numbers. I would bring the Minister of Finance back to November of 1994 when the NDP raised the issue of \$145 million in a lottery account fund that we discovered in the third statement from the Provincial Auditor, and, of course, the Minister of Finance will recall that when we said this would be used as a pre-election slush fund, the Minister of Finance in bold-faced terms said, oh, no, that will not be used for a pre-election campaign. Let me wring my hands with sincerity. We will use that fund for long-term needs of health and education. We will not use it three months hence to deal with a pre-election slush fund. I heard him on the radio saying the same thing so he cannot say it was a misquote. Well, fast forward four months later, what did the Minister of Finance do? He used it as a pre-election slush fund.

**An Honourable Member:** You should have been in the movies.

**Mr. Doer:** I cannot play the part of sincerity better than the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) when he said he would not use that money. When we are handing out Academy Awards for breaking one's promise within a four-month period, the Academy Award, the Oscar goes to the Minister of Finance across the way, and he also gets the award for the best supporting actor when he said, we will cancel the Jets operating-loss agreement May 1, 1995. He also gets another Oscar for best set design; he gets it for the best set design when he says he is not going to put any more than \$10 million into a new arena. Of course, the next day he gets another Oscar for saying that there is no money in the Kenaston underpass infrastructure program for the NDP to reallocate after the election campaign. That is another Oscar for the Minister of Finance. His lines are even better when he says that there is going to be no money in the budget for SmartHealth, so he had to create a Crown corporation to give money to the Royal Bank when he is cutting money to hospitals so he can put it off the books—off the books because he cannot keep the numbers straight on the books, because if he had the \$35 million for SmartHealth on the books this year, you might not have a balanced budget and you would have to take a pay cut under your so-called legislation.

This Minister of Finance has no credibility with us with the numbers, and we therefore will challenge every number he presents to us because once burned is twice aware of what the numbers mean for this Minister of Finance in terms of the province of Manitoba.

Now what numbers do we use with the Minister of Finance? Do we use the numbers that he produced in his teachers accountability document? Do we use the numbers in the teachers accountability document that was released in January of 1996? Now, this even shortens his commitment from the lottery slush fund. It is down to three months now. In January '96 he said, oh, we are in eighth place. Manitoba's economy is producing eighth place results. We cannot have our teachers get fourth or fifth place salaries. We are in eighth place. Yesterday, I thought we were living in British Columbia when I heard the budget from the

Minister of Finance, you know, growth was here and we were steamrolling ahead and everything was rosy from the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance will excuse us if we put all his commitments alongside his Jets promise to cancel the loss agreement, if we put his commitment to this great volunteer organization, Mr. Sweatman and Cam Osler, those great pillars of civility, those great pillars of the community that got so much from the Minister of Finance. You will excuse us if we use a little cynicism when we get numbers from the Minister of Finance, because when you said before that you would not use it as a slush fund and you did it three months later and the Dominion Bond Rating agency of course pointed that out, said you did not have a surplus, you are really running a deficit. Ironically, the Dominion Bond Rating agency said there was a surplus in '88-89 and there was not one in '95-96. Now, you are still not out of the woods. Maybe it is good that we have to hire a Provincial Auditor now because the other Auditor had to leave, but I wonder what the Provincial Auditor is going to say. [interjection] Well, the Dominion Bond Rating agency is a liar now, according to the Minister of Education.

#### Point of Order

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe the Leader of the Opposition just attributed words to me and had them put in Hansard by saying them in the House, that he has no idea of what I was saying or whom I was talking to or about. I wish he would withdraw that because I do not know what he was talking about because, quite frankly, I was not listening but I was doing something here. If he wishes to take anything I said here on another topic about another issue that had nothing to do with him and put it in Hansard as if I am reacting to something he might have said, then I ask him to withdraw it, because I was not listening to what he said and I do not know what I was supposed to be reacting to here.

**Mr. Doer:** Yes, on the same point of order, I apologize if I attributed the word "liar" to Dominion Bond or members opposite. If she was saying it about her members, I certainly am disappointed. We did hear

her say that, but I withdraw my comments about what the minister had said. We only heard the one word. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would like to thank the member for that withdrawal.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable Minister of Education, that other matter is concluded. Does the honourable minister want to have another point of order?

#### Point of Order

**Mrs. McIntosh:** I do not believe the member has gone far enough in withdrawing his objectionable comments because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he has left on the record the implication that in my saying a word here at my desk that I was referring to a specific issue or people when he has no idea to whom I was referring or to what I was referring. He should just simply withdraw his comment without the qualifications that he put upon it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable minister does not have a second point of order. The honourable member did withdraw his statement.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Doer:** Now, of course, every year we hear how great Manitoba is doing and I believe in 1995 we did have a better year than in previous years. We certainly needed to because we had followed a number of years where we were in last place in Canada. When you look at the accumulated growth figures from Stats Canada from the last eight years when this Premier has been in charge of this government, Manitoba is second last to Newfoundland in terms of GDP growth in Canada. Now, if your policies are so great, why are they not working? Why is our growth not higher than other provinces in Canada? Mr. Deputy Speaker, '95 was not a bad year. Of course, we had a lot of the money, the pre-election spending from the government and we had the infrastructure program, because it seems to us with this government, it is not like the old biblical term where you get seven years of feast and seven years of

famine with this government. With this government you get three years of famine and one year of pre-election feast. We saw that in the economic results last year. They were better, and I am happy that they were. But what excuses the fact that we were in last place two of the last four years that you had a majority government. Why are we just slightly and marginally ahead of Newfoundland in terms of GDP growth? How does that square with the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Stefanson) hallelujah chorus on the economic growth of this province?

\* (1530)

I hope the minister is right; I hope that the economy is booming; I hope we are doing great. I hope that all the things that they say in their budget are true. In which case, if it is true, then your income tax numbers are way off and the surplus will be much higher. You cannot have it both ways. You have very low—and I know why the Minister of Finance is worried. He is cutting, he is making all these ideological cuts in health, education, to welfare recipients, to babies under the age of one year and they do not want to show a big surplus next year. So what do they do? They depress the income tax numbers. Now either you are going to be right on your growth numbers and you are going to have increased revenue on your income tax side, or you are going to be wrong on your growth side and be right on your surplus of \$22 million. I hope that your error, or the numbers you have presented us yesterday are right on growth and wrong on revenue, as I suspect they are, rather than the growth is going to be much lower than what you are predicting and Manitobans are going to go through much more economic misery because of your documents.

Now there are some good news announcements, reannounced and reannounced and reannounced. The Simplot plant and Schneider's, I think those are good announcements. We want to say those are good announcements. Of course, we have said that when the announcement for Schneider's was said here, we said that when the announcement for Simplot was made here, and we will continue to say that—[interjection] You know, the member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe) may not remember, but just recently Labatt Brewery promised to close the plant here in Manitoba;

North American Life just moved 300 jobs out of this province; Safeway just moved a number of people out of this province so there is some misery going around with plant closures and relocations, along with decisions that are positive in nature.

How do we explain Western Canada Lottery moving jobs? We are paying Western Canada Lottery to move jobs to Toronto. This is the economic vision of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson). I guess it goes along with his vision of moving hockey teams to Phoenix after he promises to keep them here in Manitoba, but what a disgraceful performance in terms of the Western Canada Lottery program. No wonder Manitobans are holding on to their wallets and are worried about economic future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government—[interjection] The Jets came to Manitoba under the NDP, and they are leaving under the Conservatives. We did not make promises we could not keep. '91 was when we made the big mistake. But again it was only going to cost us \$5 million in losses in '91.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, of course, this balanced budget legislation will lead to interesting questions about how you treat Crown corporations. How is the Auditor going to treat the revenue you have shown in the numbers in the so-called surplus of last year? How are they going to show the one-time only payment for the purposes of the lottery fund? How are they going to deal with these things that some other rating agencies have said you cannot have as a one-time only payment? How are they going to deal the way you have established a credit corporation, a new Crown corporation for the Royal Bank, because you want to have the borrowing off the books for the so-called balanced budget legislation?

We know you are not in favour of Crown corporations. We know this is not a conversion on the road to Damascus in terms of your belief in Crown corporations. I mean, you are creating a Crown corporation for health care and the banks, and you are getting rid of a Crown corporation in our utilities. It just does not make any sense at all. It is just part of the sneaky way in which we see the finances of this province. And I am disappointed.

You do not think we know what you are doing to put that borrowing authority in a Crown? Why did you not put in on the books? Why do you not have it on the books? Why do you not have it right out of the Department of Finance? Why are you hiding it in a Crown corporation? You are doing it because you are hiding the borrowing authority for this organization. That is what you are doing. You do not think we know that? Do you think you are fooling people establishing a Crown corporation? [interjection] I was not going to take a shot at my honourable friend the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) in that debate, but I was absolutely shocked last week on CBC when he said, we support the government on the Royal Bank but we do not support the government on home care privatization. That is the problem with the Liberals. I had asked the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) to talk to his friend from Inkster, because it does not make any sense to close down the emergency ward and change the acute care status of Seven Oaks Hospital while the public purse is shovelling out money, \$130 million over the next four years, to the so-called smart health system.

So I would ask you to recaucus that issue, with the greatest respect, because I think the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has made a mistake. I know he kind of wants to look like he is sort of a balance, but it is not a good idea. Sometimes in this province you really cannot have it both ways. You cannot support the spending on the Royal Bank and then condemn the government on the cutback of Seven Oaks Hospital. There only is so much money, and we would ask the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) to join with us.

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

**Mr. Doer:** I have always had the greatest respect for the police union and all the other unions. I guess this is a little contagious in here. I will move along. I guess my attempt to get the Liberals—[interjection] The rhetoric from the member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon).

Mr. Deputy Speaker, of course, the government is again hiding those numbers off the books. These decisions will have real impact on real people here in Manitoba. The government broke its promise on

capital spending. This is a job creation issue. This is one of the first promises the government made in the election campaign. In fact, they even borrowed the term that the NDP put in the alternative Speech from the Throne. Manitoba Works was something we put in our alternative Speech from the Throne. Were we ever flattered to see the Filmon government was so bankrupt of ideas that they had to xerox our term and put it in their ad campaign in the election campaign. Of course they promised \$1.5 billion in infrastructure program spending. And they promised again, after 1990, after they broke their promise on capital spending and health care in 1990 they had the gall—[interjection] Perhaps the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) would like to look at the \$819-million deficit in 1992-93 when she was the minister around the cabinet table, the largest deficit in the history of the province.

Why is the government breaking their word to many people that require that capital investment, which creates jobs and decent health care services? How do you justify the cynical announcement on March 17 to the cancer institute of Manitoba that you will proceed with the capital spending, and then the Premier, of course, cancels it after he went on a telethon and promised that money again in the election campaign in 1995? Does not your word mean anything? Does it not mean anything to you and the people of this province, promise after promise after promise that is made that of course have resulted in hardship for Manitobans?

And there are many other budget contradictions. They talk about building confidence, but we have private investment down 7.2 percent. The budget talks about social services and we cut spending. They talk about no property tax increases, we are keeping taxes down, of course property tax increases have increased all over the province, and municipalities of course know where that money is coming from. Contradiction after contradiction—tourism down 1 percent in Manitoba.

This government has broken its mandate with the people on the Telephone System, which they promised not to privatize during the election campaign, another broken promise as they proceed with their brokerage friends to privatize a Crown corporation that has the second lowest rates in North America.

The government has broken their promise on hog marketing. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and the Premier went to many halls in rural Manitoba in the Interlake region and said they would not change the marketing system for hogs. We have heard from hog marketers that have said that you have broken your word and we believe the producers here in Manitoba. We do not believe the Conservatives; we believe the producers here in the province of Manitoba.

They continue to not deal in partnership with aboriginal people to settle the treaty land entitlements which would have an economic advantage as well as an advantage of dignity here in the province of Manitoba. We had a settlement in 1985 and 1986. The government just walks away from its obligations and just does what it does best. It points fingers instead of solves problems and solves responsibility.

\* (1540)

The government of course has rejected some of the alternatives that we have proposed. We have suggested that we reinvest in our communities through health care and education, that we have a long-term plan like Healthy Child to put preventative programs in our communities, that we enhance the role of nurses throughout our province, that we deal with the profit private labs that the government has four reports on rather than cutting back on acute care hospital beds and a cutting back on the emergency wards in our community hospitals, that we change home care, we get greater co-ordination with our hospitals and our home care system and we change it to be more responsive in our communities not to put more money into a few profiteers, that we have an education system that does not have educators fighting the government but has a spirit of co-operation where we can move to the basics of the 21st Century with all of our people in the province of Manitoba, not having a petty little fight which of course the Premier enjoys but does not move our kids forward, does not move our parents forward and does not move our province forward.

We have suggested long-term economic growth and investment and we have also suggested that we have a

co-operative relationship with business, labour and government rather than always fighting, rather than trying to deal the cards from the bottom of the deck by changes in legislation which invariably will come into this Chamber, that we try to deal in partnership with all our stakeholders here in the province rather than just dealing with a few.

This government has broken its election promises. It has done so generally by the breach of their election promise on spending. It has done so through ads that they maliciously placed on Manitobans last year that they had no intent of keeping. They have broken their promises on health care. They have broken their promises on education, they have broken their promises on capital spending, and it is with a great deal of sorrow I say that this province has broken its promises on the most vulnerable people here in the province of Manitoba. The arrogance and ideology of the Tory government and of this Premier (Mr. Filmon), the country-club attitude that he is now approaching his duties with, are taking over.

Regrettably and sorrowfully, I will move that this government be defeated and that the budget be defeated and that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "House."

I move, seconded by the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen),

THAT the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "House" and substituting the following:

Therefore regrets this budget breaks key election promises by:

- (a) reducing program spending by tens of millions of dollars despite the Premier's Plan Manitoba commitment to maintain overall spending of \$4.465 billion until 1998-99; and
- (b) as a result, this government is cutting vital funds for public education, reducing support for the poorest children and families, reducing advanced training, education and job opportunities, reducing support to rural and agricultural communities, and making a

mockery of the Premier's solemn election oath that he would not cut health care services; and

As a consequence, the government has thereby lost the confidence of the House and the people of Manitoba.

I so move. Thank you.

**Motion presented.**

(Madam Speaker in the Chair)

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The amendment is in order.

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development):** Madam Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to rise this afternoon and to respond and support our government's budget presented by my colleague the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), and to offer my congratulations on a budget, which, once again, shows that as a government we must live within our means, that presents to the people of Manitoba yet another surplus. We have been responsible in that we have finally been able to eliminate that horrible deficit, and it is the ninth straight budget where there have been no tax increases for Manitobans.

Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to offer my thanks to the people of Manitoba because in just a few weeks time we will be celebrating the anniversary of the re-election of our government to a third term in office, and clearly Manitobans once again have voted for the sound fiscal management along with the definitive economic framework that this government has provided time and time again.

I listened very carefully to the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), and, as he started his address, Madam Speaker, I could not help but almost reflect on the way that he started his address because he was very emotional. He talked about the children of our society and he talked about our budget at the same time, and for about 10 minutes he addressed that issue. But there is one element that he forgot to address in those 10 minutes, and that was the impact that his

previous government, his administration had on the people of this province and on the future generations of this province because, in six short years, it was his administration that tripled the debt of this province, and that is debt that we are still feeling the impact of, and future generations will feel that impact.

That debt was created at a time when revenues were increasing. The revenues to this province were increasing continuously, and yet the mismanagement and the callous approach to finances in that administration caused this province to incur a debt that we will be paying for for a long, long time.

Well, we have embarked on a road which not only has gotten rid of the deficit but indeed has a plan set to eliminate that horrible debt that Manitobans face today, and it will take us some time. It is not going to happen overnight, it will take about 30 years to eliminate that debt, but it is a course of action that we must pursue, one that Manitobans want us to pursue, one that Manitobans insist that our government must pursue in order that our future generations can have the same quality of life that we are enjoying today.

Madam Speaker, as I indicated, this budget is one that Manitobans certainly will support, one that demonstrates fiscal management along with a definitive economic framework that has been established for Manitobans. Over the past eight years, we have been able to deliver on those two counts. We have done so in spite of having some very difficult choices and decisions to make.

For example, our institutions and economy continue to change before our very eyes. These changes have included things like the federal government's decision to eliminate the Western Grain Stabilization Act and the freight rate subsidy that farmers enjoyed. The following will give you some sense of how the end of the Crow rate subsidy will impact on the agricultural economy of our province.

In 1994-95, it cost the farmer an average of about \$18.79 per tonne to ship his wheat from Winnipeg to Thunder Bay. The government subsidy paid for about \$9.68 of this total. Last year, this same farmer shipped his tonne of wheat to Thunder Bay and the cost was

\$17.13, except that last year the farmer paid the entire cost.

So I want to emphasize that in our province our government took quick action to ensure that our farmers had every possible advantage to live with and to cope with these changes. So we have introduced measures to provide producers with access to up to \$40 million to diversify the operations and add value to the products that are produced in our province.

\* (1550)

New trading rules under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the North American Free Trade Agreement have certainly impacted on our economy as well. As a province that has long produced more than it can consume, we have welcomed and benefited from the new trade rules. Easing restrictions has made it easier for our existing businesses to expand their marketing opportunities in and outside of our province. At the same time, the situation is providing an impetus for new enterprises to get underway with the comfort that there are markets that are available, willing and eager to buy our products all over the world.

As proof of this, we have only to look at Manitoba's export experience over the past year, which has remained strong, particularly to the south of us.

Madam Speaker, if we looked at the other impacts that government has on our province, one of the things that we have to look at in terms of impact is the reduced federal transfer payments which place greater responsibility with the province for service delivery. As my honourable colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) noted, we had been made aware of the impending federal cuts to transfer payments. However, nothing could have prepared us for the magnitude of those cuts.

This year, the federal government will have reduced its transfer payments, in other words, its share of responsibility for social programs in Manitoba, by \$116 million. In fiscal year '97-98, Ottawa will continue to cover this approach and will reduce its transfer payments by \$104 million. Madam Speaker, this adds up to a total of \$220 million. Just consider the

cumulative effect of this on our economy and on the citizens of our province.

Madam Speaker, taking into account the severity and the magnitude of the cuts in transfer payments, our government has been left with little choice but to trim in areas where we believe will impact least on Manitobans and on our ability as a province to continue to generate the needed revenues. These are not easy times, nor are these decisions that we are making made lightly. The conditions I have noted have impacted on our economy to fundamentally change it, not just for a year, not just for a decade, but I believe forever, and there is no going back.

As we have always done in the past, we will continue to forge ahead turning negatives into positives and turning challenges into opportunities, Madam Speaker.

How are we going to do this—well, I believe first of all by staying the course we set when we were first elected eight years ago. Even back then, we began making the necessary adjustments that other jurisdictions have only had to begin to face now. By this, I refer to how today compared with other provinces we have less government, and we have achieved this through attrition and by offering incentive packages to civil servants who have chosen early retirement. At the same time, we are continuing to do more with less.

We are delivering a high level of quality government service to the public and doing so through a more efficient community-based delivery system. We are also availing ourselves of the tools such as special operating agencies or SOAs. SOAs are enabling us to deliver services in a more cost-effective manner and to allow for greater cost recovery. Some examples of this, of course, are the Fleet Vehicles SOA that has been created by government, and also in my own department, Madam Speaker, an area which we have just assumed responsibility for, the Food Development Centre in Portage la Prairie which has become a special operating agency. In this way, the centre will be in a better position to continue to provide Manitoba food companies with the quality and the level of service that they have always enjoyed. In addition, the centre will be able to concentrate more on its efforts on helping



Manitoba firms get underway to put value-added products on store shelves and in other markets outside of our province.

Now some may argue that reducing government hurts our economy, but quite the opposite has happened in our economy here in Manitoba. The good news is that for every 10 government jobs that were lost, about 22 private sector jobs have been created. Here again, we cannot lose sight of the important role small business plays in our economy. Small business is indeed the engine that continues to drive our economy and contributes to our job performance. Added to this the fact that the province delivered an outstanding economic performance during 1995, it supports the notion that a lean and efficient government sector does not diminish but assists economic growth. The facts, Madam Speaker, speak for themselves.

Manufacturing shipments were up 11 percent in 1995. Shipments of equipment and machinery increased 39 percent in '95 after recording increases of 36 percent in '93 and 32 percent in 1994. Capital investment in manufacturing recorded an amazing 70 percent increase in 1995 compared to 25 percent increases nationally. In the meantime, our agriculture experts along with manufacturing and mining helped contribute another double-digit increase in export sales.

Madam Speaker, the following stories made headlines in 1995: a \$55-million canola plant in Ste. Agathe that could generate \$200 million of new investment over the next five years, a \$200-million expansion of the Simplot fertilizer plant in Brandon, followed by the recent announcement of an additional \$33-million project to build a 140-ton industrial grade ammonium plant; added to that, expansion of the Nestle-Carnation plant in Carberry, all of which is underway with no government money being provided. But that does not end. We have also seen the \$75-million expansion of McCain's chip-making plant in Portage la Prairie. And a \$40-million Schneider's hog processing plant is certainly welcome news to our province.

Madam Speaker, I can continue to go on with listing the good news that is occurring in our province, good news such as the 20 percent increase in new construction coupled with a 5 percent increase in jobs

in the construction sector, good news like a 16.8 percent increase in farm cash receipts, well above the national average, and a rapidly expanding mining industry.

If you look at some of the things that are happening in Manitoba, we cannot ignore the fact that a lot of this good news is happening in the rural part of our province, and there are certainly a lot of projects in rural Manitoba which are adding very positively to the economy of this province. We believe that restoring the balance in our provincial fiscal house, financial house, over the past eight years has added very positively to the improved conditions so that our economic growth can take place in this province.

Manitoba has probably one of the most enviable records of any Canadian province in that regard. We have made positive tax adjustments to encourage some of this development, tax adjustments in the mining-exploration industry and hence the reason for the strong mining industry. We have made no major increases in the past eight years. There have been no major tax increases, I should say, in the past eight years. We can lay claim to the longest-running tax freeze in the country, nine straight years.

In the meantime, we are continuing on the road of trying to insist that our government and our province lives within its means. We have to do that if our future generations have any chance of success and any chance of enjoying the same lifestyle that we are enjoying currently.

But our track record has not gone unnoticed. There are people who have noticed the positive steps that have been taken in this province and have spoken out about that. The Conference Board of Canada describes Manitoba's economy as steamrolling ahead, highlighting the following reasons: an economy that continues to diversify in response to the elimination of the Crow rate subsidy, growth in the construction sector that has outperformed other provinces, real gross domestic product growth of 2.3 percent for 1996, manufacturing that will continue to grow at a buoyant pace for 1996 and '97, mining activity that forecasts to grow by 6.2 percent in 1996 and 6.4 percent in 1997.

Madam Speaker, there are others who are talking about the good things that are happening in Manitoba, and I would like to refer to the Canadian Federation of Independent Business who have this to say about our province: Over the past number of years Manitoba has become one of the most small-business-friendly governments in Canada with an eight-year tax freeze, stable Workers Compensation premiums and some strategic reductions in key taxes. Manitoba has set the standard that many other provinces should follow.

\* (1600)

Madam Speaker, I noted earlier and want to emphasize again that small business is important in Manitoba's economy. Most Manitobans are employed in small businesses. Small business continues to provide a level of stability, making this sector truly the bread and butter of our economy.

Madam Speaker, small businesses are found throughout our province, but most of rural Manitoba is based on small business; and, if you look around at the kinds of small businesses that have enjoyed some success recently, you only have to look at some of the new businesses that have established in Manitoba over the last couple of years. With the involvement of REDI and the involvement of Grow Bonds, we have indeed been able to assist some of our businesses in rural Manitoba to become real success stories in our province.

The REDI program, the Grow Bond Program, the programs that have come from the Department of Rural Development, have been designed to help rural Manitobans establish their dreams, establish their visions, establish their communities as ones that are sustainable and ones that have a true future in this province.

Now, Madam Speaker, we have to continue to work with Manitobans. We have to continue to ensure that the programs that we have brought forward meet the needs of Manitobans and meet the needs that small business has to succeed. The incentives that we are providing are not just there to be there for one day and then they are gone the next. We know that with some

of these programs there might be the odd business that will fail, and that happens. I think that is a reality of life in rural Manitoba. It is a reality of life anywhere in our province, but I want to talk about a Grow Bonds project that has encountered some difficulty, just for a moment, because it is the approach that was taken that not only offended the community but offended the people who have worked so very hard to try and make that business succeed.

I refer to the situation in Portage la Prairie and the Woodstone project, Madam Speaker. Here is a project that is creating a very innovative product, a product where there is a market worldwide. This is a project where we have about \$6-million worth of sales in a specific year. The demand for that product was so great that the owners of the business wanted to expand to double its production, and so they entered into a Grow Bond Program. Investors from the community invested in the project.

Madam Speaker, some financial challenges have occurred down the road. That happens from time to time. It is not something that government can take responsibility for. It happens from time to time in business. That is a reality of life. But what happened in that situation was that the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Sale) decided that he would make a political issue of it, and in doing so, he not only embarrassed himself, but he indeed created a situation where all of a sudden we had companies that were not even associated with the plant being forced to respond to his comments that were being made in the news media.

The member indicated that we should move the Woodstone plant from Portage to Winnipeg, and we should put the Woodstone project into the former Labatt brewery location. Now, can you tell me how that helps the rural economy? Can you tell me how that saves the 35 jobs that are in Portage la Prairie? Can you tell me how that helps those families who are taking their pay cheques home to their families from Woodstone Foods?

Madam Speaker, I did not know what to make of it at first, especially when the member for Crescentwood decided to write to Labatt to tell them about this visionary scheme that he had. First of all, he was not

an agent of Woodstone, he was not an agent of the government, yet he was telling the Labatt people, I believe some government assistance for such a study might be available. There he is, making statements like that.

Madam Speaker, Labatt was quick to respond. What did they say to the member for Crescentwood? Well, they said, so, let me not leave you with the impression that we are interested in re-entering the food industry; we are not. He said, given that Mr. Nickel represents the interests of the shareholders of Woodstone, I can suggest that his expert opinion is the one in which you should have confidence, as we do.

In other words, what Labatt was telling the member for Crescentwood was that he was really off base, that he really did not know what he was talking about and that the suggestions he was making about the movement of this company from Portage to Winnipeg, to the Labatt location, were bizarre. I think the people from Portage la Prairie knew and understood that.

There was another issue, and that was that the member for Crescentwood also said that, oh, the bondholders are afraid that their investment will be lost. Well, the bond corporation that was involved in the project all along decided to do a bit of a survey. I am told that after surveying over 50 percent of the bondholders, not only did the bondholders say, no, they were not concerned about it, they said that they were still supportive of Woodstone being in their community, proceeding with the expansion, proceeding with the product development that they were engaged in, and they wanted to see this company in their community for the long term.

So, Madam Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition makes the statement that he wants to be co-operative and that it is time, he says, that we started to work together towards a co-operative approach in government and towards a co-operative approach in building our economy, I suggest that he impart that kind of message on to the rest of his caucus. Indeed, that is important for us, to be able to not pounce on companies that might have some financial challenges, but to work with communities, to work with those

companies to try to resolve those challenges so that those companies can be successful.

I would like to turn my attention, Madam Speaker, to the impacts of the budget on rural Manitoba. I would have to say that they are particularly encouraging and again reinforce the initiatives we have undertaken over the past number of years. Once again, I look back at my own constituency, and there was a news story not that long ago during the winter months that suggested that three out of four, or four, hospitals in my constituency were going to close. Now, this was somewhat disturbing to me because I did not know where the story came from, but the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) was the author of this story. I wondered where he had gotten his information from. Well, to date, all this has done is created a lot of fear in communities, unfounded fear, because no one, not the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), not this government, not this MLA, has suggested to my community or any one of my communities that their hospitals were going to close. So we went through a series of meetings in my communities to try and alleviate this unfounded fear that the member for Brandon East had spread throughout the constituency that these hospitals were going to close.

Madam Speaker, this is the kind of destructive messaging that continues from the opposition. To them, it does not matter whether what they say is a bit strange to the truth, but once it is said and printed in the media, they get the satisfaction that perhaps they have done something. They do not consider the destructive nature which is created by comments of that nature.

\* (1610)

Madam Speaker, we will continue to work with rural Manitobans in partnership because we believe that partnerships are the key to ensuring that our province is successful. Increasing rural economic program funding by 10 percent, as was announced in the budget, is something that is welcome news to all rural Manitobans. In addition to that, this budget increases to municipalities in terms of provincial tax sharing over 6.4 percent. Now, 6.4 percent is a lot of money to a municipality. If you compare that to any other

jurisdiction in this country, you find that certainly the most positive news anywhere in Canada to municipalities, and municipalities certainly appreciate that approach and certainly appreciate that response by government.

Madam Speaker, we have witnessed significant changes in attitudes in rural Manitoba and the approaches that are taken both not only in delivery of municipal services but also in the business community. Through the round tables that have been developed across this province, and we have something like 70 or more round tables in this province which are functioning today, people in a community get together, look at their strengths, look at their weaknesses, and then they produce a document which builds on the strengths of that community. Then they pursue the goals and the objectives that have been established under the round table concept. Communities have come to realize that if there is going to be economic growth, if their communities are going to be sustained in the future, it is up to those communities to do whatever it is that they can to ensure that those things happen.

Madam Speaker, there are important strategic alliances with private and public sector partners that Rural Development has worked on very diligently. We continue to strive for appropriate partnerships to ensure that not only are we seen as proactive in terms of the things that we do as a government but that positive results occur from our partnerships, and I think some of that has occurred. I refer to the Centra Gas initiative or the expansion of gas into rural Manitoba which was indeed a very positive initiative under the infrastructure program. For years municipalities, communities have said that if we are going to be competitive in the economic environment, we must have natural gas. Sixteen communities were able to receive natural gas as a result of a partnership approach, a partnership between ourselves and the communities and partnerships between the communities and Centra Gas. We will continue those kinds of partnerships.

I would like to mention another very positive partnership, and that is the one that has been undertaken with the conservation districts in our province. Madam Speaker, over the past eight years,

we have shown that a positive working relationship with conservation districts results in very positive projects throughout our province. Municipalities have developed conservation districts and are focusing their attention on reclamation, responsible use of water and other resources, and they are geared towards sustainable growth and development within rural communities. I encourage members opposite to take some interest in our conservation districts because when they have their annual meetings one of the things that is lacking is the participation of members opposite. I have to at least congratulate the member for the Interlake (Clif Evans) who does show up for events in rural Manitoba, but there is an absence of other members of the opposition at many of the functions that take place in rural Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, we also continue to focus on the initiatives that create and promote job creation in our province and economic growth throughout rural Manitoba. REDI, our Rural Economic Development Initiative, continues to help many of our rural Manitobans to create businesses and jobs, and to date some 1,300 jobs have been created as a result of the REDI program. Meanwhile, a total of \$21.3 million in REDI support has gone out to LEVREE, something like \$170 million in private investment in rural Manitoba.

There was one former MLA who said that this was small potatoes. Well, 1,300 jobs is not small potatoes in rural Manitoba. Madam Speaker, \$170 million of investment in this province is not small potatoes in this province, but I can continue because the list goes on and on, but I note that my little light is blinking and I only have two minutes left. How quickly the time flies by.

Madam Speaker, I must say that we will continue our endeavour to work with Manitobans in creating opportunities for all Manitobans, including young Manitobans. I refer to our Green Team, and the Green Team started in rural Manitoba. I will never forget the comments that were made by the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), the Leader of the Opposition about the Green Team with regard to what kind of a program this was and how negative they were about the Green Team.

Today the Green Team has expanded into the city of Winnipeg. It is one of the most positive work programs for students in Manitoba. The opposition, if they like, can find all the negatives in the world but, nevertheless, Manitobans know that this is a program which is positive and which results in positive results for all Manitobans.

Madam Speaker, I would like to end by simply saying to the House that today we support this budget because it is a very positive budget. It sets us on a track that will pay off our debt, that provides a surplus for us to use for emergencies when they are needed. It provides services to Manitobans that Manitobans need and appreciate. I have travelled across this province, every region of this province has been visited by me during the last few months, and I have to tell you that Manitobans do appreciate what this government has done over the past eight years.

They continue to support us because they know that we are on the right track. We can listen to all of the dialogue opposite and all of the negative but, in the end, Manitobans know that this is a government that delivers on its promises, this is a government that is on the right track, and it is one that Manitobans support.

Madam Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity.

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Madam, this morning I listened to, as I do every morning, the CBC morning info rad show, and the two co-hosts were talking about their having come into the Legislative Building yesterday for the budget and what a wonderful, beautiful, inspiring building it was and how more Manitobans should come and see it, and I could not agree more. I think it is one of the most beautiful buildings in any government probably in North America, and they said they can see why legislators have big, grandiose ideas coming in to work in this building every day.

I did have to disagree with him on that, because I think that the budget that was produced yesterday is not full of large ideas. It is not full of progressive thought and there is the word "progressive" in the Progressive Conservative banner. It is full of small ideas, mean-spirited ideas. The only big things about this budget

are the negative impacts on the people of Manitoba. Unfortunately, the grandeur of this Legislative Building has not been reflected in the budget that was presented yesterday.

I think this bodes ill for all of us in Manitoba, not only for the government and those who will be most negatively affected by this budget, and those are growing in number every day, but this budget and what it comes out of is a very negative sign for all of us in our society who care about our society and who care about our political system.

\* (1620)

I think I would like to spend my moments today talking about that in general, about the concept of trust. As my Leader said earlier today and has been said in many of the comments that have come out as a fallout from yesterday's budget, this is not what the government promised in the election campaign a year ago. It most certainly is not. The previous speaker, the Minister for Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), said that this is a government that delivers on its promises. Well, the Leader of the official opposition very eloquently this afternoon listed a number of areas where this government not only did not deliver on its promises but went in exactly the opposite way from the promises that it had in its election campaign.

During the election campaign the government made many promises in the areas of health, education and social services. They made these promises, I believe, because they know that these are areas that are of concern to Manitobans, that these are the areas that hit Manitobans, that impact on Manitoba families every day of their life in one form or another. Why is it that health care is the most important issue for Manitobans day in and day out, year in and year out? It is because it is the area that we all know we are likely to be involved with at one point or another during our life. We also know that it is an essential component of the Manitoba history. It is an essential component of what has made Canada what Canada is.

So the Premier and his election team very cynically, I believe, made promises in the election campaign: dealing with health care, there would be no cuts to

health care; dealing with education, there would be no cuts to education; dealing with social services, we will continue to provide social services. And in this budget they have reneged for every one of those major promises.

Now why is it that this is so important? It is important, as I have said, because of the impact that these cuts will have on Manitobans that are affected by them. But even more importantly or as equally as important, Madam Speaker, I believe that the 180-degree turn from what the Premier said in his election campaign and what this budget says one year later only fuels the cynicism and the dismay and the lack of respect that the public service, particularly the elected members of the public service have, receive from the people of Manitoba and all over the world for that matter. It is because we—"we" meaning the government—do not do what we say we are going to do. We do not keep our promises, and when we do not keep our promises, we do not say we are not keeping our promises. What this government has done is it has boldly and baldly in this budget said that they have kept their promises, that they have kept faith with the people of Manitoba. The people of Manitoba know that is blatantly not true. It is not factual.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) throughout his budget document talks about the people of Manitoba reaffirming their confidence in the Conservative government's stewardship of the province. Well, they reaffirmed—what they thought they were reaffirming was the government's pledge during the election campaign to maintain services. What has happened? Those services have been cut back in very many, many ways. Why is this so important? Why is trust such an important component? Why is it so problematic when it is missing?

Trust is the lubricant for all of our social interactions. We begin as infants with the basic trust in our families, in the basic trust in our mothers first and then, hopefully, in our fathers, in our siblings, in our extended family. When it is working the family works. When that lubrication of basic trust is not there then the family can fall apart. It works the same way in larger communities. The rural communities have operated for centuries on a basic level of trust. They

trust that if farmer Jones and farmer Smith can work together in co-operation, then they only need one set of farm machinery perhaps. They can share. They can work together. They can have people go from one farm to another to help with seeding and with harvesting. If they do not have that basic trust, that falls apart.

It works in the business community as well. A contract is a form of trust, and our whole system of mercantile and industrial systems are as a result of people who are involved, basically, trusting each other. When that breaks down, as it is breaking down in all of western society today, we get situations like we have in the province of Manitoba where the people do not trust the government. The government, obviously, does not trust the people because they are campaigning on one set of statements, they are governing on another, and they are not coming clean to the people of Manitoba about what is happening.

I want to very briefly comment on a couple of the cuts that this government has made. One is Pharmacare. The day that the Pharmacare announcement was made—well, not the announcement—but the day that people got the inaccurate information in their mail and the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) was having a press conference explaining the process, I had a tea with a seniors group and they were appalled. They were absolutely appalled at what was happening not only because of the cutbacks, the change to the way you could have your Pharmacare, the way that the Pharmacare deductibles are changed. Because, frankly, every single one of those people was under the \$15,000 limit. They will actually in most cases be better off. But what they were saying is what about those people who are over \$15,000? This is terrible.

What about the people who do not understand how to fill out the form? This is something that has not been talked about a lot with this Pharmacare thing. Every single year you have to fill out the form, you have to have kept your income tax from the previous year and you have to do this. There are many—[interjection] If you have one, yes. In order to access it you have to actually fill out an income tax form. There are many people in our society, and I would suggest probably more in the seniors group, who do not have family or

friends or individuals who can help them do this. They are going to be out of luck.

I think, frankly, that—and this was not my statement, this came from one of the seniors. She said perhaps this is what the government intended. They want to have it more difficult to access the program so they can save more money. Now, is this not a terrible statement. Here is a comment from a senior who has spent all of her life working for and supporting the province of Manitoba. She has paid her taxes. She has provided support and services. She has been a good citizen of this province for 75 years. And how does the province of Manitoba, how does the Progressive Conservative government, how does Premier Filmon respond to that? He takes away that trust that she has in the elements of government, and she will never feel the same again. She is very angry and upset and she has every right to be.

One other item I would like to speak about is in the education field, and, again, trust. For decades the stakeholders, the participants, in education have worked more or less in harmony, the teachers, the parents, the students, the school boards and more or less the government. What is this government doing with its Enhancing Accountability, Ensuring Quality document? It is destroying that fibre, that fabric of trust that has been built up over the decades, and I have spoken with parents' groups, teachers, even some students and school board members, and they are all appalled by the underpinnings of this document.

It is very clear what this document says. It says, No. 1, we do not trust teachers; No. 2, we do not value the work that they do; we do not trust the system that has been in place for 40 years. We want teachers to go back to Class I salaries where they are paid \$22,000 a year to start. And this comes from a member of the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) own Education Advisory Committee. [interjection] Excuse me, but if the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) would read the document, she would see that in the discussion about the fifth option, which is the only one there is any real discussion about, it says, well, it sort of intimates that, well, maybe, musingly, we should go back to Class I salaries. Next we know, teachers will be relegated to having to sit at the back of the table.

\* (1630)

Another thing this document says is that teachers are overeducated. They do not need to go out and get additional degrees. I would like to ask when the last time was any of these people have actually sat in a classroom in the inner city and seen what eight years of Tory cuts have done to the teaching ability of teachers and students in some of the schools in the inner city of Winnipeg and also some of the schools in the suburban and rural areas in the province of Manitoba. It is a despicable document and it states very clearly the ideology and the lack of understanding and the lack of commitment to public education.

One other very brief comment about education is the minister's business advisory group on education. I have shared this with teachers and principals, and they find this a very interesting item. The minister's business advisory group on education is made up of a number of people, one of whom, quite interestingly enough, is Bev McMaster, owner of the We Care Home Health Services in Brandon. One of the guiding principles behind this business advisory group is ensuring that business interests are reflected in the implementation of education renewal. Nowhere in the Enhancing Accountability document does it state that the interests of students, the interests of families, the interests of society at large should be reflected in the education system. No, this is a business-oriented education system.

What this government has said is that they want to train workers. They do not want to educate citizens, and if you do not educate citizens, you are not going to have a workforce that is able to deal with the complexities of the 21st Century.

In order to allow others to have their say on this document I am going to close my remarks this afternoon by saying and echoing the comments of the Leader of the Opposition when he earlier stated that it was a sad day. This is my fifth or sixth budget I think, and all of them have been problematic for me and for the people of Manitoba, but this one truly is a document that verges on having evil implications for the people of Manitoba. I think it shows the arrogance and the uncaringness of this government. I think that

they had best watch because even in constituencies such as Rossmere people were telling us just last Monday evening, things need to change. They were not told the truth on the doorstep in the election campaign and they will remember it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Mike Radcliffe (River Heights):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) on this magnificent budget. We have a ray of sunshine that has been delivered into our province today.

The honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) was talking about tradition and how worried he was about tradition. We are pleased to be able to say in this Chamber today that our Minister of Finance has delivered one more budget in the tradition, the fine tradition that this government has set. We are looking and are able to stand up to the people of Manitoba and say, we have kept our word. We have kept our word by saying that we have brought down a budget with a \$20-million operating surplus. We are managing the expenses of the government of Manitoba, and we are able to say that we are going to bring a vision, a statement, a plan to the province and to the people of Manitoba.

The people of Manitoba in the last election heard our vision. We went to them and we said there will be no new significant taxes. You know what? They heard that and they put us back on this side of the House.

The Filmon government heard the people of Manitoba when they said, we do not want any more taxes. Madam Speaker, I would suggest with great respect that one has to view this budget document in the context of where we have come from. I want to speak a little bit about where we have come from in this province over the last ten years.

We had a government that walked into the Manitoba economic scene in 1982, and they were maintaining a budget with \$114 million of interest. By the time they left power in 1988, they were spending over \$545 million. They moved the interest on the debt from 5.2 percent of the total spending to 12.5 percent. I have heard rhetoric today, and I would suggest with the

greatest of respect that it was empty rhetoric coming from the other side of the House. It reminded me of the tales that I heard when I was a child called the Grimm Fairy Tales, because that is what it was. Those were grim fairy tales that were wafting across the floor today because what one has to do, one has to look at reality. If one has debt of over \$545 million a year just to maintain the status quo, then what we are doing, Madam Speaker, is we are taking porridge off the table. We are taking food, sound nutrition off the table of our welfare people, our welfare recipients. We are snatching school books out of the classroom. We are slamming up and closing up hospital beds. That is what happens when you go with reckless spending that that government in their time was indulging. That was abysmal.

The people of Manitoba spoke when they put the Filmon government in power in 1988. We made a commitment to the people of Manitoba, and you know what, we repeated that commitment in 1995 and we have come through. The public debt had jumped to \$7.2 billion as a result of the reckless empty spending. These people have a concept of micromanagement. They want to centralize everything. They have an attitude of academic intellectual arrogance whereby they want to tell everybody in the province what to do, and they want to employ everybody working for government. This is just shameful.

Madam Speaker, what our government and our Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) have been able to do is to move the proportion of interest on the public debt from 12.5 percent of our public funding to at least 11.7 percent today.

**An Honourable Member:** We are moving in the right direction.

**Mr. Radcliffe:** We are moving it in the right direction. That is correct.

Now, Madam Speaker, I think that we have to look at the history of this province and see this abysmal reckless spending of our honourable colleagues on the opposite side of the House and then put that in the frame of reference of those individuals who are trying to govern in Ottawa. Do you know what that federal



government is trying to do to the social programs in our country? They have effected a 32 percent reduction in the social programming in this country, and you compare that to the fact that they have reduced spending in other areas of government by 2 percent; obviously, it shows where the priorities are of that Liberal government that we sent to Ottawa. They have no heart.

Now, compare and balance that with what the Filmon government is doing with our money in this province. We are putting 33.4 percent of our revenue into health care, and we have maintained that level of spending. We are prepared to maintain the quality of service so that when our Manitoba citizens fall ill there will be a hospital system in Manitoba. There will be doctors working in Manitoba. There will be nurses that are delivering health care in Manitoba. We are not going to blow all the revenue by going out and borrowing and then having to spend it all on interest. The next step is that we have made a commitment, we have spent 18 percent—

**An Honourable Member:** How much?

**Mr. Radcliffe:** -18 percent, in case my honourable colleague across the House here did not hear, on Education. We have made a commitment that the citizens of tomorrow have to have education, have to have development, and we are prepared to make sure that it is there. Family Services has 12.1 percent of our commitment.

\* (1640)

We have kept our word. Year after year there has been consistency in this budget, no new significant taxes, surplus, management of spending. We have made the commitment that in 30 years this public debt will be paid off, and we have taken the first step towards—[interjection] Absolutely. Then we will have further options.

**An Honourable Member:** And we will be here 30 years from now.

**Mr. Radcliffe:** Absolutely, because the people of Manitoba recognize consistency and honour. Now the

honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), if one could refer to him as that, was talking about the values of the honourable member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon). Thank goodness that there are sane heads in this Chamber. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) and our Premier (Mr. Filmon) have made a commitment, and they have lived up to that commitment. We made a promise and we have fulfilled that promise. This is a government that is delivering what it promised to the people of Manitoba.

The honourable member for Concordia was talking about senior citizens in this province who were scared. Well, do you know why they are scared?

**An Honourable Member:** They are scared at the possibility of the NDP becoming government.

**Mr. Radcliffe:** That is correct. They are frightened of the prospects of a return to the bad old days.

There are forces at work in this society of ours, and I am ashamed to admit it, that maliciously, deliberately go out and raise alarm, take fatuous tales to our consumers, to our old people, to our sick. They try to tell them there will be an interruption in home care service. They will try to tell them that they are going to have to pay for home care service. Madam Speaker, this is a deliberate attempt at trying to raise alarm amongst the more vulnerable of our society. This is despicable behaviour, and I cannot imagine that anybody who would allege that they have the ability to form a government would be so evil and so deliberately malicious as to go out and try to do this to the people of Manitoba.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) was talking about his fear of change. The problem is that our honourable colleagues on the other side of the House have a mindset that is stuck and rooted in history. They are unable to grow. They are unable to move ahead with the changing circumstances, the changing economy that we have had to move.

This government, with our commitments to Health, to Education, to Family Services, has increased spending and increased performance in the province of

Manitoba over \$990 million since 1987. That is a track record, Madam Speaker. That is performance. We have a system of priorities. We have a vision which is represented in this budget. Other departments of spending, we have only increased that spending by \$105 million. There is where our priorities lie.

I am pleased to be able to tell this House that the Filmon government has increased spending in personal care homes this year by \$2.5 million. We have been able to assess that in the coming years our population will be aging. They will have need for personal care homes. We are starting to design a health care system where older people who have chronic care needs are moved out of the acute care institutions. We are moving them into chronic care homes. This is management of a health care system. We do not blindly pursue a reckless spending pattern where, because it was done 40 years ago—and my honourable colleague was referring to education policies and dispute resolution mechanisms that were designed 40 years ago. She was wringing her hands because we were prepared to look at changing, prepared to review what was done 40 years ago. Madam Speaker, this Filmon government is a government of change. It is a government of innovation. We are prepared to move with the times.

This government has made a commitment that it is going to put \$8 million more into Home Care programs this year. This increase in spending reflects the demographics of our society, the sensible management, again, of our health care. Since 1988, we have doubled the spending on home care. Then our honourable colleagues across the room here have the temerity to suggest that we are without compassion. [interjection] I am just warming up.

Madam Speaker, we have introduced regional health care authorities in rural and northern Manitoba. We are proceeding to have integrated community health care programs in the city. We are carefully costing out before we make any changes. I look around our country, and I look at the province to the west of us. You know who is in power in the province to the west of us, what political persuasion sits in government out there? In the province of Saskatchewan, those are socialists. Do you know what the socialists in

Saskatchewan did? They went recklessly, blindly closing 52 rural hospitals overnight. [interjection] Maybe they were Devine hospitals, but I thought they were delivering health care. In any event, there have been no hospitals closed recklessly, out of hand, in Manitoba. In fact, I can tell this Chamber that I have had an opportunity in the last several days to view open-heart surgery at St. Boniface, and I can tell you that the quality of health care in our operating rooms is cutting edge. It is up to date. It is effective, and, in fact, I can assure my honourable colleague for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) that there is even brain surgery going on at St. Boniface, just in case there would be any need in the future.

Madam Speaker, I can assure this Chamber today that our government has made a commitment to spend \$38 million in integrating the partnership that we are designing and controlling and managing in this province. We are doing changes thoughtfully. We are doing them with care. We care about our health services.

\* (1650)

We are faced with the grim reality of the harsh Liberal reductions in transfer payments coming from Ottawa, but, Madam Speaker, I can assure you that facing Pharmacare reductions which we have had to do in order to manage our health care, whom did we protect? We protected the most vulnerable in our society. We have gone to the people of Manitoba and said, if you can afford to pay for the service, then we would ask you to pay your way. We do not want people riding on the backs of the taxpayers of Manitoba. If you can pay for your service, then for Pharmacare, we have said, we would ask you to pay for your own consumption. What is wrong with that? That is eminently reasonable.

Madam Speaker, I touched earlier on education. In education, this budget of ours has made a commitment for \$12 million of learning tax credits for students. We are not throwing money at institutions. What we are doing is we are saying to you, if you go and get a job, then we will give you a benefit for getting a job and then spending money on further education. What could be more reasonable?

We have gone and, due to our historical imperatives, we have said to the people of Manitoba that we will support the independent school system in this province. We are at 46 percent of the operating costs of the public school child, and we are prepared to move that to 50 percent, and we have come through with another promise. That shows that we are prepared to answer our commitments.

Now, the independent school system has no capital support from this government and no support from the local property tax base, but we are supporting the operating base, and we are there with our commitments, Madam Speaker.

Another commitment that we have made and we have met, Madam Speaker, is that we have gone to the community colleges, and we have said, we will support you at the level of spending that we committed to you last year. We have said to the universities—[interjection] I hear some abuse floating across the floor here, but—

**An Honourable Member:** Directed at the Liberals.

**Mr. Radcliffe:** I think it must be. Madam Speaker, we have said to the universities that we will reduce their operating grants to the universities by 2 percent. The capital support is remaining constant, and we are asking our university administration to rein in their costs and their budgets. We have asked the public schools to reduce their spending by 2 percent. We have said to the people of Manitoba that we are prepared to put \$1.7 million into educational renewal. We have been prepared to say that parents in this province should have some input into the school system. We have asked for standardized testing, standardized curriculum, so that we know that our children are getting a good education, so that they can read and they can write and they can figure on a high level.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would like to direct my attention very briefly to Family Services. We have said before and I think it bears repetition that the best type of security that we can offer the people of Manitoba is a job and, in fact, we have made a commitment that we want to see more jobs in Manitoba in '96. We made

10,000 new jobs in '95. We are able to say today in this province that we have performed. Private sector employment rose 2.7 percent, and on the same hand, we were able to reduce government input, government employment. We have said to the private sector, to the people who make real jobs, go out and perform for the people of Manitoba.

I want to say for the benefit of the individuals in the Chamber here today what some of the proof of the pudding has been. Proof of the pudding, there you go.

Repap is prepared to put \$250 million into our province, Madam Speaker. That is going to be 175 to 200 jobs in logging. That is going to be 75 to 100 jobs in the plant. These are real jobs. These are not government make-work jobs that our colleagues across the way would have us do. We have heard that there is a canola crushing plant coming to Ste. Agathe. That is going to be 45 real jobs. The Simplot company is prepared to put \$200 million into their fertilizer expansion in Brandon. Schneider's is prepared to put \$40 million into hog processing, and we have been told that that is going to produce 500 jobs for the people of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, what more can we ask from private industry than when they are prepared to put this sort of money into our province that they trust that there will be a stable fiscal environment? They trust that there will be low taxes. They trust that the essential human services will be maintained, and we are not talking about empty rhetoric here. We are talking about real dollars that are being prepared to be put on the table, real dollars like McCain at \$75 million; real dollars like Louisiana-Pacific, who are bringing \$80 million to Manitoba; Palliser Furniture at \$7.1 million; Rea Gold in Bissett, Manitoba, at \$37 million.

Economic growth, Madam Speaker, in Manitoba has risen 2.5 percent. Manufacturing shipments last year rose 11 percent. This is not a colony of some faraway economy in eastern Canada. There is real enterprise happening in Manitoba. Bankruptcies in Manitoba for the fifth consecutive year have declined. Retail sales growth in Manitoba in 1995 increased 4.9 percent, and this was double the Canadian national average. Our

population in Manitoba has grown last year over outmigration for the sixth consecutive year.

Not only did the people of Manitoba vote at the ballot box last year, but they are voting with their feet. They are coming to Manitoba because they know that this is a positive place to be. I am proud to be able to say, with this budget that our honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) has presented, that he is putting Manitobans to work. Manitoba is at work. Manitoba is strong and I am proud to say that Manitoba is the best province in Canada to live, to work and to raise a family.

Madam Speaker, the reason it is is because we have sensible fiscal control. We have a commitment which we have met and that we will continue to meet to pay down the debt. We have a commitment to maintain the social programs in this province, so that our underprivileged and our marginalized will be safe, will be secure. We have made a commitment which we have maintained that our children will receive a strong education, so that our citizens of tomorrow will have jobs.

I am proud to say that this budget is in the tradition of Manitoba, and we are going to carry on with this commitment to the citizens of Manitoba. I thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to this budget today.

### Introduction of Guests

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder if I might draw all honourable members' attention to the public gallery before I recognize the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), where we have with us this afternoon a number of students from Japan, from Shizuoka Eiwa Jogain, sister school to Balmoral Hall School.

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

\* \* \*

\* (1700)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I am provided the

opportunity to respond today to the government's budget.

I ultimately believe, along with the Liberal Party, that this is, in fact, a budget that basically keeps this government on course. It is a status quo budget in terms of their political, ideological agenda. It is a budget which demonstrates very clearly that this is a government that does not care for the average Manitoban. This is a government that does not have compassion. It has demonstrated that once again in this particular budget.

We talk a lot about fiscal stabilization, and, once again, I would like to tell you what the Fiscal Stabilization Fund has been to this government in the past. It has been a fund which they have used and manipulated for electioneering purposes. That is the primary reason why we see the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. That is why the Liberal Party voted against it back in the 1988-89 budget, and that is one of the reasons why we do not necessarily agree with what the government is doing with the Fiscal Stabilization Fund currently.

Madam Speaker, we see the balanced budget legislation that was introduced last year. We did not support it primarily for a couple of reasons. One of the primary reasons why I took great offence to it is the fact that it did not take into account the economic business cycle of the economy. By not allowing for that, what you are doing is you are disallowing government to be able to have more of an input or impact when the economy is in the low of the business cycle, and that causes us great, great concern.

The government also talks a lot about freezing personal income tax and freezing the sales tax. Well, Madam Speaker, the bottom line is that for a vast majority of Manitobans, disposable income is going down. It is going down primarily because this government has offloaded many of their responsibilities and in other areas have increased fees. That is the reason why this is indeed quite a misleading document, and when the government says that it is freezing taxes, tell that to the individual that requires pharmaceuticals that now have an additional \$1,000 to pay as a direct result of this budget. Tell that to the individuals that have to pay the increases in different fees. I do not

believe for a moment that those people are going to agree with this government's assessment. [interjection]

Thirty minutes and, Madam Speaker, there is so much that I could talk about. I want to concentrate on a few specific areas. First and foremost, health care. Health care, as we introduced and attempted to get a MUPI in the other day, a matter of urgent public importance, we believe is going to be the issue of this particular session. When we look at it—and we will applaud the government. The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) today condemned me personally and the Liberal Party for our comments with regard to the health card, SmartHealth program, and that is most unfortunate. I do believe, if the government does move in a direction that will benefit Manitobans as a whole that we should in fact applaud the government. This is one of the things—and trust me, they have not done much good in health care—but this is one of the things that they have done, and the New Democrats have gone out of their way to discredit this program.

What they should be aware of is that the New Democrats in Saskatchewan are entering into the same sort of an agreement. In fact, the Royal Bank has also put in a bid in that particular province. What we have to realize is that the technology and the infrastructure that would be required in order to provide a program of this nature is not something in which as a government we would have the resources. Those resources would be much better utilized if in fact they are put into other aspects of health care, and that is the primary reason, Madam Speaker, that we support the idea. This is not \$110 million that is going to the Royal Bank; \$27.6 million, from what I understand, is going towards MTS; \$35-plus million is going towards computer infrastructure. That means purchasing. We in the Liberal Party hope that they negotiated something that would see the local computer companies benefit and manufacturers benefit from it. But as I say, there is a lot more that this government is doing that is damaging health care. So let us applaud them when they do something that is somewhat positive.

Let us talk about what they are doing, Madam Speaker, where they are really putting at risk the way in which our health care is being administered in the

province of Manitoba. I liked Don Orchard and the Action Plan and the former deputy minister, Frank Maynard. I never thought I would have to bring up Don Orchard and say something this positive about the former Minister of Health. His vision of health care reform said that you need to enhance community hospitals. That was his vision along with the deputy minister. You can take a look on page 26 of the government Action Plan in 1992 where it states: Although teaching hospitals are our most expensive, most high tech institutions, they appear to admit many patients with uncomplicated disease who may well be better served at community hospitals. His booklet is full of information that indicates that the Seven Oaks Hospital and the Misericordia Hospital should remain open as community hospitals. What sort of direction is this government taking us? This is a step backward.

Madam Speaker, the decision that is being potentially made here is based on politics and nothing more than that. They will not dare close down the Concordia Hospital because they have Conservatives around there. This government has got to realize that the Seven Oaks and the Misericordia Hospital are viable. The former Minister of Health was correct. If this means that the Deputy Minister of Health in his vision, his biased vision of health care reform on this particular issue, and he sticks to it, the Deputy Minister should resign. Failing that, the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) should resign on this particular issue. This is a bad idea, and this idea has to be stopped. I appeal to all members of the Conservative government to take and listen and hear what has actually happened. Read some of the stuff that the former Minister of Health has said about community hospitals. Why would you close the most modern health hospital that the Province of Manitoba has in the city of Winnipeg? This is a first-class facility. Well, the government members ask, who is closing? I hope that they are not going to close or convert it into a geriatric centre. That is what we hope.

If this government does what is right, they will investigate this and they will, in fact, not accept the recommendation and keep it as an acute hospital.

Let us talk about home care services. What they are doing in home care services is another disastrous attempt at trying to establish a system that is, in fact, not in Manitobans' best interests. What we are going

to see is the establishment of a two-tier health care system. Let there be absolutely no doubt of that. The former member and the Premier and the Minister of Health can say whatever it is they want, but the bottom line is, what we are going to see is a two-tier system. They are going to have a basic core service. That basic core service is, yes, the private companies will administer that. They will not have that charge, but then there is going to be the little extras. Those little extras have to be paid for.

Madam Speaker, those individuals that have the economic means will be more than happy to pay those little extras. Well, not everyone has the same economic means, but this government has the responsibility of ensuring that there is equity and there is equality when we have a program like home care services. What are they doing? They are promoting the division—[interjection] Members across the way say, federal government. The greatest threat to health care reform is not the federal government; the greatest threat to health care reform in this province is this government. They are talking, you know, gambling revenue has more than compensated any federal cuts that have come down from the government in Ottawa. Do not try to pass the buck. Accept responsibility and do what is right.

\* (1710)

To convert home care services, what you are doing is, you are going to create a two-tier system. You are going to see, Madam Speaker, the creation of a minimum-wage, American-type style company that will come in and offer a basic service while another service will be a little bit enhanced for those who have the economic means. We believe that is wrong.

Madam Speaker, before I leave the home care services, I want to emphasize one other point, and that is the Victoria Order of Nurses, the VONs. This is a group that has done a lot of wonderful things for Manitoba, and even if this government continues with its fixation of privatization of home care services, I trust and I hope that there will be given preferential treatment to the VONs because, quite frankly, I have a lot more faith in the VONs than I do in We Care and

the many other private companies that are going to be putting in bids. I hope the government will give some consideration to that.

Madam Speaker, to move on to Pharmacare card, the Pharmacare changes that this government has entered into, the bottom line is that the government moved to this new system in order to save money once again. This is not a system that is going to try to establish a means test which says that if you are rich you will be able to afford the higher deductibles, and if you are really, really poor, well, then the deductible is going to be low. The bottom line is that even individuals living in poverty are still going to have to pay a deductible; there is no incentive. Under the current system, there is more of an incentive for individuals to get those prescribed prescriptions that they would require, because there is a certain split in terms of cost and cost sharing. There are many other models that the government could have looked at. You know, today I received a letter from the MSOS, Manitoba Society of Seniors, and the seniors are greatly concerned about what this government is doing regarding Pharmacare, not to mention what is happening in terms of the home care services.

This is something in which we believe the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) has not been listening to. The Minister of Health has not been going out into the community. He has been listening to individuals that are prepared to support whatever this government is doing and is prepared to agree with that particular line.

Madam Speaker, let us talk about the capital freeze. What a mess. You know, this government makes a promise. They say to the Cancer Research Foundation, we are going to commit the \$40 million-plus to ensure that the Cancer Research Foundation turns into reality.

They said this when in fact the transfer payments of the government, whom they blame, by the way—obviously, they have to find someone to blame—when they believed that the transfer payments were going to be reduced by \$140 million. Not only is it not going to be \$140 million, it is going to be \$100 million, but they knew about it when they made that commitment. So do not go and try blaming the federal government that you have reneged on a promise. Live up to your commitment. You promised the Cancer

Research Foundation this facility. Why are you putting it on hold? [interjection] Well, the member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe) says, well, no, no, no. We are putting it on hold. What are you putting it on hold for? Do you want to wait till we get closer to the next election. Then you can reannounce possibly.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that I have learned over the last eight years is to be very suspicious of this government in terms of the way in which it tries to manipulate the public to try to give them the impression, the public the impression, that in fact this is a government of action when this is not a government of action. If it is a government of action, it is a government of action only for those that are strong. You know, the campaign theme—we all remember the campaign theme, Manitoba Strong under this administration— and when you go through the budget, it is not Manitoba strong, it is Manitoba for the strong. That is what this particular budget points out.

Madam Speaker, what about the profession? Let us look at the health care professions. The disservice that this government has been doing with the professionals, our health care professionals. They do not acknowledge in terms of the amount of stress and anxiety that is out there that this government is creating because of its inability to make good decisions. This is really a disservice. The morale of our health care professionals, I am convinced, is at an all-time low because of this government's actions. You know, we have LPNs which this government says have no role in our hospitals virtually. They will not accept that responsibility. But what has happened? Look at the LPNs, and the LPNs how they are used in the Victoria Hospital. Then you have other hospital institutions that, because of government direction, what the government is indicating to them, are phasing the LPNs out.

We do not know in terms of what the government's real intentions are in terms of health care, and what we really want to do—I should not say that. We do not know the hidden agenda. It is kind of leaking out bits and pieces here and there, but, Madam Speaker, there are, if the government is true or if the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) is sincere when he says that we want to make our patients the No.1 priority, then why

do we not make them the No.1 priority? When you deindex eye examinations, what is going to be the actual result of that? Now we have \$46 that is going to be charged for someone that wants to get their eyes examined. They are going to have individuals that cannot afford to get their eye examinations. What they should be doing then, and we are encouraging them to do so, is to go to a family practitioner or go to a doctor and get the doctor and go then and get your eye exam at no cost.

I do not think that the government has actually thought this thing through. What is the long-term cost of this particular policy? Do not say, well some other provinces in Canada do not do it, so we do not have to do it. What is wrong with trying to be on the leading edge on health care changes, Madam Speaker. We in the Liberal Party in the province of Manitoba do not oppose that. The government should take more of an initiative.

Madam Speaker, I could speak for another hour and a half quite easily on health care, and that is the reason why we wanted to have the MUPI, and we attempted to set right from Day One the provincial Liberal Party's position, and we wanted to hear what the government had to say. I was quite frankly very disappointed that, in fact, we did not have that debate in the Manitoba Legislature and, again, what I was disappointed in is that we had attempted to try to get every member on the record in terms of what they felt about health care and the importance and what they believe about this emergency debate, and we were quite disappointed that we did not get the support from the New Democrats to allow us to have that recorded vote. We do not know what the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), who wore a yellow ribbon last year—that particular member might have voted with us.

There is the difference. The Liberal Party is prepared to fight all the way to protect health care in the province of Manitoba. The NDP are prepared to play the politics of health care. We will not play the politics of health care, Madam Speaker, because we are going to protect our first priority, and our first priority is the patients of the province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, moving on to education, this government, over the last 10, 12, 15 years, we have

seen governments in the province of Manitoba cut back on public education. We have seen an absolute disrespect for our public education system in the province of Manitoba, and that is something that is most sad. We have to realize the importance of our public education. We have continuously relied on the increasing of financing of education through our property tax, through the school divisions. Take a look at 15 years ago what percentage of education was being financed through our school divisions. Compare that to today. You will find that astounding. This is something which the government has to take responsibility for. Under no circumstances whatsoever should a government in the province of Manitoba cut back on the Department of Education. We have to stop that flow of relying on financing education through our property tax—most disappointing.

Madam Speaker, this government's perception or our feelings of private schools is scary. What we have seen is the government says, okay, here is a school. Now, what we do is we take a student and we force the student through it, and if the student does not fit it, it will just fall through the cracks. That is what educational reform was all about under this particular administration, and its actions time and time again clearly reinforce that mentality.

Madam Speaker, the public education system has to be there for all Manitobans, the special needs, the learning disabled, the gifted child. All Manitobans' abilities have to be challenged through our public school system. This government and former governments have not recognized that. They have demonstrated that because they have not allocated the priorities when it comes to dollars and resources. Once again, as the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) points out, this is Manitoba for the strong under this particular administration—most sad.

\* (1720)

Rural diversification—you know something, rural diversification to this government has been putting VLT machines in every little corner in rural Manitoba. That is about it for rural diversification. Actually, Madam Speaker, I can be kind to the government on this. I have another positive thing to say about the government. You will be pleased with this, you should listen. [interjection] Hush, hush. You will be pleased

with this one. It is going to be another compliment, okay? The government, I think, with the elk farms, you know, that is a positive move. I am not too sure about the way in which they are doing it, but the concept, the idea of diversification with elk farms is something which we believe is beneficial. Rural Manitoba will benefit by it.

Having said that, Madam Speaker, let us go, let us continue on. Where is the government going wrong on rural diversification or agriculture? What about the pork industry? Look at the change that they are making to the pork industry. Absolutely amazing. They are prepared to destroy the family hog farm all in favour of vertical integration. They have not consulted with rural Manitoba. They have not consulted with the rural producers—and one of the members, the minister kind of laughs in his seat indicating that he has. They have not consulted.

We have had presentation. We have had discussions with hog producers, and they are totally amazed at this government's inability to make themselves accessible on this issue. They are not listening, and potentially they can destroy the uniqueness of our small hog farmers, and we appeal to this government and in particular the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns).

It is interesting. The Minister of Agriculture wants to pass the buck. I met with a group of individuals and this group says, you know, we believe that the Minister of Agriculture really does support us, but he is saying that it is the big bad Premier. Sounds like he was trying to pass the buck. I suggested to this group of people that yes it is the big bad Premier at times, but I suggested to them that Mr. Enns or the Minister of Agriculture is the dean of this Chamber and he does carry considerable weight inside that Conservative caucus. Do not let him off the hook so easy.

The Minister of Agriculture has a responsibility. When I spoke on this bill I indicated to the minister that we had the faith that in fact the Minister of Agriculture would have been consulting. We were awfully disappointed when we assumed, because the problem when you assume things is that at times it could be embarrassing. I was somewhat embarrassed in the sense that I had expected that he did but only to find out that he did not.



There are many other areas of rural diversification that are absolutely essential. When we talk about the REDI program, the Grow Bond Program, yes, Madam Speaker, there is great potential there, but let us not try to overestimate in terms of this government's initiative in terms of trying to enhance rural Manitoba. What we need to do is to get the communities themselves more involved in economic development in rural Manitoba, because it is those individual entrepreneurs that have the ideas. The former minister or the minister from Roblin-Russell indicates, well, he brought up the small potatoes argument, and we all know actually what the Leader of the Liberal Party was implying.

When you take out the millions of dollars that the VLTs and the gambling policy has done, taken out of rural Manitoba, this government owes a lot more to rural Manitoba than some of the things that it has done. We somewhat—or I should not say somewhat—we encourage this government to take rural diversification a whole lot more seriously than it has over the last eight years.

Madam Speaker, there are other areas of economic activity that need to be addressed from this government. If we take a look at the question of privatization, well, we could talk about the MTS. What is this government's actual intentions? You have 3,000 employees that are out there being employed by a Crown corporation that has served Manitoba well over the years—95-plus years—and it has a future in the province of Manitoba well into the years ahead. This government appears to be putting itself in a situation where we could see MTS being sold off.

Madam Speaker, once you sell it off, it is going to be awfully difficult to buy it back, and what this government will do is they will wholesale it to their friends and that creates a great deal of concern. MTS as a corporation has to stick around because it has a future role in the province of Manitoba, and hopefully this government has put that whole issue far, far back on the back burner and turned the back burner off.

Other economic development issues of course—you know the biggest thing during the last provincial election—I had the opportunity to tour a number of different facilities in many areas, there are some jobs

that are there. The problem is this government has failed at trying to provide the training programs that are absolutely essential to develop the skills so that many Manitobans can fit into these jobs. I had a tour of a lathing company where it was the school division that was actually taking more of an initiative of training than the government. We are going to be monitoring very closely the training programs that this government is talking about now, but the government has to start working more closely with industries as a whole, with our educational institutions at ensuring that there are going to be more skill development training programs and so forth.

Madam Speaker, there is no reason why we cannot start training programs in our high schools. There are many benefits by doing this. We ask that the government approach this whole issue of training in a much more aggressive way, because if we do that at the end of the day we are going to be able to fill those jobs that are left empty which do not bode well for our GDP. So those are the type of things which we have to address.

The government had addressed the one issue of the garment industry. We were quite pleased with the government working with the government of Ottawa in coming up with the 200 allocation for immigrants to fill the garment industry jobs. There are hundreds of other jobs within that industry. We want to see the government training—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Inkster will have two minutes remaining.

The hour being 5:30 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, April 3, 1996

## CONTENTS

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>		Health Care Facilities Wowchuk; McCrae	469
<b>Presenting Petitions</b>		Social Assistance Martindale; Mitchelson	470
Licensed Practical Nurses Lamoureux	463	L. Evans; Stefanson	473
Retention of Hogs Single-Desk Selling Wowchuk	463	Sarah Kelly Inquest Mackintosh; Praznik	472
<b>Tabling of Reports</b>		<b>Members' Statements</b>	
Annual Report under The Trade Practices Inquiry Act Ernst	463	Senior Curling Championship Helwer	473
<b>Oral Questions</b>		Misericordia General Hospital Friesen	474
Eye Examinations Doer; Filmon Lamoureux; McCrae	463 468	Budget—Rural Manitoba Penner	474
Pharmacare Doer; Filmon Ashton; McCrae	463 467	Seven Oaks Hospital Martindale Lamoureux	475 475
Health Care System Chomiak; McCrae	465	<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>	
Home Care Program Sale; McCrae	466	<b>Budget Debate</b> (Second Day of Debate)	
Physical Examinations Lamoureux; Filmon	469	Doer	476
		Derkach	491
		Barrett	497
		Radcliffe	500
		Lamoureux	504