

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 22 February, 1988.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to table, as required by legislation, the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 1987, of The Public Trustee of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a ministerial statement.

It gives me great pleasure to announce that last year the value of mineral production in Manitoba surpassed the billion-dollar mark for the first time in our province's history.

The mineral production and processing industry in this province experienced dramatic growth in 1987 in both volume and monetary value. The value of last year's mineral production, at \$1.016 billion, was the highest ever. This was a 33.1 percent increase over 1986, and beat the previous record level, \$861 million, which occurred in 1985.

The fortunes of the mining and mineral processing sector are important to Manitoba. They are particularly important to many communities in Northern Manitoba. The industry employs thousands of Manitobans directly; and, Madam Speaker, when we consider employment for those providing goods and services to mining and to mining communities, the "multiplier effect" raises this figure to approximately 15,000 people. The industry accounts for about 5 percent of the gross provincial product.

In this sector, which was hit harder than most by the economic recession and the low base metal prices of the early 1980's, things have improved dramatically over the past few years. Since 1984, mineral production has surpassed its pre-recession levels and now improvements in metal prices on world markets, combined with the increased efficiency Manitoba companies have achieved, along with the support of the Provincial Government, the mining industry is returning to good health.

The most significant increases are in gold and nickel production and value. The value of gold produced in the province is up by 70.3 percent, from a 1986 value

of \$41.95 million to \$71.43 million in 1987. This, Madam Speaker, is a 46.8 percent increase in the volume of gold production.

The value of nickel produced in 1987 reached \$386.11 million, a 55 percent increase over the \$247.66 million in 1986. The volume of nickel produced increased by 34.7 percent, Madam Speaker.

We can attribute these record levels to new mine start-ups and increases in average mineral prices. In 1987, the MacLellan Gold Mine experienced its first full year of production, and the new Tartan Lake and Puffy Lake Gold Mines started up. Both of these mines, Madam Speaker, will provide a welcome boost to the economy of the Flin Flon region; and exploration in these areas is also at record levels, which is reason for even greater optimism.

Madam Speaker, it's interesting to note that these gold mines are the first to operate in the province for nearly two decades. MacLellan was brought into production with the help of a \$2 million loan from the Manitoba Government in 1986.

Continued production at MacLellan represents a healthy payoff for the Manitoba Government's successful initiative at that mine. This helped to preserve the economic viability of the community of Lynn Lake.

We expect further increase in gold production in 1988 with Tartan Lake in its first full year and with more gold mines coming into production.

The improvements in nickel production in value are due, in part, to Inco's ability to boost production at its Thompson open-pit mine in response to increased prices.

The increase in nickel prices is very good news. It bodes well for the Namew Lake Nickel Mine. This mine, Madam Speaker, is owned in part by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and is set to begin production in the fourth quarter of 1988.

Madam Speaker, the Government of Manitoba helped to preserve the production in the copper and zinc industry in 1987 with an important initiative to keep the Ruttan mine open at Leaf Rapids open. By agreeing to refinance a 1985 \$10 million provincial loan when Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting bought the mine from Sherritt Gordon Mines, Manitoba ensured continued production at Ruttan.

If we turn our attention to minerals other than base metals, there is reason for optimism there too, as well.

Although Tantalum production decreased in 1987, it will jump in 1988 when Tanco's Bernic Lake Mine and processing plant resume production, following a \$4.7 million refurbishment of its plant at Bernic Lake.

Tanco is jointly owned by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, Cabot Corporation, and the Province of Manitoba.

The mine and processing plant near Lac du Bonnet suspended production, Madam Speaker, at the end of 1982 due to the absence of markets. The Tantalum market has improved significantly and Tanco has secured multi-year contracts for Tantalum concentrates.

This resumption of Tantalum production will mean new jobs and a solid contribution to Manitoba's

economy. Madam Speaker, as I have outlined, we are pleased, as a government, to have participated in many of these projects.

A buoyant construction industry, highlighted by the Limestone Generating Station project, boosted international mineral production in 1987, especially that of cement.

Better crude oil prices also meant a 17 percent increase in the value of petroleum produced in the province, despite a slight drop in volume.

These improvements, Madam Speaker, go hand in hand with an optimistic picture in the exploration industry. During the recession, the search for gold kept exploration expenditures in this province up. The positive results are now visible, such as new mines and new properties being investigated and a diversified mineral base in many northern regions. Exploration for base metals is picking up as well.

We all recognize that these statistics are more than just numbers. They have meant jobs, employment opportunities and stability for both individuals and communities in many parts of Northern Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude by saying that to prosper, the mineral industries in Manitoba must remain competitive. This government recognizes its role in helping the industry strive for increased efficiency and increased productivity. We have fulfilled that role during and beyond the recession period with innovative and useful programming. The results have been satisfying, and we will continue to play our part in strengthening Manitoba's mining industry.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I thank the Minister for bringing us this statement today. I know that all members on this side of the House are pleased to see the return of an up-cycle to the mining industry in Northern Manitoba. We're pleased that the economy of Northern Manitoba has a much stronger base as a result of the changes in world metal prices that have dramatically increased the incomes of all of our Northern mining companies. We're pleased for the 15,000 people in Northern Manitoba who rely on the mining industry for their employment.

We are very pleased that the mining industry has had the positive effect of the changes that they've been able to work their way through after quite a down-cycle in the early part of the Eighties.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I join in congratulating the mining industry for their foresight, for their continued investment and their continued faith and confidence in Northern Manitoba. That makes it worthwhile and a very productive thing for all of us.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the government for its participation in the various projects. I hope that the Minister wasn't attempting to take too much credit for the government's part in the whole issue, because definitely it was the mining companies and their confidence and their investment that made this upturn possible for Northern Manitoba.

I would just remind the Minister and his colleagues that the mining industry is one example of a huge

industry in Manitoba that must have free trade in order to ensure a secure, positive future for it. — (Interjection)

— Absolutely, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, last year, I believe Inco exported better than 70 percent of its production to the United States. It's absolutely essential not only to Inco but to all the northern mining companies that they have secure access to the American market, secure access that can and will be provided as a result of a free trade agreement with the United States. That is important to the people of Northern Manitoba - extremely important to the people of Northern Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, as well, of course, I just want to remind the Minister that his government and some of their policies have had a very detrimental effect on the competitiveness of these northern mining companies; and some of their difficulty in the mid- and early Eighties was as a result of the huge increases in payroll costs that were added as a result of the payroll tax and the skyrocketing Workers Compensation rates.

When I was up in Northern Manitoba and spoke to the senior officials at the mining companies, they were very concerned about the doubling of their payroll additive costs in a very short period of time as a result of the huge increase in Workers Compensation rates and the addition of the payroll tax. Both of those items threatened their viability to the extent that some of those mines were in jeopardy of being closed in the early and mid-Eighties as a result of this government's initiatives and this government's policies.

Madam Speaker, I say to the Minister that he should not rush in to take too much credit. The credit is due to the people of Northern Manitoba and the mining industry that had faith and made the investment that's allowed them to weather the storms and come out on a positive note. So we congratulate those people for what has happened. We're delighted with the progress and the economic strength that's being shown in the mining industry in Northern Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to table the Annual Report, 1986-87, of The Universities Grants Commission.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. W. PARASIUK introduced, by leave, Bill No. 2, The Health Services Development Trust Fund Act; La Loi sur le Fonds fiduciaire en vue de l'amélioration des services de santé.

HON. V. SCHROEDER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 3, The Re-enacted Statutes of Manitoba, 1988, Act; Loi sur les Lois réadoptées du Manitoba de 1988; and, by leave, Bill No. 4, The Statute Re-enactment Act, 1988; Loi de 1988 sur la réadoption de lois.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge to my right where we have visiting with us Mr. Steven Langdon, who is the NDP member of Parliament for Essex-Windsor.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

And may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have, from Murdock MacKay Collegiate, 60 Grade 9 students under the direction of Mrs. Sally Swetz and Mrs. Nancy Trush. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Opinion poll results

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Acting Premier.

It's my understanding that, last week, Criterion Research of Winnipeg has been conducting polling throughout the province on questions such as opinions of the Provincial Government's performance, health care, issues such as job creation, pay equity, and many others.

I wonder if the Acting Premier could indicate whether or not this polling was being done on behalf of her government, or any of its departments, agencies or Crown corporations.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, we do polling from time to time. I don't think that we need comment on each specific one.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wasn't asking the Acting Premier for a comment on the polling. I wanted to know whether or not the polling was being done on behalf of her government, its agencies, or Crown corporations.

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take that as notice, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: In the last Session, on July 6 and on July 7, both the Premier and the then-Minister of Energy and Mines indicated that they would be committed to release polling that was done on the ICG takeover.

At both those times, on the evening of July 6, it was the Premier who made the commitment and the next day in question period the then-Minister of Energy and Mines said: "I have indicated that in due course that material," referring to the polling, "will be presented to the public of Manitoba."

I wonder if she would now indicate whether or not her government is prepared to make that public and table that information in the House.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, in due course, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, two years ago, my colleague from St. Norbert placed an Order for Return in this House for polling that had been done by this government. It was then updated to include subsequent polling that this government has continued to do over the course of the last number of years.

Again, on the evening of Monday, July 6, the Premier, in response to my question, said: "Mr. Chairman, there is an Order for Return requesting that information," referring to that polling. "We will be providing that shortly." "Shortly" was the term he used on July 6.

Is the Acting Premier now prepared to let the people of Manitoba and the members of this House have that polling information?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, given that I had accepted that Order for Return on behalf of the government, as Government House Leader, I feel it would be appropriate to respond to the Leader of the Opposition's question.

As he is aware, having sat in government for a short period of time, and, as other members on that side are aware, Orders for Return are often accepted, but it takes some time to return back to the House.

If necessary, Madam Speaker, we can go through the listing of the amount of time which it has taken for Orders for Return to be returned back to the House by different governments and I can undertake quite clearly that in some instances in the past, those Orders for Return were never returned back to the House.

But in saying that, Madam Speaker, I do want to make it clear that it is our intention to follow through on all the Orders of Return which have been accepted by this side of the House and return them to the House in due course, which is the standard accepted practice of this House over many Sessions and throughout many terms of many different governments.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, this past fall of '87, polling was conducted by Viewpoints Research Limited, on behalf of the government, into a variety of matters which included questions such as: Do Crown corporations, including Manitoba Telephone System, Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, Manitoba Hydro, and Petro-Canada offer good services? Would it be fair to increase telephone and hydro rates and boost Autopac fees 20 percent? Should Crown corporations be allowed to increase charges to create a surplus, to cover costs and to allow modernization?

The president of the corporation who did that polling was Mr. Ashley Blackman, who is also this government's appointee to the Manitoba Telephone System board.

Does the Deputy Premier see a conflict of interest in that relationship?

MADAM SPEAKER: That question seeks an opinion. Would the honourable member rephrase his question?

— (Interjection) — The way the honourable member has worded the last part of his question, it seeks an opinion. Would you care to rephrase it, please?

Conflict of Interest - MTS Board

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, during the fall, Viewpoints Research Limited of Winnipeg did polling, on behalf of the government, specifically into areas dealing with Crown corporations.

They asked questions such as: Do Crown corporations, including Manitoba Telephone System, Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, Manitoba Hydro, and Petro-Canada offer good services? Would it be fair to increase telephone and hydro rates and boost Autopac fees 20 percent?

They asked a variety of questions to do with projects of these Crown corporations and whether or not they created jobs. The president of that corporation is Mr. Ashley Blackman, who is also this government's appointee to the board of Manitoba Telephone System.

My question to the Acting Premier is: Is this not a conflict of interest?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, the matter of the employment of Mr. Blackman and his private sector company is well-known to all of us; and, secondly, all matters are fully disclosed at the board; and, thirdly, he does not deal with any issues. In fact, there was an issue related to a survey which was conducted by the Manitoba Telephone System last summer, which has been made available in the library for interveners for the Public Utilities Board. It's been made public.

Madam Speaker, the member of the Manitoba Telephone System board, who is also a telecommunications expert, disclosed fully at the Telephone Board any possible conflict and was not involved, in any way, shape or form, in any decisions around that survey.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, on March 4, 1987, in referring to the removal of one Mr. Bidhu Jha from the board of the Manitoba Telephone System, this Minister - the Minister responsible for the Telephone System - in commenting on the fact that Mr. Jha had some relationship with the corporation, having sold equipment and also doing some consulting for the corporation, said he removed him because there was a perception of conflict, and that the conflict of interest guidelines had been changed so that members of the Board of Directors could not have commercial relationships with the corporation.

I wonder if he does not see this as being precisely the same kind of situation.

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, as I mentioned last year, the individual which the Leader of the Opposition referred to last year was asked to leave the board. In fact, there was a mutual consent to leave the board because, on a regular basis — (Interjection) — the cheap shots are not necessary.

Madam Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the individual had sold furniture at a higher level and had

more commercial accounts before he was put on the board than after he was placed on the board, I thought - and we discussed it mutually - that it would be an awkward situation for him.

Madam Speaker, he was selling furniture to Bell Telephone companies, he was selling furniture and other equipment to other companies across the country; and I thought, given the fact that he was selling equipment that was generally recognized as top-of-the-line - in fact, even in the business pages of our newspapers was recognized as one of the top-of-the-line - it put him in an awkward basis to be dealing on a weekly basis in a commercial relationship with the Crown corporation. He was in a position of being on the Board of Directors.

Madam Speaker, there's been no commercial relationship between the individual referred to by the Leader of the Opposition and the Manitoba Telephone System; and, secondly, if there was, it was fully disclosed to the board, consistent with the act, fully on the record.

Madam Speaker, I can bring you the minutes where it was referred on the minutes, just like there are members in this House who referred to certain situations pursuant to the conflict of interest acts, where they may potentially be in a conflict of interest. They have disclosed it and removed themselves from the meeting, Madam Speaker. The same rules apply to the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Telephone System as apply to the members of this House.

Madam Speaker, the individual in question has fully complied with those rules and regulations, disclosed and withdrawn himself from the meeting and yet has not had a commercial business, notwithstanding that fact.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

WCB - Cormack Report release

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my further question is to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board, following again on the subject of open government.

Last Session, on April 27, May 4, June 8, June 15 and June 30, I asked questions of this Minister with respect to the tabling of the Cormack Report; that is the report of the Long-term Claims Disabilities Committee of the Workers Compensation Board, a report that was somewhat critical of the government and the government's handling of the Workers Compensation Board and some of their internal problems.

I wonder if the Minister is now prepared to table that report.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I have answered that question on many occasions, and we have done that since this Session has started, and I've told the critic that report is the responsibility of Workers Compensation Board. I have no difficulty with making it public. If they want to make it public, they can do so.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the new chairman of the Workers Compensation

Board, Mr. King, has publicly stated that he wants to have an atmosphere of openness at the Workers Compensation Board, that he does not want to be seen to be hiding facts and information from the public; in view of the fact that at least one other member of that board has said she has no difficulty in having that report made public, will the Minister now indicate that he has no objection to the report being made public so that Mr. King will release that Cormack Report publicly?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, indeed, one of the recommendations of the Legislative Review Committee was that they would become a more open government.

We have started participating in that way. We are more open with both the employers' groups and the labourers' groups. I have just told the Leader of the Opposition, if he wouldn't have been thinking of his next question, I said, yes, I have no objection with tabling the report. It is the responsibility of the Workers Compensation. If they want to release it, I have no difficulty with them releasing it.

Autopac - premium reductions

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for MPIC.

In a recent letter received last week by the various people in Manitoba, about 3,000 in number, I would like to quote from the first paragraph. It says: "The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation has recently reviewed its '88 premium increases which were announced in December. At the time the '88 premiums were established, claim results for the entire '86-87 fiscal year were not available. Premiums were based on estimated experience. After examining these updated figures, however, it has been determined that reductions in '88 premiums were warranted for about 3,000 vehicles."

Madam Speaker, this seems to be another example of back-door politics from this Minister. I wonder if he will now identify what those 3,000 vehicles were, and can other Manitobans, if they petition this Minister, expect to receive similar treatment?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the vehicles involved dealt with a number of classes in which the experience, as noted in the letter, was not available at the time that the rates were in fact struck. The corporation, once receiving its full rating impact for the previous year, made those adjustments.

Madam Speaker, Manitobans did speak fairly loudly in terms of the question of increasing the rates to recoup the losses that the corporation sustained in the previous year, and said that in fact the rate increase should be ameliorated. As a result, the government did move to bring in good driver discounts, both on the driver's licence and on the vehicle licence, to deal with merit drivers, Madam Speaker.

So we have in fact listened to Manitoba motorists and are having and will continue to have discussions with both the trucking industry, the taxi-cab industry and all segments of the industry to try and make sure that the insurance program is the best within the country for the best possible rates, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister.

He did not identify which vehicles these were. This particular letter was received by a tow-truck operator. I would like to know if that is being handled as a group or if this is a singular situation.

Madam Speaker, it is my understanding, within five days of the close of the month, that Autopac has a running total and an update on its claims losses. Their year-end is the end of October. The announcement of the premiums was two days prior to Christmas.

Madam Speaker, will the Minister now make a new statement to clarify the policy of Autopac regarding rate structure for 1988, and establish those rates so that everyone in the public can know what the rate structure is?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend knows that the record claims number in the corporation, the highest number of claims, was sustained in the year previous - 249,000 claims.

There are, in fact, approximately 700,000 vehicles insured by the corporation, and the honourable member opposite is attempting to be mischievous in his calculations that somehow 3,000 vehicles make up the large portion of the premium base of Autopac, Madam Speaker. That is not factual at all.

Madam Speaker, the honourable member will be able to come to committee. We will deal with all the vehicle classes. We'll have all the vehicle classes brought forward to the corporation. We'll come to committee and provide all the information that my honourable friend wishes to have on them, which are all those vehicles that he speaks of, and they will be brought to committee so that everyone can see.

Autopac - renewal extension

MADAM SPEAKER: The Member for Ste. Rose for the final supplementary.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, it seems strange that the Minister doesn't understand it. The letter goes on to say, "We have enclosed new renewal forms which reflect the revised premium." There's obviously a very firm decision made in the corporation.

Madam Speaker, will this Minister explain to the people of Manitoba and to this Legislature why the Autopac agents were not informed of this change in policy?

They were faced, Madam Speaker, with a completely unknown situation, when people approached the counter with this letter. Madam Speaker, will this Minister explain that slip-up, along with the many others that are going on in this corporation? Why is he dealing through the back door?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the honourable member should know that the average increase in terms

of total revenue, premiums earned, as originally announced, was some 24 percent across the board when we announced the rate increase.

Madam Speaker, we listened to Manitobans. Manitobans said that the increases were too high in the short period of time and that if the corporation was to rebuild its reserves, it should take a number of years to do that, notwithstanding comments made by the executive assistant of the Leader of the Opposition, in Toronto, who said they did not campaign against the rate increases, Madam Speaker. They did not stand with the seniors and with the Consumers' Association that the rates were too high. They did not want to interfere in the rate question. But, Madam Speaker, that's fine on their side.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: On a point of order, my executive assistant did not travel to Toronto and make any statements on the record with respect to Autopac. I'd like the Minister to withdraw that comment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, you've said before that a member has to take another member's word for what happened. I ask the Honourable Minister to withdraw the statement, because my executive assistant did not travel to Toronto and make any such comments on the record.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I regret that I may have said that it was his executive assistant. I know that the gentleman represented the Conservative Party of Manitoba.

He is the research director, Madam Speaker, if that's his correct title. I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition, but their research director for the Conservative Party went to Ontario and said that they did not stand with consumers to interfere in the rate question, Madam Speaker - Mr. Bessui, who was the representative of the Conservative Party - they said that they were not opposed to the high increases, that they did not stand with the seniors and with the consumers in this question.

In fact, the Leader of the Opposition now is indicating that he's changed his mind on the whole question of the rates and the rebates that they promised in '86.

Madam Speaker, I'm not . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister has the floor.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, at least on one segment of this question, the Conservatives have been consistent. Through whatever means they can find, they will try and get rid of the publicly operated insurance

system in this province. That's what their agenda is, Madam Speaker, and they intend to carry it on in whatever political means they intend to, Madam Speaker. That's their agenda.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, with a short supplementary.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Obviously, the Minister says that Manitobans have been speaking. They've also been telling him that not everybody . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. CUMMINGS: . . . who has a question has to be politically identified.

The question, Madam Speaker, is there's a line-up at Autopac counters right now, with all of the type of changes we see here unknown to the agents. There simply will not be a possibility of having all the renewals completed by the end of the month. Is the Minister now considering an extension?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, many of those 3,000 vehicles that we spoke about earlier are handled, in fact, directly through the Motor Vehicle Branch. Those changes will be handled and are not handled by agents.

Specifically, Madam Speaker, with respect to the question of extension, there have been extensions in the past and we are monitoring the situation in consultation with the agents. Up to this point, Madam Speaker, the Agents Association have indicated that they will be able to handle the process in time.

However, Madam Speaker, if an extension of some period of time is necessary, we will monitor that and an extension will be granted, given the circumstances at the end of the month. At the present time, Madam Speaker, agents have indicated that they in fact can handle the business.

Senior citizens protection program

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the First Minister.

In the Speech from the Throne over a year ago, this government toted the idea of a program dealing with seniors and the abuse of the elderly. They said, "We will initiate a process respecting a protection for vulnerable adults, particularly the elderly." Manitobans have waited in vain for any announcement about this program, Madam Speaker.

Would the First Minister tell us when they can expect to get this kind of socially active program?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, that particular program is under review at the present time. In view of the many other programs that we've had to institute in order to ensure that we maintain and sustain our

health care system, our community programs, that program is under review, and it may or may not be forthcoming in this Session.

Home care services - review

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Health.

People involved in the Home Care Program continue to wait for the establishment of an appeal mechanism for home care services.

I ask the Minister when, in his view, will they finally get this much needed service?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Could I ask the member to please repeat the question?

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: My question is to the Minister of Health.

Vulnerable people who receive home care services have been asking for five years for an appeal board process. When will this Minister give it to them?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, we are conducting an external review of the home care system. When that review is completed, I'll look at it, and certainly I believe that there should be some mechanism. I'll take the member's question under consideration and report back in due course.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Can the Minister tell the House why, in this Price Waterhouse review of the Home Care Program, those delivering the Home Care Program have indeed been questioned, but those receiving the Home Care Program have not?

HON. W. PARASIUK: That is a fair enough question. I became Minister just as the review began to be undertaken. I had met with some home care workers. I, in fact, sent a letter out to all the home care workers indicating that if they wanted to contribute to the review they were certainly free to do so. They could either contact my office anonymously or by letter and I would pass that on directly so that they would feel very free in terms of their comments, criticism or advice. I think that was a very valid process.

It didn't extend in a systematic way to the consumers, although I believe that there was a process built into the review whereby, on a selective basis, a random basis, consumers were in fact interviewed.

I think that the member's suggestion and hindsight is very good, and I will look into how well that process of consumer identification in terms of causes or concerns was done.

I understood that there was a process whereby it would be looked at, at least in part, but I certainly accept the intent of the member's questions in terms of consumer input, and I'll look into whether in fact it was done well or how it might be improved if we still have the opportunity of doing that.

Bill No. 2 - Health Trust Fund

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health.

Madam Speaker, the Minister introduced Bill No. 2 today, which presumably will develop a trust fund in health.

Can the Minister indicate to the House whether this trust fund is the same trust fund that was announced in the Throne Speech and by his Premier on Thursday, 10 days ago, the same trust fund at that time the Minister had no knowledge of its existence?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, this is a bill that I'll be presenting very shortly to the House. I indicated that I understood that it wasn't in the Throne Speech. I, in fact, have very good knowledge of the fund and I know, in due course, that the Member for Pembina will also be enlightened with respect to the fund and its purposes and objectives. Since the fund will be so innovative, I hope it will get the unanimous support of all the Conservatives to improve our health care system, and I look forward to that support, Madam Speaker.

Crown lands sale policy re Zarecki

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Crown lands.

Madam Speaker, last week it was disclosed in question period that one Walter Zarecki, who is the chairman of the Highway Traffic Board, and vice-president of the New Democratic Party for Lac du Bonnet, received a \$10,000 grant from the Tourism Department.

Madam Speaker, could the Minister responsible for Crown lands indicate to this House and to the people of Manitoba how that same Walter Zarecki achieved getting a piece of Crown land in the Lac du Bonnet community? Did he go through the normal tendering process or was it handed to him like the \$10,000.00?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, the Member for Arthur has chosen to get into the gutter again on this issue as he has on most other issues on that side.

Clearly, there is a policy established for the sale of recreational Crown lands in this province. This policy was adopted in May of 1987. It's a matter of public record, minutes of Cabinet, and that outlines in detail the process and eligibility criteria for the purpose of recreational Crown land under The Crown Lands Act that is in place in this province, Madam Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, the question was: Was the property handed to him or was there a process

by which Mr. Waiter Zarecki got through on a point system as do those people in the agricultural community have to go through to achieve a Crown land lease? They have to go through a point system.

Was this land handed to Mr. Zarecki, who is a government employee, who is an NDP second vice-president of Lac du Bonnet, Madam Speaker, and who donated to the NDP Party, was it handed to him or was there a selection process that he had to go through to achieve that?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, a number of premises are mistaken again by the Member for Arthur. He is referring to the agricultural Crown lands policy that is in place when he talks about a point system.

Under that system, farmers who have leases for Crown land for agricultural purposes can apply to purchase that land, and if there are a number of competing interests, they go by a point system that is in place.

We're talking about a recreational Crown land policy that is in place. It was adopted just about a year ago, about nine months ago, last year in 1987. In this case, the individual that the member is referring to is not an employee of the government but is a member of a board of the government, which is incidental, Madam Speaker, because this gentleman has been working for a number of years in putting together a proposal for the use of this particular Crown land in that area. He has undertaken a study that I understand was financed through another department which acquires the Crown lands.

Madam Speaker, insofar as The Crown Lands Act is concerned, he will have to meet all of the criteria that are in place for purchase of Crown land. They involve eligibility of the applicant, general conditions, land suitability; there are a number of points there. The member can come and discuss this with me at any time. It's a legitimate detailed policy that is in place that is the same for all members of the public when coming forward to government, if they wish to purchase Crown land for recreational purposes, Madam Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I have a final supplementary for the Premier.

I would ask the Premier if he would have his Ministers, the Minister of Tourism, the Minister responsible for the Crown lands policy, table all documentation dealing with Mr. Waiter Zarecki and the \$10,000 grant, all the letters of application and the process that he went through as well, Madam Speaker, and the study; and, as well, the Minister responsible for Crown lands, to table all documentations and the total process that was proceeded through for Mr. Zarecki to get the Crown land gift on top of the \$10,000.00.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the honourable member's question obviously — (Interjection) — proposes . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'm prepared to take this under review, that we table all documentation pertaining to all application for Crown land lease, and that would

include, in various times in the past, applications for Crown land leased by honourable members across the way.

Madam Speaker, there is a criteria that is followed, there are standards that are adapted, and in the past, generally, Crown land leases have been given on a fair basis to applicants that may or may not follow a number of various political pursuits.

Madam Speaker, if the honourable member wants me to file one particular group of documents, I'm not saying that can't be done; then I think we must do it for all applicants so that all applicants are treated alike before this Legislature.

Doerksen - custody action

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to make a correction to a point that I made when answering a question in the House on Friday about visitation rights of grandparents.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, I notice that in the first part of my answer I was indicating that the grandparents would have full visitation rights; but when I get down to the bottom of my answer, I inadvertently said that the parents were in daily contact with the child - had daily visitation rights. They have not had daily visitation rights with the child.

There is a procedure that has been set up that allows them regular visiting with the child and it requires them to make contact with the social worker of the agency. The agency has guaranteed that when they make contact, they will try and set up the meeting within a few hours.

So the opportunity is there, Madam Speaker, but they have not at this time had daily visits with the child.

U.S. mineral tariffs

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Energy.

Early this afternoon in response to his ministerial statement, the Leader of the Opposition indicated that free trade was necessary for the development of the mining industry in Manitoba. I am wondering if the Minister could indicate to the House what the tariffs in the United States are against the minerals that we ship from Manitoba into the United States.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yes, the members opposite want to belittle the question. Madam Speaker, it seems to me that this is one of the keystones upon which the Mulroney trade deal is being sold to Manitobans.

Madam Speaker, for the information of the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite, there is currently no tariff, no tariff on nickel, and virtually no tariff on any other base metal produced in the province.

So I think the members opposite who have no familiarity with mining or Northern Manitoba should recognize that HBM and S and Inco have been in this province for 50 and 30 years respectively and have been operating without the so-called benefits of the Mulroney trade deal.

Finances - 3- or 5- year projection

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, as the Free Press Saturday article so aptly pointed out, social service expenditures as a percentage of the total Provincial Budget has fallen under the term of this NDP Government. No doubt, Madam Speaker, the primary reason for this is the fact that the government has had to direct such a larger amount of its expenditures towards servicing the debt, servicing the debt rather than supporting social service expenditures.

My question to the Minister of Finance, Madam Speaker: Will the government in the forthcoming Budget be presenting to Manitobans a three or a five-year forecast of finances, such that Manitobans will know that there will be social services in place in the next three or five years, such that a larger amount of their scarce tax dollars are not directed towards servicing this massive debt?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

There are a number of assumptions that the member made that are incorrect in terms of the costs and the benefit of services for Manitobans.

Firstly, the reality is that we have been spending more and more money on the social services, Madam Speaker. And if you look at some of the major spending areas like health and compare it to the cost of living, you'll find that costs are going up at a pace higher than the cost of living, at the same time that the support from other levels of the government are shrinking.

The support from the Federal Government for health and higher education, as an example, and other support payments to the province has decreased from some 42 percent down to some 31 percent, which is having a major impact on a province like Manitoba, and not only a province like Manitoba but other provinces in Canada.

Just last week the Treasurer in Ontario, the Liberal Government in Ontario, when explaining the fact that

his recent quarter report indicates that their deficit is going up in a fairly significant way in Ontario, indicated that the major problem in Ontario was the continued decline in federal support payments to that province. There's a province that is relatively affluent compared to most other provinces in Canada.

The same was true in New Brunswick, Madam Speaker, when the Conservative Treasurer in that province indicated the same problem when he brought down his Budget last year. So the member should look at where the problem is in terms of causing the continued stress on our Budget.

In regard to public debt costs, yes, Madam Speaker, public debt costs are increasing. The fact is that we took deliberate action during the very difficult times of the recession to maintain expenditures, Madam Speaker, to maintain the social and economic and educational infrastructure in our province, which I think is paying dividends today. Yes, we have to work to bring down public debt costs, and we have continued to do that, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Would you consider one more question from me? That was not at all fair, Madam Speaker. My question was very precise.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The only way that I could entertain another question would be to have leave of the House. Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Morris with a question.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the members of the House for granting leave.

Madam Speaker, the Minister is so addicted to his own rhetoric, he didn't even answer the question. He didn't even indicate, didn't even come close to addressing the question. The question, Madam Speaker, was: Would the government be bringing forward a three- or a five-year forecast?

Madam Speaker, prejudging the Minister's answer, I wonder why the reluctance to do so. — (Interjection) — Well, Madam Speaker, I won't prejudice it. I'll save my response to his answer for tomorrow's question period.

Will the Minister be bringing forward a three- or a five-year forecast of provincial finances in the years to come?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Now that the question was more direct, rather than the long preamble that the member raised in his first question, I will answer it directly.

He'll have to wait for the Budget. But I can tell him, as I pointed out when we reviewed this matter in Public Accounts, the experience of other governments in Canada is to not do that kind thing. In fact, one of the problems we face is the fact that the Federal Government no longer gives those kinds of projections, and the fact that the Federal Government has a very significant impact — (Interjection) — the fact, Madam Speaker, that the Federal Conservative Government,

to be a bit more direct, is pulling back on any long-term forecast which affects the province's ability to make those kinds of forecasts makes it much more difficult for other provinces.

As I indicated to the member in Public Accounts - and I'll repeat my answer - I intend to review this matter with other Provincial Governments, with other provincial treasurers, to see what their experience is and why they in other provinces and the Federal Government are going in the opposite direction from what the member is suggesting.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development and Tourism.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Madam Speaker, by leave, I would like to withdraw some remarks in Hansard. I referred to the Honourable Member of Lakeside in a manner which I ought not to have. I indicated that . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I recognized the honourable member, assuming he was going to make corrections to Hansard, which is appropriate. Withdrawing - changing Hansard is not quite appropriate.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I appreciate your comment in intervention, but I believe I heard the member ask for leave to withdraw those comments. If, in fact, leave is not forthcoming, then I would agree entirely that it would be inappropriate for him to do so at this time. Perhaps we can test the Chamber to see if, in fact, leave is forthcoming.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

Okay, the Honourable Minister of Business Development and Tourism.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

What I wish to do is withdraw the reference that I made to the Honourable Member for Lakeside during the course of the Throne Speech Debate, which was found in Hansard on page 155. There was some provocation to my remarks. There had been an intervention, but I accused the honourable member of being more familiar with innuendo and smear than fact. For those words, I regret using those words, and I apologize to the Member for Lakeside. I had determined at the outset of this Session that I wouldn't reduce myself to that kind of debate and so, therefore, I want those words withdrawn, Madam Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I ask leave to make a non-political statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, Northern Manitoba's Trappers Festival was held in The Pas in the past week, from February 17 to 21. I'd like to congratulate the Board of Directors for all the work they did in organizing the annual event and for the countless number of volunteers who have given of their time so others could enjoy the festival.

There are four main parts to the festival for the spectators' events. The first is the world championship dog races. The winner this year was Richard Beck, and the Manitoba champion was Brian Pullen. Miss Northern Manitoba Trappers Festival Queen was Vanessa McLean. The Queen Trapper was Diane Buck and the King Trapper was Robert Ducharme. There was a tremendous response from tourists all over the country who came out to celebrate with us in this annual event.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Just on a small matter of order, I was somewhat taken aback by the apology, the drawled remarks, by the Member for St. James. I was just wondering whether, if not in the same spirit, I could not have a special arrangement with you, Madam Speaker, that anything that I may say about the Honourable Member for St. James that would be parliamentary during the course of the Session would be deleted from the transcript.

MADAM SPEAKER: As the honourable member well knows, he is not to ask the Speaker questions.

The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I can also beg the indulgence of the House for a non-political statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Seeing we are in the festival mood, Madam Speaker, I would also like to bring to the attention to the members of the House that yesterday was the closing of the 19th Festival du Voyageur. From here, Madam Speaker, I'll also ask their indulgence to say a few words in French about the festival.

Qui a été le plus réussi de toute l'histoire du festival avec une participation entre 350,000 et 400,000 visiteurs, qui sont venus de tout les coins de la province, et en nombres plus élevés des tats-Unis, et des provinces avoisinantes. Il y a eu une participation de festivaleux plus élevée que jamais. Et je voudrais, en cet occasion, Madame la Présidente, félicité en particulier les 3,000 volontaires bénévoles, sans lesquels le festival ne pourrait fonctioné, et certainement pas avec le succès que nous avons connu, dans ce dernier festival. Je félicite aussi, les membres du bureau de direction et le personnel du festival pour avoir organisé

un festival de cet employeur. Il y eut une participation aussi, de plus de 20,000 étudiants, donc un programme scolaire réussi, et il y a eu, cette année, pour la première fois, on a lancé le festival sur le boulevard Provencher. a été aussi très bien réussi, avec une participation des commerçants de St. Boniface.

Il y a plus de sculptures de neige que jamais dans le passé, et ils étaient aussi très belles, selon le dire de tout ceux qui ont visité le festival. La participation des visiteurs dans le parc du voyageur, et dans le parc Provencher, ainsi qu'au Rendez-vous a été aussi plus levée qu'autrefois, et il y avait là au parc du voyageur, quatre tentes, alors qu'il n'y en avait que deux dans le passé, où ce sont produits des spectacles de chansonnier, de danse, et des artisans de tout genres.

Il y a aussi eu de nombreuses compétitions sportives, tel que les courses en traine à chien, les courses en raquette, le tournoi de balon panier, tournoi de hockey, tournoi international de ringuette, et de hockey, et aussi une compétition d'altérophilie, et un tournoi, que j'ai mentionné déjà, de hockey au niveau mineure, au Peewee.

Madame la Présidente, il y a eu aussi, ça été une occasion pour les francophones de se rencontrer, de resserrer les liens d'amitiés dans la joie, et de rencontrer leur co-citoyen des autres cultures, et se faisant de pouvoir mieux se connaître, et de participer dans plusieurs relais où se sont effectués des artistes venant aussi bien du Manitoba, que des autres provinces. Merci, Madame Présidente.

(English translation to appear in a subsequent issue.)

MADAM SPEAKER: I have a ruling to present to the House.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. D. ROCAN: I wonder if I could have leave, Madam Speaker, of making a non-political statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed).

MR. D. ROCAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I thank the Minister responsible for the Environment for bringing congratulations to all the organizers from the Festival du Voyageur.

Nous avons aussi l'occasion d'être parmi les autres la semaine passée, et puis nous aimerons féliciter les 3,000 volontaires, tout ceux qui avaient donné à leur temps, for such a wonderful festival that we all have enjoyed. So we would like to join with the Minister in thanking them.

(English translation to appear in a subsequent issue.)

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: Now, I have a ruling to present to the House.

On Friday, I took under advisement words spoken by the Honourable Member for Pembina. I have reviewed the draft printout of Hansard and find that the honourable member said, and I quote: "My simple

question to this First Minister is when is he going to start telling the truth . . . "and subsequently, "When do we get the truth from the Premier."

Both quotes contravene a number of Beauséjour citations, including 316(f), 357(1)(a), (h), (i), (q) and (t), and part of Citation 322, which I quoted to the honourable member on Friday.

Finally, the words used also contravene Beauséjour Citation 359(7), which states, "A question must adhere to the proprieties of the House in terms of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of it."

I, therefore, ask the Honourable Member for Pembina to withdraw those remarks.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, not wishing to miss the vote tonight at which this incompetent government shall be defeated, I withdraw those remarks at your request.

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the motion stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

It's a pleasure to get up and speak today when the House appears to be in such a festive mood. It's always good to start off the address, at least, with members on the two sides having a friendly banter back and forth.

Perhaps, Madam Speaker, many members of the House did as I did on the weekend, and were more glued to the television sets in watching this wonderful four-year phenomenon of the Olympics. I have just been amazed at the level of performances that are offered there by athletes from around the world. I'm particularly pleased by the number of Canadian athletes and more particularly those from our own province here at home in Manitoba.

The figure skating competition and the men's figure skating, in particular, with Brian Orser against Brian Boitano, and the rest of the people participating as well, all of the competitors skated just beautiful performances, and the two stars', I suppose - the two Brians - performance was really one fine - it's hard to describe in words, in sufficient superlatives, the accomplishments of those two individuals with the performances that they gave in that competition. There certainly were no losers. They were both winners and they both deserve the highest appraisal for performances that I believe most previously we would not have believed possible.

We have seen many young athletes supersede the expectations that various observers of the Olympics had expected and, in particular, I would like to point out a couple of Manitoba athletes. It's with great pleasure that I saw Lorna Sasseville, formerly Lorna Daudrich of Winnipeg, who I had the honour, several

years ago, on a few different occasions, of presenting her with Manitoba medals for the highest of athletic accomplishment. This lady has now gone on not just to do Manitoba proud but to do the nation proud to be our leading female skier in cross-country skiing.

I'm sure that there is no one more amazed at what he's doing today than Greg Haydenluc from Emerson. Who would have believed that a person from a city in the middle of a prairie would be involved in a bobsled competition and be doing as well as they were! In the first run, I believe they were in third place after the first run, before the event was cancelled.

Others yet to come - one young friend of mine, Paget Stewart, a young man who has dedicated the last four or so years of his life in preparing for this moment in participating for the first time with the Canadians in the biathlon event. Unfortunately, he missed the 20 km. biathlon due to an injury, but he's expected this week to compete in the 10 km., and I can assure Paget that the good wishes of Manitobans are behind him and very supportive of him in his endeavours in the Olympics.

Madam Speaker, moving on to the main text of my presentation today, I would like to first focus a bit on the role that members of the Legislature have, and the political parties as well, and the role that the political parties have played and do play in the House.

(Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

For the individual MLA, it is often somewhat of a Catch-22: you are a representative of your constituents; you are also a representative of your political party. You are selected by your constituents to represent them in the House, and one would hope that the individuals in this House are chosen on the basis of their thoughtfulness, their knowledge, their honesty and integrity, their record - either in office or in the community that they represent, or both, preferably - and, of course, as well, their party allegiances.

Within the political parties, our parliamentary system started out essentially with no political parties, or one, I suppose, would say that those who favoured the king were on one side of the king and those who started to question the rule of the king began or eventually evolved to sit on the opposite side of the Legislative Chamber in the earliest of days.

People started to evolve according to political ideologies into their respective camps or inter-respective allegiances and alliances were formed. We see that happening still today in areas where there aren't necessarily formal political parties participating, such as City Hall, where we have 19 members of City Hall elected as independents but effectively functioning as an organized political party in the so-called group of 19.

Political parties are generally made up of persons who believe in a general philosophy towards the role of government in society. They are a diverse collection of individuals, many holding opinions that are not necessarily consistent all the time with a leading party position. Traditionally, constructive debate has been brought to the fore within parties and debate has been encouraged. Through debate, we gain a better understanding of issues and better decisions generally are a product of those debates.

Political parties are generally made up of persons who believe in a general philosophy towards the role

of government in society. They are a diverse collection of individuals, many holding opinions that are not necessarily consistent all the time with a leading party position. Traditionally, constructive debate has been brought to the fore within parties and debate has been encouraged. Through debate, we gain a better understanding of issues and better decisions generally are a product of those debates.

Political parties are generally made up of persons who believe in a general philosophy towards the role of government in society. They are a diverse collection of individuals, many holding opinions that are not necessarily consistent all the time with a leading party position. Traditionally, constructive debate has been brought to the fore within parties and debate has been encouraged. Through debate, we gain a better understanding of issues and better decisions generally are a product of those debates.

A party that demands absolute uniformity is doomed to ideological suffocation and a resultant decline in relevance that always follows. The party that encourages debate keeps an openness to ideas, new, old and reformed. It also keeps the party closest to the public, the mass majority of whom never get involved in political parties or particularly in joining political parties.

New ideas were the essence in the formation of the CCF, and I'm proud to say that those ideas, and new ideas, are still welcome within the New Democratic Party.

It is with some regret that I noticed recently with Mr. Donald Johnston, a federal member of Parliament from Montreal, a former Liberal Cabinet Minister, who has felt it is not possible for him to sit with the caucus any more in the federal Liberal Party because, essentially, he was excluded - he was shunned - from the party; and the leader, weakly attempting to show who was in control of the party, told him there was no room for him within the party.

If that is the attitude that the federal Liberal Party will play, both for its own members in the House of Commons and for other participants in the Liberal Party, the Liberal Party is doomed. I am confident that my own party will never take that course and I think, traditionally, the Conservative Party has certainly not been a party of uniformity of ideas, although when it has had the emphasis put on uniformity of ideas and a lack of dissension, it has generally eroded in popular support, let alone having the active support of its own membership and the key members of . . .

Within the parliamentary process, it is not at all unusual to have members of a political party differ in opinions and to state those opinions publicly, and even to vote according to their conscience or their particular opinions on a particular issue. I note with interest, just in the middle of January in the British House of Commons, there were some 19 Tory MP's voted alongside the opposition parties in favour of a bill to reform the catch-all Official Secrets Act. Dozens more abstained in that vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, because it is not unusual to have individuals speak - and there have been many instances of individuals that have spoken both eloquently and with determination - it has profound impact on the future of their political parties. Perhaps the best of our era, at least in this century, the most clear example of that, of course, was Sir Winston Churchill, perhaps the best known antagonist towards

his own party, having left it twice before returning to lead it through a most difficult period of time, the Second World War.

Disraeli, another eventual Prime Minister in the 19th Century, also differed greatly - frequently - with his political party, but eventually came to lead that party for the longest period, I think, than any Prime Minister ever has; and the longest period of political dominance of two particular people, being Disraeli and Gladstone, throughout some 40 or 50 years in the British House of Commons.

The sad thing today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the media, driven by their editors' need for a story and the desire to create the issues and events of the day, play dissent as a prohibitive practice and a negative force. God help us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we and our political futures, for those of us who are MLA's, are afraid to speak their minds because they're afraid of being branded freethinkers, or in many words that the media plays or chooses to describe individuals who may have some differences with their political parties.

In Rousseau's words, as was quoted by the Member for Burrows, the Deputy Speaker last week, he said, "A man is born free and spends his life in chains." Let it rest with the media to make sure that the chains are not tightened in this Chamber by their decisions to play up any kind of dissent and for the desire to make a story.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, further along, the role that we as individual members play in this House, I would like to see - and I called for this a couple of years ago, as well - a much stronger presence and a much stronger role for us to play as individual members of the Legislature, particularly within the committee structures. We need to strengthen the role of the individual member, we need to give them more initiative, and we need to give them more participation in the process of governance. It will, unfortunately, require a revolution in our approaches within this Chamber, at least to the role of committees, for usually our committees have fallen into the trap of divisiveness based not on principles but of playing politics.

In the House of Commons, I am pleased to observe that they have initiated a very substantial number of reforms in this particular area and certainly the committees of the House of Commons, many of which or most of which, I think, are performing quite effectively.

There are some committees of course that have been near-shows, such as the one that came across the country looking for participation, or so-called participation, into the free trade arrangement. That I do not believe is satisfactory, and I hope the Government of Canada will have learned something from that. Certainly, the members of the committees who participated gained no great deal of satisfaction in participating in that particular forum because it was stacked politically and the outcome of the committee was written long before the committee had its first meeting.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would hope that within this Legislative Chamber we can move beyond that and that our Committee of the Whole, as well as the individual standing committees, can begin to function in a far more effective way with the purpose that we're elected here for, and that is to get down to look for both difficulties, look for areas of success, reward

success, and work to change the areas, be it programs, Crown corporations or whatever, that are having difficulties to try, together, to present not only alternatives but also a path for a steadier and greater stability into the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the evolution of social democracy, I believe, has been probably the most important single development in western societies during this century. In Europe, virtually every country has had a social democratic administration during at least a few of the last 40 years, and they have set the parameters within which all governments function.

Social democracy to me is fundamentally concerned with the equality of opportunity - that is, working to develop a social contract between a state and the individual. It is not a one-way street. Both must accept responsibility. The state must guarantee the opportunity of access; the individual must accept the duty to take advantage of that access to the best of their abilities and of the opportunity presented.

The essence of the relationship is that the product or service offered must be of value. It must be something sought after and worth seeking. It must build the individual's perception of their self-worth within a society. I'd like to give a couple of quick examples of this. Perhaps the simplest examples can be looked upon in education, health and social services.

In education, it's the state's responsibility to provide the best education possible from the earliest years to the highest level of academic achievement.

For the individual, their responsibility is to take advantage of those offered facilities and programs and to perform the best that they are able to. They must also be aware of the investment the society is making in them and to treat that investment with respect.

In the area of health, the state must, of course - it is now accepted - provide the treatment to the sick and the injured through the best organization possible and within its financial capabilities.

The state has more recently also taken on the responsibility to inform the public of methods of maintaining good health, as well as introducing regulations and practices, to regulate practices and substances which endanger the public health.

The individual must accept responsibility for their own lifestyles and conduct themselves in such a way as to maximize their good health and not to abuse the health delivery system.

Within social security, the state must provide an income security net, which will enable the individual and their dependents the means to survive a period of employment loss, and loss of income along with that.

The state must also provide a network of educational, social and job information services to facilitate the individual's return to the work force. The individual has a duty to use these services constructively so as to return to the work force as quickly as possible.

This is essentially how Canadian society has evolved, producing a society where there is concern for one another and a sense of civic duty and responsibility. In my opinion, our society is slipping from our sense of mutual responsibility both between ourselves and within our country.

Through many years of relative prosperity and a profound ethos of liberalism, we are now, in my humble opinion, losing our sense of duty and responsibility and

replacing it with one of individual rights, a concept that has been quite foreign to the development of our nation. We, as individuals and as a society, are demanding far too much of government. We all have rights; we have lost our sense of our duties. Governments and political parties promise the sky and people have come to expect it, even if their institutions have to borrow from tomorrow to pay for their services today.

Individually, we, as Canadians, don't save as much as we once did, and many don't think twice about borrowing for vacations or borrowing for present wants rather than present needs, and hoping that the future will be rosy enough to pay for those debts that they incur.

I would like to give a couple of recent "Letters to the Editor," one to the Brandon Sun where an individual by the name of Don H. Slimmon - I don't know the individual at all - but he wrote a letter to the Brandon Sun, and I'll just quote a couple of parts from it. He said: "With wide open opportunities in a country where there is freedom to participate, we have become mentally irresponsible and lazy. Our entire concept and effort seems to have grown into a crescendo of the government can do this or the government should do that, all the time sitting on our duff while it becomes fatter. We drink coffee and ale and complain.

"We only have to look at our provincial and national debts to awaken to the fact that we ask government to do for us, and it usually takes three times as long and three times as costly as if we did it ourselves. In the process, we have become even more lazy.

"It is with amazement," he goes on to say, "and with pleasure that I see that Mr. Len Evans has taken a highly unusual step for a politician and has acted as a catalyst to a local group in the gas price situation, instead of promising great things from the government. Would that more politicians adopt this attitude in putting the onus for constructive action back on those who are concerned and will be affected. I'm not sure how far the gas bar idea will go, but how do we know if we don't try?"

He goes on, and I'll conclude with this quote: "I'm just as tired as anyone of government promises to do for us many things we can do for ourselves. The more they promise, the more we sit. To me, Mr. Evans' proposal is sound and it offers no government financing."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are in a period in this country where I think that we're looking forward to a very uncertain future, and we are not in the least prepared for it and we have not been preparing for it at all. We have huge consumer debt, highest levels ever, lower levels of individual savings, at the same time that our government deficits are at an all-time high.

In Michael Wilson's federal Budget last week, it was noted that the debt of the Federal Government is to reach \$300 billion this year. That is 53 percent of our Gross Domestic Product. The interest costs alone on those represent an annual obligation to pay over \$28 billion, and we have to make those payments before we can make any other payments because they are statutory. You cannot tell the people who have lent money to you that we're going to put off paying back the debts. When we come into that sort of situation, we'll be the northern Brazils and Perus of the world, and I have no intention of letting our society evolve and fall that far.

Also this \$28-plus billion that we're paying in interest represents 30 percent of the Federal Government's budgetary revenue. In other words, 33 1/3 cents of every dollar of taxes they collect has to go to pay interest for services that they offered in the past.

Much of this debt was accumulated under the previous Liberal Government but, even with that, the majority of it has been accumulated since the Conservatives have taken over in Ottawa.

As bleak as this appears, it does not account for all the Provincial Government debts, both direct and guaranteed. When they are added, the national debt of the country rises dramatically. I believe it's up in the vicinity of \$360 billion to \$370 billion.

We have got ourselves as a nation into the situation where we are the second largest debtor country in the world. We have approximately \$172 billion, according to the C.D. Howe Institute, in foreign debt in this country.

More significantly, Canada is carrying almost half as much foreign debt as the United States with an economy one-twelfth their size. This is from an editorial in the Globe and Mail from February 3, 1988. In 1986, Canadians paid \$12.4 billion in net interest to foreigners compared with only \$3.1 billion in net dividends. Indeed, the net outflow of dividends is generally decreasing as Canadians make more direct investments abroad than foreigners make in Canada.

Interest payments on Ottawa's debt have already been noted as being 30 percent of their budgetary revenue. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot continue in this vein. Essentially, we have worked ourselves into a position where we have very little flexibility left.

Perhaps the province with the most inexcusable large deficit is the Province of Ontario, where the Liberal Government there has continuously given in to additional spending, where they, with the strongest economy in the whole country have continued to add large amounts to their deficit, that at a time when they have had the lion's share of the last six years of steady growth in the whole country.

To me, the idea of a balanced budget is not something that belongs to any particular ideology. As a social democrat, I believe in balancing budgets. When one looks at other social democratic administrations in Europe or to our sister province just to the west in Saskatchewan, we have seen that they have generally operated with budgetary surpluses. Tommy Douglas took over a virtually bankrupt province left by the Liberals back in 1944. He turned that Province around, balanced budgets and provided for services as they could provide the services; and he, in a relatively poor province, began to offer the most wide and broad schedule of public services of any province in the country with far more fairness and equity than anyone had previously dreamed of.

Allan Blakeney followed in his footsteps and I am pleased to note that Roy Romanow, the new leader of the NDP in Saskatchewan, is again campaigning on the need for budgetary restraint and balanced budgets. It is ironic that a right-wing leader like Premier Devine in Saskatchewan preaches fiscal responsibility and has done the exact opposite for their short six years in office, have contributed virtually everything to the public debt of the Province of Saskatchewan. It is much like south of the border with Ronald Reagan campaigning about the terrible deficits that they had in the United

States under Jimmy Carter and now he has multiplied that by something like six-fold since he has taken office.

The deficit in the United States is just simply unacceptable and is one of the primary reasons that there is so little stability and so little confidence in the financial markets before us today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to give you just a bit on my own philosophy of the need for flexibility and the need to maximize our elements of flexibility within our individual budgets, our corporate finances, as well as government finances. For individuals, we have to adjust our living standards and our cost of living according to our capacity to pay for them. The same applies to corporations. For corporations, as with individuals, it means keep your fixed costs down; don't overload yourself with debt; allow yourselves for flexibility.

In corporate terms, they talk about liquidity, and liquidity is needed for some flexibility when they get into a situation where their revenues are dropping. If their revenues drop too far, they'll be bankrupt in no time if they have a very high level of fixed interest and other fixed costs. For governments, it means for us to maintain our expenditures at a level that enables us to have a good enough credit rating and sufficient reserves so that if the economy turns downward, we'll be able to take money from our reserves, and if none are available, at least to borrow money because of our fiscal responsibility in previous years.

In a downturn, the government needs to inject money into the economy. Unfortunately, for the past number of years, since 1982 at least, within the North American and essentially the Western World, I believe we've lived in an economy that I call a "heroin economy." It has constantly needed huge injections of additional money to keep it afloat. The question now that's being raised is whether or not the injectors are willing to keep injecting that amount of money and are still going to loan those vast amounts of money to our governments to be able to pay for the services of today from tomorrow's money.

We have allowed ourselves to consume so heavily today that we have borrowed from a very unpredictable future. Tom Wolfe, a major U.S. social commentator and writer, I would like to read a couple of quotes from an article that he wrote, and it was excerpted in the Toronto Globe and Mail on January 14 of this year. In talking about the future, he states: "The next century, I predict, will compound this century's notion of a future as something exciting, unexpected or radiant, as progress to use an old word."

He goes on to say about what the people in the 21st Century, when they look back at us and how we have conducted ourselves in the 20th Century, he says: "But above all, they will look back upon the 20th as a century in which their forebearers had the amazing confidence, the Promethean hubris to defy the gods, to try to push men's power and freedom to limitless, godless extremes. They will look back in awe, without the slightest temptation to emulate the daring of those who swept aside all rules and tried to start from zero."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the worries that I have, being a relatively young person of my generation and not quite reaching the fourth decade of my life, is that my generation is the first generation that I'm aware of in recent times at least which has threatened today to

present our heirs and future generations with less of a future to look forward to than we have had. No doubt, they will still be paying off our debts well into the end of their generation, unless we can bring more control into how we are dispensing and putting obligations upon those people into the future.

We have to get our own houses far more in order. I for one believe that we, not as individual members of the House alone or not in any particular political party but we're in this as a country together - it's our responsibility to get ourselves out. We're not going to get ourselves out by going into election campaigns like we both did the last time and promising more and more and more.

We have a Federal Government who, it looks by the last Federal Budget, have given up on fighting the deficit and trying to — (Interjection) — Well, I give the Federal Government credit for stopping the growth in the federal deficit. I don't give them much credit for giving up on trying — (Interjection) — I don't give them much credit for eliminating the prospects of further reducing it. They have now put it off for the next three years at the same levels, and you can't project what's going to happen in the next three years any more than I can. But I don't believe that in the next three years they are going to be any more capable of paying back these huge accumulated deficits that we're accruing in this country any more than we are today.

So, Mr. Wilson, due unfortunately to political pressures - and this comes into the public itself where it must accept some deal of the responsibility, because it continually is bought by the people who offer the most money. So the individuals who are voting, the individual citizens of our country have a shared responsibility in where we are today, because they do not emphasize when they go to the polls and do not emphasize, between going to the polls, sufficiently the need for governments of all stripes to reduce the obligations that we're putting on to future generations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've only got a few more minutes left and I would like to spend a couple of minutes on Crown corporations because it's something that's near and dear to me. I believe very strongly in the role of a public sector in the economy, particularly in the areas of utilities, in providing of essential or compulsory services.

We have Crown corporations because they have historically been able to provide a better, a more efficient service to the recipients of those services. That is why we have a government-owned hydro utility, and that's common virtually across the whole country. Similarly, several provinces have telephone utilities - one municipality, and some small municipalities, as well, have their own telephone services - because they collectively could provide a better and less costly service than could the private sector.

We now have I believe a responsibility, and it's not unique to ourselves, but perhaps one of the biggest weaknesses we have in running our Crown corporations is the lack of the need for Crown corporations to generate profits.

The profit of a Crown corporation is not something that just disappears or is something that is taken out of the ratepayers' pockets. The profits enable, in all instances, to reduce the amount of borrowing required by the utilities for their future expansion, and their future

expansion and upgrading is necessary in all of our utilities. It's an ongoing thing; you cannot escape it.

For every \$10 million of profit we earn, that's \$10 million less we have to spend to maintain a similar level of Capital expenditures. It gives us greater flexibility; it gives us, I believe, a more responsible attitude toward the running and the responsibility of our Crowns to be self-sufficient.

Recently, just in the month of January, the Manitoba Telephone System, of which I'm very proud to sit on the board, adopted a new mission statement, and as soon as the Page returns, I would like to pass this mission statement out so all members of the House can receive one. I would like to read it to you because I'm proud of the document. I think not only is it well stated, but it provides a good direction for that firm for the foreseeable future.

The MTS mission is stated as: "To serve the province and its people, by overcoming the barriers of time and distance, to telecommunications solutions, outstanding service and superior products. Our corporate goals to achieve this mission are, to provide customer satisfaction; to be financially responsible and self-sufficient; to pursue aggressively market opportunities; to provide equal opportunities and to develop dedicated, well-trained employees; to be a good corporate citizen; and to keep the public well informed."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that those as general guidelines would be well to be adopted by any corporation in this country and in this province.

We have, in our corporations - in our Crown corporations in particular - a responsibility to become more accountable and to become more open with the public who are our ultimate owners, and through the establishment last year of the new Crown Investments Corporation to act essentially as a holding company for our major Crowns, will, I believe, facilitate the improved access and the improved accountability of our Crown corporations. It necessitates the corporations to get out into the public to have more direct public consultations.

Something I would like to add to the already growing list of requirements for our public Crowns is the generation on a regular basis, perhaps one month after each quarter, of quarterly financial statements.

I say that because I believe that if we are offering quarterly financial statements there would be less room for surprises. We wouldn't be a year-and-a-half or a year after the fact, or six months after the fact, before we realize or the public realizes as well that their public corporation is having some difficulties. The people would be able to respond more quickly and be able to, as well, in the management of the corporation, be at greater liberty, I suppose, not only to discuss but also have an obligation to discuss the viability of the corporations.

I believe that this idea of quarterly reports would be much stronger even than the request to go through the Public Utility Board process. For the PUB process in itself, while it can be beneficial, is also an extremely costly enterprise. I believe, in general, it has been beneficial.

Sometimes I wonder, when one looks at the presentations and some of the presentations that have made to the Public Utilities Board recently on the hydro rate request. People making statements before the

board are essentially saying that present-day consumers have no obligations toward funding up front a portion of future major Capital requirements such as generating stations.

I do not think it is at all irresponsible to go ahead and to bank some money so that when you start into a major new enterprise, be it a transmission line from the north down to the south, or be it construction of a new plant, that we should have some money up front to cover the first couple of years of construction of that plant. It would reduce dramatically the amount of interest that is required for the funding and the construction of that plant; and the interest costs are even greater than the cost of construction in the long term on any of our major utilities, at least within Hydro, on any of the power generating stations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in regard to Autopac, I have been somewhat distressed at some of the arguments that have come from members opposite and some of the media in attacking our Public Insurance Corporation for the provision of automobile insurance. I think it has been highly irresponsible in many instances. I don't mind whatsoever having constructive criticism, but I fear that much of the criticism that has been labelled and levelled against Autopac has been an effort to destroy the corporation.

If that corporation does not get back on its financial feet and generating profits to reduce not only last year's losses, but also to eliminate this year's losses which are still expected, even with the substantial rate hikes that we've had, the corporation is still expected to lose money unless there is a profound decrease in settlements on personal injury claims and a decrease in the number of accidents in this province. We, as drivers, have to share some responsibility there as well.

Let us not live on cloud nine thinking that we can have the ultimate in services and coverage and not pay for those services and that coverage. It is just not possible. It's not possible in a private corporation; it's not possible in a public corporation.

For us to run our Crown corporations, even in some instances having Legislative requirements, virtually, for them to run as break-even operations, you build no level of flexibility when you are continually - just barely - meeting your cost. One bad year puts the corporation in a very difficult situation not simply in a financial status, but more importantly perhaps, for some of the corporations in the public trust.

For when the public trust disappears for a Crown corporation, no matter how legitimate that corporation may well be, the future of the corporation is grossly in doubt. Perhaps most distressing is that if that corporation or if any particular Crown was to go down, in a Crown offering in a utility sector, you can bet your bottom dollar that whatever company comes in to replace that and pick up, providing those essential services, will be doing it at a much higher level of cost to the individual ratepayers than our utilities now, or expect to be charged in the future.

One concern I have for the other Crown corporations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that because of the amount of media attention and the amount of outrage that has been manipulated around the Autopac issue, we will run some risk in the future of not providing sufficient rate increases to enable our other major Crown corporations to finance ongoing major reconstruction and new construction projects.

We have to be able to fund those as we go along, at least partially, and we have now been relying far too much on the major capital programs, be it financed totally out of debt equity or our depreciation allowances. I believe that we have to start generating far more cash flow in the corporations to reduce the amount of borrowed funds that are required. If we go into any type of recession whatsoever, all the corporations will be at substantial risk, not only the Crown corporations, but I believe all of our governments across this country. There is not one right now that is running on a balanced budget, and that is after we have had six years of substantial growth.

I call on members not only on my side of the House but members opposite as well to work together through the committees of this House, through debate in this House, to build and to bring a greater degree of expenditure control in particular, in the future expenditures of our province and that we, working together, can build a better future in the province. Working apart and just with a constant small narrow political bickering, we are not going to accomplish anything because we have failed to accomplish what is expected of us in the past number of years.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

It is again a privilege to address the Chamber in this one of our more important debates that we have in the Chamber, the other one being, of course, the Budget Debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I extend my customary and usual congratulations to all of us for having survived yet another year and being prepared to conduct the government's business once again. That includes the Speaker's staff and other people who serve us in this Chamber.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had some specific advice for the Member for St. Vital, which I'd like to dispense with later on; although allow me to say that listening to speeches of the kind that we just heard from the Member for Inkster, which I believe was probably if you had to go back and research the speeches that he has made in the House, by far one of the more responsible, common-sense, intelligent speeches that we've heard from the Member for Inkster for many a year and I congratulate for him that.

Recognition comes slow on the part of members opposite but I, for one, am somewhat buoyed by the thought that if it can come at all to a member like the Member for Inkster, then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there surely must still be hope in this province of ours that responsible, sane government can prevail.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I try to make a point of listening to many of the speeches in the House. I seldom go back and reread the speeches - I mean that is asking a great deal on the part of anybody - but I did so in the case of the Honourable Member for St. Vital when he addressed the House a week ago Friday as Mover of the Throne Speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is certainly not unique or uncommon for a member of the Opposition to be at

variance with his government from time to time. That has happened. Certainly, it has happened within the ranks of the party that I have been long associated with. It has happened within this Chamber that I can recall. Members opposite won't, but certainly a member from the North, Mr. Gordon Beard, who was less than pleased with the performance of the Conservative administration in 1969, took considerable time of the House to make the Government of the Day aware of the fact that as far as he was concerned, his government wasn't performing in the way that he would like it to perform.

Indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may recite a bit more history, he then went on to win that election in 1969 and came back into the Chamber and sat as an independent and became very influential in terms of that period of time, when the then newly elected New Democratic Party formed a minority government, prior to the time that my now departed friend and colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, chose to make his move, but it was a Conservative member, Mr. Gordon Beard, who at that time played a pivotal role in the affairs of the Provincial Government.

So Mr. Deputy Speaker, simply for the Member for St. Vital to unburden himself and to criticize his government is in itself not so unique. But Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is perhaps unique about his situation is the occasion that he used to do it with. He was after all, the Mover of this government's Throne Speech. By and large, the whole idea of a mover or seconder - we do that everyday in our House. If I'm asking my colleague to second a motion for me, as we often do, I'm assuming that he is supportive of that motion that I am presenting, or else he distances himself from me and refuses to allow his name to be used to move or to second that motion.

So it is a rather unique situation that we have a former Speaker of the House, senior member of the party of the Government of the Day, unrecognized, I might add, by the Government of the Day, but taking the occasion to make the kind of speech that he made while moving the Throne Speech. However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for those of us who listened to the Throne Speech, for those of us who have read this Throne Speech, we can understand that too. We can understand that too.

I do have some specific advice for the Honourable Member for St. Vital. I give this advice in all seriousness. As I mentioned, I did take the time to reread his comments of Friday last. I interpreted his speech as not so much of a long-time party faithful party worker, sitting party member, elected member, of a betrayal or of a decision that he had already come to with respect to his future with the Government of the Day, but one as using his position and using that occasion right at the start of the Session in moving the Throne Speech to issue a pretty clear warning, a pretty clear signal, some pretty sound common-sense advice to his party colleagues who form the Government of Manitoba today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when he suggests, as he does, on page 22 of his speech last Friday, the government will probably turn around and say that's nothing new, we know all about that - referring to some of the criticisms that he had in his speech - we've heard all those problems before; we're dealing with them, they're

in hand; we really don't need any more criticism from you; we're getting enough from the Conservatives opposite; then the Member for St. Vital goes on to say: "if they take that point of view then my remarks would have been wasted, and I might as well not have said that. But if they take them as they were meant, as a constructive assessment, if you like, of the present situation in the province, maybe the topic once defined can be addressed and maybe it can be cured."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's on this, I think, reasoned observation made by the Member for St. Vital that I now offer this very serious advice to the honourable member. I interpret it as an expression of hope on his part, that his colleagues, his government, does take seriously, does take the heart of the affairs of state in this Province of Manitoba. I take it that he, in his speech, does hope to influence them in their decision-making over the course of this next Session. He says that by the way he places his remarks. I, of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking in support of the motion that we're speaking to, namely, the resolution of my leader, would in the first instance encourage him to support that resolution.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am also only too keenly and well aware that the move to do so, to contemplate doing so, is a very difficult one for anybody who has served a political organization, who has dedicated himself to a political organization, particularly for the number of years, and I might add, with the style and class of the Member for St. Vital, is indeed a great deal to ask and very difficult.

I offer him this advice. I suggest that during the supper hour adjournment he takes his lovely wife, Valerie, out for supper and contemplate the affairs of state in the Province of Manitoba and not show up for the vote at 9:30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am offering him this opportunity. He knows that action will not defeat the government. I want the government defeated, and I'm asking him in the first instance to come and join us and help them defeat the government. That of course is the advice that I am giving him; that advice is being given in a straightforward, forthright manner. We are honourable gentlemen in this House and from time to time we have to make hard decisions. The kind of speech, the kind of sentiments that the honourable member expressed in this Chamber would surely lead one to believe that that is the right course of action, that is the decision that he should come to.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if that decision is too agonizing for him at this moment, there is of course that other decision at this point in time still to make and that is simply to allow him some time to see whether or not this government has accepted his advice. Have they thrown away the words that he uttered last Friday?

Surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that his first clear indication perhaps will be as early as Friday next when the Budget is brought down. In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that the Member for St. Vital has a great deal to contemplate on this particular day. I want him to know that he has certainly, perhaps in a way that hasn't happened too often in this Chamber, certainly not in the kind of heated, partisan debates that we've had during the course of most of his political life and mine in this Chamber, that an individual member, a single member can, in fact, fundamentally alter the

destiny of the affairs of state in this province. And I say without hesitation - without hesitation - to bring about the kind of improvement and respond to the kind of hope, to respond to the level of anticipation that is out there, the general public, that somehow this government and this government's life will be brought to an end. And I reach out to my colleague, the Member for St. Vital, and ask him to join us in seeing that happen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate that members have over the years - and traditionally - used the Throne Speech Debate to allow themselves the widest possible latitude in discussing all manners of concerns that they may have, or that indeed their constituencies may have, and that of course is a much valued tradition which I have no objection to. Technically, of course, we are supposedly directing our comments towards the Throne Speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not seen a Throne Speech that has so debased its currency in terms of what a Throne Speech ought to be, because a Throne Speech does have a very serious and important purpose in any Legislature, any parliamentary system. A Throne Speech sets out, agreed in broad and general terms, the directions of a government. A Throne Speech also has a rule that includes the specific commitments of a government. Common terminology in a Throne Speech is: "My Ministers will; my Ministers will do this; my Ministers will undertake that."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can read through most of this Throne Speech and find all of that missing. We have, in effect, a propaganda document here on free trade. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're going to be debating that issue. I don't know precisely in what form. I suggest, though, I suspect it likely will be in some form of a resolution. We'll certainly be debating it on a daily basis, you know, every other day in question period. The government has already debated this at considerable government expense through various meetings throughout the width and breadth of the Province of Manitoba, and so have we, although any meetings that we've held, of course, have been at our expense or at our sponsor's expense, and not on the backs of the taxpayers.

So what is this that is filling up five pages of the Throne Speech with respect to free trade? Where are the commitments? Where are the signals? Where is the direction that this government intends to take during the course of this Session and those Sessions still remaining to this government? Or did they have a premonition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there were not going to be any more Sessions of this Legislature, that in fact this Session was going to be cut short and that they just had to fill up the pages, they just had to fill up the pages with some verbage?

A MEMBER: They're groping.

MR. H. ENNS: Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's what it is. That's what it is.

Where were the kind of commitments and promises made in previous Throne Speeches by this administration, or have they learned from the misrepresentation that they contained in previous Throne Speeches that it's best not to say anything in any Throne Speech?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, some years ago a Throne Speech promised a Freedom of Information Act. We've actually passed it.

A MEMBER: Yes - two terms ago.

MR. H. ENNS: But do we have freedom of information in this province? No. Three Throne Speeches ago, a Throne Speech specifically mentioned three major hydro sales, export sales to the U.S., that would safeguard us from the kind of rate shock that Hydro ratepayers are now facing - a fact that the vice-president of Finance just alluded to in the last weeks in front of the Public Utilities Board hearings, saying that Hydro is going to be short \$40 million.

But three years ago, three Throne Speeches ago, this First Minister and his Cabinet Ministers had the audacity to put into a Throne Speech that they had concluded three major export sales to the United States. Where are they? Where are they, Mr. Minister of Energy?

A MEMBER: Surely we can be forgiven for talking about the truth.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is perhaps the reason this present Throne Speech is so bereft of any substance. They realize that some people do take the time to read them; some people do recall what was in past Throne Speeches, and so it's best not to be specific. It's best not to show any signals; best not to give any indication at all as to where you're going.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll show you how generous the Opposition was prepared to be. In discussion with our caucus, not breaking caucus confidentiality, but the general impression of caucus was not only of course what would be in the Throne Speech, but - well, we might even be persuaded to applaud them if they suggested in the Throne Speech that they would now be ready to proclaim The Freedom of Information Act.

What kind of answers have we received in the course of this short Session so far? In due course; in due course.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that kind of track record leaves you with little confidence in what little substance there is in this Throne Speech, certainly gives Manitobans little encouragement for their immediate future and certainly encourages all of us to do all we can, starting tonight, to replace this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reference, and the major reference in the Throne Speech with respect to the free trade issue, and in particular its reservations about what a potential free trade deal with the United States of America can do with respect to our energy sources is expressed in the Throne Speech.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of distortion - well, I'll even be stronger - the kind of fear mongering that this government has embarked on with respect to the free trade deal has seldom been seen before in the annals of this province, if indeed in the annals of this country. That's what it is - blatant anti-Americanism - blatant anti-Americanism at its worst. But we should have expected nothing less from this government. They, after all, are that group that rejoices at the burning of an American flag. They are, after all, that group that has successfully driven out the American Consul

representation that we for 65 years had here in Winnipeg, servicing not only us but visiting Americans. They are the government that won't even finish double-laning a highway that leads to the border because they don't particularly want Americans to come to visit us and they don't want us to go and visit them.

Well, that's just about how foolish it is, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I see the Minister responsible for Autopac gets a chuckle out of that. He was in the House when his Minister of Highways, one Honourable Joseph Borowski, stood up in the House and gave that as a reason why they did not want to double lane No. 75. They did not want to encourage north-south tourist traffic.

A MEMBER: And he was there.

MR. H. ENNS: And you were there. You were part of that Cabinet, Billie. Pardon me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should not be referring to him by name.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fear and the distortion that is now being paraded by this government and they are spending taxpayers' money on - and I will restrict myself strictly to the energy field - the fact that somehow or other, under the free trade deal, the Americans will be able to seize our energy sources or take our energy when they want it. That, of course, prompted that infamous remark from the Member for St. James about if we did not give them everything they wanted, the United States Marines would come marching in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they know better because in 1973 and 1974 a minority Liberal Government, supported by New Democrats, Mr. David Lewis, all voted in favour of an international energy accord which has far more onerous obligations on our energy resources than the present free trade deal. It means that we share our energy, not just with the Americans but with the other Western industrialized nations as well. That bill was brought about because of the crisis after the immediate energy situation, the OPEC decision in 1973. What really caused unnecessary harm to western economies was the kind of, you know, grab while the grabbing was good, the hoarding of whoever had what energy was available to them. That caused a great deal of turmoil in the western democracies.

So to avoid that, in what I call a laudatory, complementary bit of international statesmanship, the western industrialized countries each agreed to pass legislation which would, in the event of another energy crisis, empower an international board to in effect ration, to in effect provide mandatory controls on how energy was to be used, including those of Canada's, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Every New Democrat, including Mr. Broadbent, and every Liberal, from Mr. Trudeau down, supported that in the House of Commons in 1973. That act was further amended in 1974 and it was further amended in 1979, which sets out the mandatory obligations that we have under these pieces of legislation in the case of an energy crisis.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is the Mulroney-Reagan free trade deal that is now, all of a sudden, going to jeopardize our energy. What hypocritical nonsense! What dishonesty, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Why are they doing it? Why are they doing it? It's only somehow to

colour our American friends in the worst possible light. I can't understand, and I will not forgive them for doing that. That is not in the interests of Manitobans. That is not in the interests of Canadians; that is in the interest of small mean-spiritedness, balkanization of one country. And you have the audacity to talk in your Throne Speech here about Olympian ideals of sportsmanship rising to the top. My good Lord!

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they can be found so wanting on just one example of where a most extreme distortion is taking place with respect to free trade, where they know that for some reason, particularly in a province like ours, in Manitoba, with the climate that we have, on a cold winter's day with the wind blowing like today, of course, the ordinary citizen would be concerned if he thought for a moment that Uncle Sam could all of a sudden turn off our energy switch, all of a sudden turn off our base heaters, turn off our stock waters on our farms.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is never going to happen. You know that. What's even worse, all of them know that, but they're prepared to use that on the hustings. They're prepared to use that at their tax-paid sponsored meetings to whip up anti-Americanism, and to whip up the anti-Americanism that they generally grovel with - hardly the subject matter for a Throne Speech which is supposed to be uplifting, which is supposed to show us some light, some guidance for the future.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find that so discouraging on the part of honourable members opposite. They are swimming so mightily up the stream of public opinion on this one. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm not fooled. They will convince and they will scare a certain number of our citizens.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you travel through the rural parts of Manitoba. You talk at some of the meetings that we've had. You talk to the 69 percent of the 1,500 businesses in Manitoba who enthusiastically support free trade. They do so knowing that there will be some hard adjustment. They do so knowing that there will be some jobs lost, but hopefully others gained. They don't need this kind of distortion, this kind of fearmongering that is being handed to them officially and, what is worse, paid for by their own money, by their own tax dollars.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I look forward to the debate with respect to free trade, whatever form it takes in this Chamber. I know that, without question, I have the substantial majority of my constituents supporting me in the position that I'm taking in it, as it is in the case with most instances, in most communities, where everyone has the opportunity for a reasonable, rational presentation of the events.

The crime that is being omitted by the government, because I find that so many of the people who are writing to me or phoning me about free trade do not know enough about it, and they need to know more about it. But what they don't need to know about it is government propaganda. Give us the facts and let the people decide.

I should not really let the Liberal Party off the hook on this issue. You know, Sir Wilfrid Laurier surely must be turning over in his grave these days when you consider that he lost a national election on that issue. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say this with some caution, because it is critical of a party that I represent. It's

critical of the traditional Conservative point of view which all too often in its history has opposed expansion of trade with the Americans, but then principally because they were also extremely concerned about maintaining the ties with the Empire which, of course, no longer is there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me assure all the members opposite, they will lose the debate on free trade and they will lose the support of many Manitobans, particularly if they continue to argue in the manner that they have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, just to touch on one more topic before I conclude, it was a shocking headline in the government's favourite media source, the Winnipeg Free Press, the other day: "Tax rise triples inflation rate, records show." Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can recall earnest social democrats lecturing the House from time to time in the past, about saying there's nothing wrong to impose taxations to provide a needed social or humanitarian service. There's nothing wrong to put a sales tax or put a larger personal income tax, preferably a larger corporate tax, on the people of this country or the people of this province, and to provide the Medicare services, the hospitalization services, the other social programs and physical programs, whether it's highway construction or enhancement of our parks and so forth. That's what governments are for. That's how the argument went.

Of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to some extent, we've all accepted that point of view, although I think that some of us are now recognizing that we have probably stretched the limits because there is a difference between my socialist friends and Conservatives. I am not prepared to take away all a person's earnings and retain it as government taxes and just dole back to him what I, in my wisdom as government, think he ought to retain. I still think it ought to be the other way around, that a willing taxpayer pays to the government a certain portion of his earnings to provide the services that he deems are necessary from time to time.

But what do we find now, after six years of this glorious government? Taxation that is going out of sight, tripling in six years, well ahead of inflation. Have our benefits tripled? Are we tripling our hospital beds? What's the situation with psychiatric services in this province? Have Autopac benefits tripled? Their rates have or just about, but the benefits went down. The benefits went down!

This finally is the position that this administration finds itself in, and it really is the worst of all worst situations, where you are forced into a situation where you have to tax more and more and provide less and less. That, in the final analysis, is going to be your epitaph and will cause your collapse. What a legacy you've left for somebody to try to straighten out, for somebody to try to resume control, to try to bring our finances back to some sense of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if nothing else, this Session should be remembered by all Manitobans as a Session where a spendthrift New Democratic Government has so debased, so abused so many of our institutions, including our Crowns, have so pushed and prodded the upper limits of Manitobans' capacity for paying taxes, and, at the same time, expecting them to mutely accept diminution of services. If there's any advantage at all of having this government before us, it is hopefully

that a lasting, lasting memory of their mismanagement will be remembered by future Manitoban voters.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Before I begin, I would like to pay tribute to the former dean of the House, the former Member for St. Boniface, who served the House as an MLA and as a Cabinet Minister very well for a number of years.

I listened to all of the speeches over the last week. I enjoyed them all, especially the . . .

A MEMBER: All of them?

MR. J. MALOWAY: All of them, especially the previous speaker, the Member for Lakeside, again, made one of his spellbinding speeches. Once again, he made a lot of good points, but all of them are wrong. The member for Lakeside reminds me of the story about a fellow who was out in the desert and there's no water around and he keeps seeing mirages. He's thirsty for water, he's thirsty for power, and power eludes them.

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is really the story of this group over here. They really feel that they have the natural right to govern this province. In the last five elections, they've lost four of them. They get so close, but they manage to miss. I think they're desperately trying to get over here. I think in the final analysis, we'll find that even if we go through an election, they will still be over there; we will still be over here.

I wanted to deal for a moment with the Tory philosophy on debt reduction. In Opposition, they make a lot of noise about reducing the deficit. That's all you hear about the horrors of deficits. When they get into government, what has been their experience? The three provinces with the highest per-capita debt are Conservative provinces: Newfoundland, New Brunswick and I'll give you the other one later.

The fact of the matter is that the Federal Government, the Mulroney Government, has increased the public debt by 60 percent since he became Prime Minister. Now that public debt is over \$300 billion. The Manitoba public debt is one of the lowest on a per-capita basis. Our public debt charges are \$100 per capita lower than the national average. So this story that they are trying to sell, that they in fact, are going to reduce the debt, it just doesn't work. In fact, in Manitoba, we are doing a better job than they on a national basis of getting the public debt under control.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the area of tax reform, the ordinary Canadian families are now paying an average of \$1,200 per family as a result of Tory tax reform. You know the fuss they made about tax reform, they sold this thing as a major initiative on the part of the government. We, on this side, knew what would result. What would result is higher taxes for working people and lower taxes for the people they pick who pay their campaign debts; they're the rich people in this country.

Taxes in gasoline have gone up 32 cents a gallon under the federal Tories in the last three years. Just two weeks ago, they raised another \$300 million by

raising the tax on gas another cent in the recent Federal Budget.

The Federal sales tax has gone up 3 percent. Two weeks ago, they added another \$2 million in such taxes. They've raised the tobacco and alcohol taxes four times. They've added a 10 percent tax on long distance calls. They've added taxes on air travel. They've deindexed family allowances and the child tax credit, and this is all part of their commitment to the sacred trust. Remember that? I think people still remember all that great puffery and talk about the sacred trust and I think when the federal election comes about, they will reward the Conservatives again and give them what is their due, which is not going to be a lot of seats.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

We all remember how they tried to cut the old age pensions. Madam Speaker, as recently as last Saturday, as a matter of fact an article in the Free Press under the title of "Tory Turmoil" - that's got a nice ring to it, an accurate, nice picture as well - they say, as recently as Saturday, that rumours about the ambitions of the MLA for Brandon West, that's the "deputy alligator" over there, actually the Trojan horse in the alligator kingdom, because most of them think that the alligator crowd over there is limited to the Member for Springfield, the former deputy leader and the Member for Morris. I think there's a couple of other quieter alligators who have their own agenda and, of course, they talk about the ambitions of the MLA for Brandon West in terms of leadership. Of course, we'll watch with interest as to how that whole sorry story unfolds.

In fact, the head alligator, the Member for Pembina, said in that article that Filmon said he would know when to leave. I think that Mr. Filmon knows it's his last Session here as leader and he is engaging in all the theatrics that he can manage, in an effort to hold onto that leadership which is threatening to slip away from him. In fact, the Brandon leadership convention in November is going to be a pretty messy scene, I would think, and that's where the real swamp draining is going to occur. — (Interjection) —

Well, you know, within their caucus they have different views on a whole bunch of issues. — (Interjection) — At least we have a consistent view coming out of the caucus and communicated to the public. You people can't get it together. The Member for Tuxedo supports tax increases and that certainly flies in the face of what some of his other colleagues have talked about. In fact, he wants more like his Federal Leader. As a matter of fact, Fred Cleverley wrote an article in the Free Press recently, again claiming that it was time to clean out the swamp.

Of course, the Member for Springfield, I mean he was on record within the last month stating that it was time to bring back Jake Epp. Jake Epp was going to come back to Manitoba and take over the government. As a matter of fact, the Member for Portage La Prairie actually made a very interesting comment when he said that Jake Epp should be running in Springfield. So, Madam Speaker, it will be very interesting to see just how many Tories actually show up for the vote tonight. I'm not so certain that the alligators over there really want their current leader to become Premier, because I don't think they wanted to go so high in the polls so

quick. I think they were hoping to get rid of their leader and then . . .

I would like to suggest to the Member for River Heights that if she supports the defeat of the government, she may be hurting herself in the process, because in fact she cannot gain electorally, in terms of seats, with one party at 50 percent in the polls. She would lose her own seat, so I don't see where her interests lie in any way in helping to defeat the government.

You know, there's people who would say that there's lots of leadership in the Conservative ranks over there, particularly when the current leader is in California, and we now know that now that he's back, they're dropping in the polls, so perhaps it's time to send him on another holiday south.

The federal attempts to control their deficit have been a combination of cutbacks in everything from the environment, the National Research Council, health and education. They've brought in record tax increases. — (Interjection) — Oh, I don't think so. I think they're in very good shape there.

Wilson, himself, said the deficit will go down only \$400 million in 1988, and while he will cut over \$300 million in government spending - and again he hasn't announced where he's going to be cutting these programs. It's not surprising that the Tory tax reform measures have resulted in fear of taxes for the wealthy and more for everyone else. And again, the Member for Tuxedo, last year, went on record as supporting the net income tax and he said and I quote: ". . . that it was a laudable goal." He said, "It works toward getting those who benefit the most paying their share."

Now in January of this year, he asked that the hydro rates go up further than the 4.5 percent hydro proposed. So on the one hand he will say that the rates are too high, and on the other hand he says, no, you're not bringing them in high enough. Now what does he want?

Last year we listened to him defend high natural gas prices. He opposed the takeover of the gas company, an exercise that I believe we should follow through and I still think we should take the gas company over. But the fact of the matter is that if we had not taken the initiatives that we did, the consumer of Manitoba would have paid a lot more in terms of higher gas prices. That whole exercise was successful to the extent that it lowered the price of gas to the consumers in Manitoba, and that's a fact. You can't deny that.

Also, their whole stance in the drug price issue of last year, no doubt they're happy now that the drug prices have gone up. The latest news, just last week, is that the multinationals are now selling their own versions of generic drugs in an effort to bankrupt the other generic firms that are making the product.

So, you know, this is all part of the - well surprises if you ever elect these people. They will promise one thing to get elected and then the reality will be an awful lot different. I think Manitobans remember back to 1977, when they took up Flyer on you people and you saw what happened - the first one-term government, I believe in this century, and if you happen to squeak through - just happen to squeak through in the next election - I predict that it will be the same sorry story again. One term and you'll be out.

The restraint to these people means cutting old age pensions. You never hear a Tory when they talk about

restraint and when they actually try to practise it. Do they ever cut back on grants to their business friends? No. It's necessary to attract business and so they have to hand out the carrots and dump bucketfuls of money into companies that probably would build the plant anyway. But they know they're easy marks - at least the companies know, that they're easy marks for government handouts.

So where do they cut? They cut old age pensions, they cut family allowances, social assistance, apprenticeship training; they contract out government services. There really is a Conservative agenda. I think that a good number of people in Canada and in Manitoba really understand that. You don't see that until they get into office.

For example, privatization, that is one of their latest buzz words. They're carrying it out with a vengeance in Britain. They've got around to privatizing half the country. They've been working on the airports. I've said for a couple of years now that there are some of them over there who would like to privatize the roads, sell the roads, set up toll roads.

The Member for Pembina certainly didn't discourage me when I suggested that earlier this day that we would twin Highway 75 at taxpayers' expense, get it all ready so that a new Tory Government could sell it off to the highest bidder or maybe pay somebody to take it. Ultimately, where does this privatization philosophy take them? How far are you willing to go?

A MEMBER: Too far.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Well, this is it. The provincial Tories, what would they do with rent controls? They might say that they're going to protect the renters in election campaigns, but as soon as they get back in they'll try to exempt or eliminate rent controls, low hydro rates, telephone rates, MPIC rates.

If given the chance, they will come in and basically do exactly what the Devine Government is attempting to do in Saskatchewan where in fact in Saskatchewan they've got a fellow in from Britain who has been making a lot of money, actually he was I think Margaret Thatcher's advisor on privatization. He did so well there and made so much money that he's over here now. I don't know whether he's operating on a contract or maybe he just gets a percentage of what he managed to get privatized. This guy is working very hard with Grant Devine to get as much of the province sold as possible before the NDP comes back in power in the next election and then has to sort out the mess and try to take these things back.

I don't know what they would do here in Manitoba, maybe they would sell Hecla island, maybe they would sell seniors' homes, the roads, the universities. We have no idea how far they would go. They won't tell us. They're not going to tell us. They're going to wait till they get elected, then they will decide. They will do some studying. That's typical Tory strategy.

Madam Speaker, Manitoba's economic growth has been the second best in Canada last year. Most independent forecasters expect our growth to exceed the national average. In fact, a lot of people, the Member for Minnedosa being a former banker, would probably put some credence in bank forecasts and bank reports.

The type of forecasts that we were using last year came from banks, came from financial institutions, which said that Manitoba was doing very well, relatively speaking. But you know, again they — (Interjection) — Well, you know, when they give the government good reports, I suppose we want to repeat that as often as possible. In fact, Madam Speaker, more Manitobans are working now than ever before. Our agenda is very clear. We believe in more employment opportunities and job training for our young people. We believe in continuing to diversify the economy. We believe in setting out the implications of the trade deal for Manitoba, which I'm going to deal with in a couple of minutes, new health special initiatives, consumer protection and efforts to assist rural Manitoba, as far as grain prices are concerned.

Madam Speaker, we have established programs, such as the Jobs Fund, Careerstart, Jobs and Training, the Youth Business Start and the Community Assets Programs. These are going to continue to be very valuable programs for all of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, Manitoba has Western Canada's best growth record and it has the most diversified economy in Western Canada. The Toronto Star said last year that Manitoba has the healthiest economy next to Ontario, and it's dropped its "have not" tag, which certainly has not been the case with Alberta and Saskatchewan. I mean, they've been in virtual declines in the last couple of years; the members opposite know that.

Again it seems that no matter what the Conservatives seem to touch it turns into a mess. You look at the Conservative Governments across the country, they've developed, what, 6 or 7 out of the 10 governments and how many do they have now? They've been losing them, losing them on a regular basis.

The healthy economy and reasonable interest rates are expected to continue, to encourage strong buyer demand in 1988. Now, this is according to the Real Estate News in Winnipeg, so certainly the real estate industry is fairly bullish on the Manitoba economy. In 1987, Winnipeg's resale housing market was fueled by a strong and diverse local economy and a growing retail sector and low unemployment rates are expected to spur consumer confidence in 1988. Now this is the Winnipeg Real Estate Board, Madam Speaker.

Last week, Madam Speaker, we saw several examples of the Manitoba approach, the province loaned \$600,000 to Fripp Fibre Forms to set up a \$4.75 million egg carton manufacturing plant in Winnipeg. Now this plant is to serve Western Canada and is the first ever started on the Prairies. This, Madam Speaker, is an excellent example of diversification in the Manitoba economy. Also on Thursday, Madam Speaker, a feasibility study for a generic herbicide, which can save prairie farmers literally hundreds of dollars each per year, was announced.

The funding, Madam Speaker, for Manitoba universities was announced and that is a 4.5 percent increase, which is equal to Ontario's increase and three times that of Alberta. In other words, Manitoba was able to give a three-fold increase relative to the Alberta Government and there is an example again of a Tory Government at work.

Madam Speaker, the Minister of Community Services and Corrections announced a new Remand Centre, which will relieve overcrowding, outdated facilities and save taxpayers' money on transportation of prisoners.

The Minister of Tourism announced a record year for tourism despite a drop in tourism across the rest of Canada. The Minister of Northern Affairs, Madam Speaker, announced funding to assist Indian Bands in their efforts to focus on improving child care, health care and improvement of economic development on the reserves. Other projects, Madam Speaker, include the health trust fund, improving telephone service, particularly to rural Manitoba. The income stabilization plan for cattle feeders, the northern economic strategy, housing plans, the improved Landlord and Tenant Act, and labour standards changes.

Madam Speaker, the past experience with Tory Governments again, as I mentioned before, shows that they never make good on their promise to reduce the deficits. The three provinces, okay, New Brunswick will have the third highest provincial debt per capita along with Alberta and Newfoundland. Now collectively, in terms of years, how many years have the Conservative Party been ruling those three provinces? It adds up to quite a number of years, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, let's deal for a moment with the Free Trade Agreement because I know members opposite are very, very quick to hop up and down, telling us that we're all wet, that we don't understand how important this Free Trade Agreement is for Manitoba and Canada. Let's just take a look at this.

Simon Reisman said that the Americans bargain like a Third World country. Let's have a little test here. Who said the following; whose quote is this? "Canada-U.S. free trade is like sleeping with an elephant. It's terrific until the elephant twitches and if it rolls over you're a dead man. This is why free trade was decided in an election in 1911. It affects Canadian sovereignty and we will have none of it, not during leadership campaigns or any other time." Who said that? Who said that?

He goes on to say: "Canadians rejected free trade with the United States in 1911. They would do so again in 1983. Canada must increase its share of total world trade which has dropped by 33 percent in the past two decades." Who said that? Your federal leader, the Prime Minister, Mr. Sacred Trust himself. If you can't believe the Prime Minister, who can you believe?

Madam Speaker, how about this? "Unrestrained free trade with the USA raises the possibility that thousands of jobs could be lost in such critical industries as textiles, furniture and footwear. Before we jump on the bandwagon of continentalism we should strengthen our industrial structure so that we are more competitive." Who said that? Joe Clark. I believe the Member for Arthur even supported this man for the leadership in '76. If he didn't, he knows people who did. The former Prime Minister, their former leader said this. Obviously, they don't feel too comfortable with it.

Here's another one: "The Canadians don't understand what they've signed. In 20 years they will be sucked into the U.S. economy." Who said that? — (Interjection) — No. Clayton Yeutter the U.S. trade representative. Or this Madam Speaker: "The momentous move towards uniting the two countries economically is very gratifying to me. For more than a decade my pop urged in his newspapers that Canada become part of the U.S." Who said that?

A MEMBER: William Randolph Hearst.

MR. J. MALOWAY: William Randolph Hearst - right on.

Another quote: "As a sovereign nation, Canada can sign whatever trade pact it wants with the USA but we would never sign such a trade deal like the one Canada signed. We won't be giving away our oil resources to do a trade deal. Mexico intends to be an industrial nation not a mere provider of raw materials." This statement was made by the economic advisor to the president of Mexico.

One final: The free trade deal would devastate the Canadian wine industry and throw thousands of hard-working Canadians out of work. We're not sure about that one either.

Finally, Madam Speaker, as Pennis Adroar (phonetic), who is Israel's senior official in Washington, put it last year: "My opinion is that Canadians gave up a hundred times more than the U.S.A."

Over the past three months, we've heard a lot of nonsense about Autopac from the members opposite who should know better. In fact, Manitoba's rates are actually fairly reasonable in relation to other provinces. In fact, rates have risen dramatically across the country and, in Ontario, they're still much higher despite huge losses there.

In fact, Madam Speaker, companies in Ontario want to raise their rates 30 percent in the next year. As a matter of fact, one firm, Safeco - and it was reported in the Globe and Mail last week, Madam Speaker - Safeco are wanting a 30 percent increase in their automobile rates. As a matter of fact, Safeco said it needs 44.1 percent to break even in Ontario.

Across the industry, \$330 million, Madam Speaker, was lost on auto insurance in 1986 and, between 1982 and 1986, premiums in Ontario rose 55 percent. Losses and expenses rose 68 percent, and losses on bodily injury claims rose a total of 84 percent. A no-fault system and a tort reform are being studied in that province, and of course that is something that we're going to have to deal with here. We have set a commission of inquiry up to in fact hear representations on items of that nature.

Now, Madam Speaker, I wanted to just note a couple of articles. Frances Russell on Saturday, February 20, noted a few - and by the way, Madam Speaker, it might be instructive to start with some comments from the Tory Autopac critic, when in fact, on MTN he said, on February 3, when asked, "Would the Conservatives consider selling Autopac," his answer was: "If Autopac is not saveable, that's the only alternative we have to get real profit-oriented or, if you will, low cost because of competition back into the insurance industry of Manitoba." His leader, the leader from Tuxedo was reported in the Free Press on February 17 as saying: "Filmon said his party would open Autopac to private competition. He said management of the Crown corporation may be cured by farming out some of its business."

Well, Madam Speaker, regardless of how many times they would not privatize Autopac, never believe it. It's part of the overall agenda of the Conservative Party. In fact, they were attempting to do it last time, but the stars were not in the right configuration in the sky, and so it didn't happen. But given the right opportunity, Madam Speaker, they would do it.

In any events, Frances Russell obviously can see through this as well, and she has dug up information

to show how the private industry works on many occasions in Ontario. She takes - and I'll just give you a couple examples, Madam Speaker, because I have four or five here that are very, very good.

An 18-year-old male driver in Kenora had one accident last year. He's now paying \$5,295 for his car insurance. How would you like to have to pay that kind of money? This person is driving an '87 Ford Taurus with a million public liability and a \$100 deductible. We have another situation where a tow-truck owner - and these people are the friends of the tow-truck owners. I think today they were making some case for a tow-truck owner. Premiums for his five vehicles jumped to \$37,000 from \$5,900 two years ago. He shopped around and he got it for \$22,000.00. You know, that's free enterprise. He could go wherever he wanted and he did. He went to a company that got it for \$22,000, but that is a heck of a lot more than he was paying before. He went from \$5,900 to \$22,000.00 - that's freedom to choose. They raised his deductible to \$2,500.00.

Madam Speaker, in Ontario, they have a bad-risk grouping called the facility association. According to Frances Russell, premiums can run as high as \$10,000 to be a member of that facility association. Now this is what these people would like to see happen with Autopac. Madam Speaker, it's amazing that we could, in fact, get ourselves back into this kind of a situation that we extricated ourselves from some 15 years ago.

Madam Speaker, Gordon Sinclair, he's back to writing columns now and he's learned something too. After this big fuss about 20 percent increases in Autopac rates, now the guy in the very end has got around to doing a survey, which he should have done in the first place, but now he's doing a survey. What has this survey showed him? It showed him, he says: "What our survey found . . ." - and this is Saturday, February 20, so just a couple of days ago, he says - ". . . just as Autopac officials had been telling us, Manitoba drivers aren't the only ones being splashed by a big, red puddle. After years of happy motoring, ICBC - the British Columbia equivalent of Autopac - lost dump trucks full of money last year, although no official figures have been released." And he says Saskatchewan is in a like situation. Where was all this information, where was all this fair reporting two or three weeks ago when he was running around spreading fear? Now he's seen the light.

"Auto Plan in B.C.," I have an article here from Auto Plan and it says: "All drivers will pay higher premiums in 1988, average increase \$90.00. The reason is a steadily increasing number and cost of vehicle insurance claims. The cost of injury-related claims increased by 24 percent for the first 10 months of '87 over '86. Everyone contributes to the insurance pool to pay for the misfortunes of a few." That is a promotion put out by the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, Madam Speaker.

Just another point on Autopac before I finish with that subject, what the Member for Concordia pointed out in his speech - and I think should be repeated as many times as possible, and will be if we see ourselves in an election campaign - and that is that, if we had not set up the Public Insurance Corporation 15 years ago, we would not have had these \$250 million worth of investments. If that investment money had been in private hands, it would have been in Ontario or it would

have been in other provinces. It would not have been in Manitoba, and it would have been invested in Burger Kings and other private concerns. No private insurance company would have lent \$250 million over the years to hospitals in Manitoba, to schools in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I just wanted to mention a couple of these because these should hit home to some of the members opposite, because these are towns in their own ridings, okay? The Hamiota Hospital - whose constituency is that in? - has \$56,000 from Autopac. What about the McGregor Personal Care Home, \$77,000; the Neepawa Hospital, the Rossburn Personal Care Home, the Steinbach Hospital, and on and on, Madam Speaker. Roblin-Russell, I'm sure is in here as well - schools: the Morris-Macdonald School Division, the Rhineland School Division, and again a very comprehensive listing. What private insurance company would invest part of its income into investments like these?

Cities, municipalities: the town of Altona, \$537,000; the town of Birtle, \$62,000; the town of Boissevain, \$24,000; the town of Carman, \$480,000. And, Madam Speaker, I could go on and on and on.

Madam Speaker, in summary - how many minutes do I have?

MADAM SPEAKER: I just gave the honourable member notice that he has three minutes remaining.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Three minutes? Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In summary, Madam Speaker, the job creation record since 1981 of this government has been excellent. Under the Tories, you will recall, the population was decreasing, and the symbol of the time was, would the last person leaving the province turn out the lights. The Member for Brandon has an innovative saying now. Well, I remember back eight years ago when we had bumper stickers out to that effect.

We all remember their eagerness to try to destroy Autopac when they were in for those four years, to give Manitoba Hydro away. Remember they were trying to get Alcan Aluminum so bad that they were willing to give them a chunk of the hydro plant. They cut back health and education. They would bring back premiums in Medicare and other such attacks on ordinary Manitobans.

It was this government, Madam Speaker, that brought in the Jobs Fund, brought in Careerstart, Jobs and Training, Community Assets, Fifty-Five Plus. Madam Speaker, we revised child agencies, and we stopped the practice of sending Natives out of the province. Madam Speaker, we started Limestone. We brought Natives into government. We appointed the first Treaty Indian to Cabinet, the first Native judge, Madam Speaker. Would they have appointed the first Native judge? I doubt it. They certainly had enough years in government, and they didn't do it.

Madam Speaker, we brought in training programs which resulted in record numbers of Natives working at Limestone. We brought in pay equity. We brought in a new Human Rights Act. They wouldn't have done anything like that, not in a million years. What have we seen? A proper Human Rights Act that is one of the best in the country, Madam Speaker, extensive

housing projects. We brought down the natural gas prices and, as I said, I wish we could have got our hands on the gas company and I still think we should, but the effect was to bring down gas prices. Madam Speaker, we assisted farmers in fighting low commodity prices. We greatly increased health and education spending. We began a major reform of health programs, and there are numerous other accomplishments, second to no other province when it comes to protecting ordinary workers.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise with some trepidation and nervousness following that scathing attack on our Conservative colleagues in Ottawa, Madam Speaker, but I won't endeavour to refute a great number of the misinformation and misstatements and misquotes that the Member for Elmwood made, because I don't think that's the purpose of us being here.

The Throne Speech, Madam Speaker, as always, marks the start of a new Session, and I am pleased to see the members back again, ready to do battle, and to see you, Madam Speaker, in the Chair. I'm sure, this Session, you'll govern and show your usual impartiality to the House, which we hope you may have a chance to test this evening about 9:30 p.m., and the other Cabinet changes.

There have been a few shuffles around, not new faces but the old faces have changed places. I wish them well in their new portfolios, although the new Minister of Business and Tourism, whether there's hope for him doing well in his new portfolio, Madam Speaker, I'm just not too sure because all of the other ones that he's held have been disasters.

So we do look forward to seeing some improvement, and we know that he is going to encourage all our tourist friends from the south to flock up here and visit us. He assured us of that the other day. So we look forward to that.

Madam Speaker, the Throne Speech, to spend much time debating it is going to be quite difficult because I guess about a third of it was taken up with free trade bashing and another third of it was taken up with bashing the feds on other items, and the third that was left, there was little plan at all, little direction of what the future aims and objectives of this government are.

There was some mention of some improvements to the health care system. We welcome that, and of course, we wait with great anticipation the announcement of the feed lot industry support. And as I said to the Minister after the Throne Speech, the fence is down and the horse is gone and now we're going to fix the fence. I realize that, Madam Speaker, but when . . .

A MEMBER: There's no cattle either.

MR. D. BLAKE: I'll mention a little more on the feed lot situation when I get into agriculture, although many of my colleagues will be covering that, I'm sure.

But the non-confidence amendment, Madam Speaker, is really what we're debating today, and you

know, just quoting from it, because I think it's well that we be reminded every now and then of what is in the non-confidence motion: the government's mismanagement and political manipulation of our Crown Corporations resulting in millions of dollars of losses; the government's failure to provide a plan to deal with the serious economic and financial problems facing the province; the government's insistence - it's really an obsession - with opposing free trade; their mismanagement and wrong-headed priorities that have resulted in the lack of funding for vital services, health education and agriculture; and, therefore, the government has thereby lost the confidence and trust of the people of Manitoba.

There is no question about that, Madam Speaker, and that is evident day by day. The polls are showing it. It's interesting to hear at one time the First Minister would get up and attack the members on this side of the House and always had a little left-handed praise for the Member for River Heights; but now that the polls are showing a slight change, a little slippage of the NDP vote and a slight increase in the Liberal support, we now find the Premier, after he finishes devastating us on this side of the House, turns his guns on the Member for River Heights, which is a real shift, because I think he feels that maybe he's lost their confidence also.

Madam Speaker, there's an old saying that governments don't defeat themselves - the people defeat them. Well, the people don't vote for a government; they vote against one. The evidence is out there and the members opposite cannot duck that fact that people are fed up, they're mad, and this government has seen the end of their tenure coming very, very close. It could happen tonight, it could happen next week, but their days are numbered and they know it.

The non-confidence motion is set to go at 9:30 tonight, Madam Speaker, and it just could be that I may have to add a codicil. I would hate to think that this is the last Throne Speech in this Legislature that I participate in. I may have to rearrange my schedule if I find that I'm facing an election tomorrow morning, so we'll just have to leave that a little fluid for the time being.

Madam Speaker, the mention of agriculture in the Throne Speech, as I say, was quite encouraging. The tiny little bit that was mentioned about some assistance to the feedlot, something akin to a little band-aid program that may help the feedlot situation.

Madam Speaker, it's too little and too late. I think the only thing that prompted the Minister of Agriculture to impress on his colleagues that that had to be in the Throne Speech, there had to be something in there, is that the union people in the slaughter facilities got to him and said, look, we got no cattle in Manitoba; we're not going to have a job; there won't be a slaughter house or a packing plant in Manitoba to provide us with employment; you're going to have to do something. But it's too late, Madam Speaker. There's something like 200,000 feeder calves went out of here this fall to Saskatchewan and Alberta that have fairly attractive programs.

Something a little more current than that, Madam Speaker, if the Minister is not aware of it - he should be - that now those farmers that do feed out 100 or

150 or 200 head of their own cattle that they market about May or June when they're up around 1,000-1,200 pounds, they are now marketing those animals and they're going out to Alberta and Saskatchewan as feeders to receive a little more finish and then we'll have to buy them back. That's happening right today. There are thousands of cattle going out of this province that would normally stay here and be finished off. The price is attractive, the feeders out there are bidding them up, and the guy said, well, why should I feed them for another three months or four months; I'll let them go now. They're cleaning out their feedlots. — (Interjection) — I won't blame this Minister that much for it because he hasn't been there long enough, because I know in a year or so we'll have all kinds of things to blame on him.

A MEMBER: He won't be the Minister in a year.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, you're right there, if things work out well tonight.

Madam Speaker, the bull-headedness, or pig-headedness, whichever term we want to use on the former Minister of Agriculture who would not go into the tripartite deals - I mentioned the beans and the tripartite one on cattle might have helped the cattle industry more than it's done now - they've made great plans to announce a farm debt mediation board. There was already a federal farm debt review board in place - we've got duplication. These people are running around now.

And the per diem rate - I should mention to the Minister - the per diem rate for the farm debt mediation board is something else. We think Silver got a nice little sweetheart deal out of Autopac. Well, I'll tell you, these people on the mediation board are doing just about as well. — (Interjection) — It's about half of what I understand the mediation board is getting. — (Interjection) — I'll tell you, if you're paying for capable people, you've got one of the most capable people in that job that you could ever find anywhere. You talk to anybody on that farm debt review panel and they'll tell you that this guy is just doing one fantastic job and they couldn't have found a better man anywhere. So you may have done him a favour. — (Interjection) — Are you up to 150 yet on the mediation panel? The feds have got, I don't know, 700 or 800.

But there is duplication there, Madam Speaker, that there was no need for. They could have done some cooperation. The federal debt review panel made an offer to the Minister to put some people on those boards and he wouldn't do it. No, we're going to run our own show. Well, he's running his own show now and he's costing the taxpayers of this country a pile of money. I know that there are others, Madam Speaker, that will be covering the agricultural scene a lot more thoroughly.

I know it wouldn't be fair if I didn't make a mention of Autopac. It has come up once or twice in the past week or so. Madam Speaker, when this flagship of the N.D. Party was brought in, in 1970, I should have taken some time to research the quotes that were used at that time when they were bashing the insurance companies, what enemies they were of the state and of the system, and how they thrashed and writhed and smashed them to the ground.

Now they love to quote from the insurance company releases when they are losing money and say, well, look, they're losing money, too. We're not all bad. So they hold that up and read them off with glee when the private companies are losing funds. That's nothing new, Madam Speaker. The insurance companies have lost money before, and they'll lose money in the future, but they make a little bit along the way.

I wish MPIC well and hope they do because I don't know how much longer we can afford them. But I take some exception with the Member for - where is he from, again?

A MEMBER: Elmwood. Very easy to forget who he is.

MR. D. BLAKE: Elmwood. Reading off all these debentures in the hospitals of rural Manitoba - I mean, we're not naive, we've been around the mill a little bit. We know that they've made a \$250 million investment. — (Interjection) — Certainly. To listen to members on that side of the House, you would think that there was never a hospital or a care home in Manitoba prior to 1970. I mean, the MPIC didn't have any money in 1970. It took time to gather those premiums in and to make those investments.

We had hospitals before. Where do you think the money came from to cover those debentures? It came out of the marketplace. It didn't come from the government. The Royal Bank put up a lot. The Bank of Commerce put up some, the trust companies, the insurance companies. Look at the mortgages the insurance companies held for years. This just isn't a revelation all of a sudden because MPIC came along. So I really can't put too much stock in what the Member for Elmwood was trying to stuff down our throats about all the great things that have been done. — (Interjection) — It was such a devastating attack to their Member for Inkster there that it took me a while to recover. I was reeling from the shock of that from the Member for Elmwood. You see I think he must be bucking for a Cabinet spot, the way he came on there.

Madam Speaker, you know, the efficiency of Autopac has been mentioned time and time again. I happened to use a Free Press editorial that I want to quote a bit from, but the cartoon on the back of it I think says it all, with the MPIC going over the cliff and the driver being jettisoned, and the it says, "Heigh ho, Silver, away."

Madam Speaker, I have said it before and, you know, I sat on the board I suppose with someone who was in charge of that corporation back in those days, one J.O. Dutton. Unfortunately, he's not with us and it's most unfortunate for the corporation that he wasn't able to run it for a few more years, because I don't think we would have been in the mess we're in today.

Even Mr. Poneira who left us and had tremendous knowledge of the insurance industry - and that's been part of the problem with the corporation. I don't care how capable a man like Mr. Silver is, or Mr. Lane, there is nothing to suggest otherwise that they are the most competent people in their field, but they know absolutely nothing about insurance.

It does make a difference, Madam Speaker. You have to understand the system. That's where we got into all the problems with our reinsurance. We didn't have

people who were knowledgeable in the international market. They weren't trained at Lloyd's of London or in Bermuda where all the big shooters are, and you just can't get into a hard-ball game with those guys and come out a winner.

I don't know what's going to happen. Mr. Silver - obviously you have to read between the lines - wanted to make some changes. Apparently the Minister didn't agree with him and they agreed to disagree, but you've got to clean up something in the corporation. Something's obviously wrong, and if you're not going to let the head man have a free hand, you are going to be in this same mess or worse a year from now. Now, with the disagreement with Mr. Silver, I think he was treated adequately. He came out of it smiling and he's got himself a little sweetheart deal for a year. Mr. Lane is going to take over now and what's going to happen in a year if he doesn't make any headway? Are they going to make him the same offer? He's going to want it, for sure. Mr. Laufer was turfed out and all he did was buy a few dishes and take a secretary to lunch or something, and he hadn't lost \$100 million in one year. So I don't know just what was accomplished by that move at all.

We had the former Minister in charge of the corporation trying to defend things. It's now obvious that not only did he hide those horrendous losses from us prior to the election, rates should have been put up back in '86, but they weren't put up prior to the election. That was pretty obvious, the \$70-some million that we had in reserves that we were told were adequate obviously were earmarked. They knew the losses were there, that's why they were crying so loud when we said the reserves are adequate. They weren't and the rates were too low. They should have been increased back then. It was done back in the Schreyer years. You should have taken a lesson from that.

Autopac suffered a devastating loss the year after the election back in '73 - or '77. Madam Speaker, the deficiencies have to be found to make MPIC work properly, especially the Autopac end of it. I think personally they should maybe take a hard look at getting out of the general business. It's a field where they're competing and they're losing \$5 million, \$6 million every year there, so obviously you're not going to be able to turn that around, because I know for a fact the house insurance policy premiums have jumped way up and people are bailing out and going back to the private companies that maybe are somewhat lower. But waste and mismanagement has got to be there, Madam Speaker, and it's going to take a tough man at the helm and a tough crew to put things back into shape.

You know, people out in the rural areas can see it. Just one example in my area, if there's a claim or a wreck in Carberry, the adjuster goes out to look at it, the appraiser goes out, and they make a couple of calls there. They maybe do Shilo in the afternoon. They're both travelling in government cars, two vehicles, going to the same accident or the same vehicle to inspect it. There are deficiencies there that the rural people are just throwing up their hands up and screaming about.

Why couldn't one man do the same job? Why couldn't there be an appraiser and an adjuster at the same time? That's not a big trick to train someone like that, I'm sure. Those are some of the things that the rural

people are saying, why haven't we done these things? These are efficiencies that can be brought into effect very, very quickly.

But what really alarms me, Madam Speaker, and I spent some time on the board - we were provided with a monthly statement of where the corporation stood, what the losses were, what the accident rate was every month. Surely this board - mind you, I will say the board that I sat with, we had people knowledgeable in the insurance industry, we had enough people knowledgeable in the auto repair business and people who have proven they were top-notch people in their own field.

If we had have seen those losses mounting for three or four months, we would have been calling management in and saying, hey, we've got to stop this hemorrhage, this is outlandish, what's happening here, but nobody has apparently done a thing about it. It's just gone on and on and on, and we end up at the end of the year with \$65 million in the hole, to say nothing about the premium raised last year that was supposed to bring in another \$30 million, so really there's \$100 million disappeared in one year. That's a lot of fenders and a lot of bumpers, Madam Speaker.

As I say, we haven't been given the breakdown of the injury claims and the repair claims. I'm sure they'll be forwarding that to us before too long, but to lose \$100 million is absolutely staggering to the man out there on the street. He said, "What happened to it"? The Member for St. Vital, in his remarks, mentioned the same thing, "What happened to the \$27 million MTX lost in Saudi Arabia"? He said, "Did somebody trip over a pile of sand and dump it out of the basket or where did it go?" Nobody has really said where that money went and nobody has said where the big amount of losses in Autopac, when there's got to be a breakdown somewhere, that \$20 million went on injury claims, \$50 million went on bumpers.

I know what's happening on windshields before the end of February, before the deductible goes up. These glass people are banging in windshields just as fast as they can get them into the shop. I forget the figures that one of the auto repair shops or supply houses in Brandon told me that they had supplied in the last couple of months. It's up in the thousands of windshields.

So these are things that happen that there doesn't seem to be any handle on or any control over, Madam Speaker, and that has to be stopped, to say nothing of what the rates have done to the family that has to come up with \$600 or \$800 by the end of February or they don't drive.

But there are a lot of families out there that have a second car, and there are some that have a third car, maybe an old clunker one. They are not going to license all those cars. They might not even license a second car. Maybe it's not driven too much, a little bit around town. They're not going to pay out \$700 to license a \$500 car. They're going to put it in the bush or put it on the market for whatever they can get for it and let it go, and that all affects the economy. That car is not going to be purchasing gas, it is not going to have repairs to it, and the local garage man is going to suffer. The loss to the economy, Madam Speaker, is going to be tremendous.

I don't want to spend too much time on Autopac, and I won't go into the article I was going to quote

from that was in the press. But, Madam Speaker, in spite of the reward that Mr. Silver got - and it seems to be obvious that he tried to do something and straighten that corporation out and try to get somewhere and was stymied, so he thought it was best that he get out - but with the questions that should be directed to Mr. Uruski, apart from where the money went and whatnot else, the interesting quote at the end of the article is the most interesting question of all. "Bill Uruski is responsible for the Manitoba Public Corporation, but is anybody in charge?" The MPIC Autopac Division seems to have floated long for a year or a couple of years, Madam Speaker, with nobody in charge. The losses have just been absolutely horrendous, and it has to be ended.

Madam Speaker, I want to just touch for a minute on something that is constituency-related, I suppose. It's to do with the Community Services Department and their Welcome Home Program, which was a great dream that's gone astray. It hasn't worked out. The sheltered workshops, there was a sheltered workshop opened in Minnedosa three years ago with a great fanfare. People from the government were out and this was a real breakthrough. They had a training shop there, and there have been some excellent articles on it, Mr. Corley who runs it. There's a local board, and they received funding. I won't go into it all but there's so much for a client or whatever name they put on them who are going to be trained in this little workshop. They make leather belts and gunslings and purses and things of that nature, some harness, and they do excellent work.

The philosophy behind it is that they get some training there. They get used to coming into work in the morning. They get a little bit of pay, and those who are capable are going to be able, maybe in time, to get a job. There are some of them, one hopes to be a mechanic, and it has been an excellent training program. They're allowed to stay there two years and then they are out of the program or the funding is stopped.

Now we all know, Madam Speaker, very, very well that there's the odd one of these people who can be trained to go out in the community and take a job, but many, many of them are never going to be in that position. This Frontier Trading Company, where these people are employed, is going to be something for them to do and a place for them to be, but they have to have the funding to do it. The funding has been cut, and I don't know how long this Frontier Trading can survive. I have another one in town, Rolling Dale at Cardale, in much the same situation where the people there are maybe a little more advanced or not as far advanced. I don't think they will ever be able to go into the community to take jobs, but they do make lawn furniture and things like that and it keeps them occupied. They're provided with transportation and it makes them feel that they're part of the community.

This is hard to explain to the local committee, which Dr. Carter's chairman of and a very compassionate man who understands the problem extremely well. It's hard to explain to him why their funding's been cut when he finds they've built a \$20-million bridge that goes nowhere - the road hasn't been connected to it; the study on the ECG, where the Minister got up the other day and said it cost some \$580,000, we understand it cost \$1 million or \$1.3 million; the dozens of communications that the public are now starting to

find out that the government has hired; the former chairman of the Workers Compensation Board, shuffled aside but taken on at \$64,000 a year as advisor to the Health Department. These are the things that those people out in the community just can't understand.

Mr. Corley, who runs the Frontier Trading and is working with these people everyday, in the article, the people who have put in the two years and naturally won't be finding a job in the community, they're cut back about \$15 a day for their funding. He goes on to say that the province can't close us down, but they can starve us out. Now the corporation will lose probably \$31,000 this year out of a proposed budget of \$64,000.00. Well, \$64,000, Madam Speaker, to run an operation that handles about 15 of these clients is about the salary that they're paying the former chairman of the Workers Compensation Board to do what, we are not too sure, but he is apparently going to advise the Health Department.

Madam Speaker, to defect funding on such a worthwhile project as this is something that the government just seems to turn a deaf ear to. But this sharing and caring that the former Minister used to tell us, and I think she was the Minister when this corporation was set up, when it was opened and the government people were out there and we just thought this was a great thing and the funding would be there; but then we find all these little catches in the funding apparatus that gets the thing started and then leaves it floundering and probably to close, which is going to be no good.

Where are these people going to go, back to where they were, into their homes and wander the streets? At least they've got some purpose going to this, this little business each year. — (Interjection) — That's right, my colleague from Gladstone says what's the point in starting these things unless you are going to provide the funding and keep them going? So I will be saying more about that when we get into the Estimates.

I suppose, Madam Speaker, that it wouldn't be right if I didn't say something on free trade, although I won't go into it too deeply. I'll save that for the resolution because I see a resolution coming up that obviously we are going to spend a great deal of the taxpayers' time and money on. But, Madam Speaker, this deal will come back to haunt this government if they continue on their course of opposition to the free trade deal. The scare tactics they are using, they might scare some of the old people but they are not going to scare the young people.

The young people want an opportunity to reach out and grab something and go. I mean, they're getting into a gung ho age where they say, well, why can't we trade with them? I mean, what's wrong with it? They're our closest neighbours and we do 80 percent trade with them now. If we haven't lost our sovereignty and our culture by now, how are we going to lose it by doing a little bit more?

You know Anne Murray - bless her heart - I love her singing. Anne Murray says, "Oh, we're going to lose our culture." And where does she say it from? Her big home in Beverly Hills; not from Nova Scotia. How in the hell are we going to lose our culture if she's down there? And that's what's being whipped up to try and terrify the people and scare them into thinking this free trade deal is some kind of a big boogeyman.

Madam Speaker, we heard the Member for Elmwood say that the wine industry was going to suffer. Well, you know the big great wine industry of the Niagara Peninsula at one time used to produce peaches that were unique. They're better than the peaches that come from Georgia or anywhere else. Canada, whatever we produce in this country is top quality; we don't produce any second rate stuff. Our wheat, our canola, corn or whatever - you name it - we've got it better than anybody else can grow it. And our peaches were that way.

But all of a sudden we started making wine, and grapes became important. They were subsidized to the hilt. They can make more money growing grapes, so they took over all of the peach land and grew grapes. What's wrong with starting to grow peaches again and phase the grapes out. If there's no money in growing grapes, you quit growing them. If you can buy them cheaper from the Americans, then buy them.

Jake says we can't smoke any more. What's the tobacco grower going to do? Are we going to have to subsidize him and get him into his potatoes? Maybe he can grow peaches on tobacco land, I don't know. But he can grow something else other than tobacco, I'm sure, because it's good land; they can grow something else.

Madam Speaker, there was an article in the Co-operator this week, and Ontario, naturally, is opposing free trade. They say, oh, we're going to lose \$95 million, and I'll just touch on it briefly, but they go on to knock this myth or show what a myth it is, these losses. There's a \$30 million loss in the wheat industry because the Minister announced a change to the two price system. That's going to be made up; they're going to be compensated for that; so that's not any loss.

Another example was they're going to lose \$10 million in the dairy industry. I think that was to do with ice cream or something. They found out that's not true, that money is not going to be lost. This is where the grape and wine story came from, that there's not going to be a loss there that is feared.

Madam Speaker, the most important thing is that the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food is going to go around Ontario and they're going to hold a bunch of meetings, seminars, the same as this government's going to do, which is going to be a waste of taxpayers' money.

The ministry has lined up six seminars for February and March to discuss the trade deal and is featuring this study and the director of the Economics and Policy Branch. They won't venture into the Waterloo region or anywhere close to the three universities at Waterloo and Guelph. The closest they'll come is Mildmay, on February 29. If they're lucky, they'll be able to blame a terrible winter storm for the dismal turnout and won't have to concede that the people here have little time for poppycock. That's exactly the mission that the Premier is going to take us through with a dog and pony show through Manitoba. That's what's going to happen. It's going to accomplish absolutely nothing.

Madam Speaker, I will be supporting the resolution, the amendment rather, tonight, when the vote comes at 9:30. I won't take up any more of the House's time because I know there are many of my colleagues that have been patiently waiting to get their turn to thrash this Throne Speech for what little bit was in it and for

the waste and mismanagement that the government has put us through during this past year.

Thank you for your patience.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm quite pleased to be able to join in the debate, Madam Speaker, and to use the time to talk about an issue, a program that is near and dear to the hearts of thousands of Manitoba families, and in fact I think one program that has the support of all parties and all members in this Chamber, and that is the day care program in Manitoba.

I think that everybody thinks that the day care program is a very important program, that we should have it and that we should expand it. I think there are differences of opinion though about what kind of day care programs we should have and what kind of expansion there should be.

We made reference in the Throne Speech that this has been and will continue to be a priority of this government. It's a particularly appropriate time because the Federal Government has finally come out with their program and we're in the process of trying to have bilateral negotiations with them that will determine the effect of the federal program on Manitoba's day care system. We have a number of concerns about the program and its implementation, and I'll want to talk about those for a few minutes, Madam Speaker.

I think first of all, it's important that we say a few things about how proud we are of the day care program that we have developed and to give credit to my former colleagues for the time and the attention they took to develop what is recognized, not only throughout Canada, but throughout North America, as one of the best day care systems anywhere.

A MEMBER: You've even got Donny now.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Oh, Donny's with us; that's good. So is Ontario, Madam Speaker. Not only is the member from Pembina with us, but the Ontario Government is with us. They have gone into commercial day care in the past, Madam Speaker. Now, as a result of the experience that we've had and the demonstration of the improved quality that you get through the non-profit day care program, they are saying that all of their new day care programs are going to go into non profit, and that they're going to begin the process of transition to convert their commercial day care, Madam Speaker.

So, here's some very good examples. We've got Ontario taking that position, we've got Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec and the Yukon all modelling their day care program after Manitoba's day care program, Madam Speaker.

So that tells us what we knew, that we've got a very good program, and there are reasons for that. First of all, we have parent control. There are very good reasons why we have decided to put our money into public, non-profit day care. If we had all the money in the world, we might be able to fund commercial and non-profit, but we don't, so we have to make choices about where the money goes, and we have chosen to put it into non-profit.

Why do we do that, Madam Speaker? One - it gives parent involvement and parent control, and there's a parent over there, the Member for Morris, who would appreciate that, being involved and being able to control and direct the day care program that his children would attend, as other parents appreciate.

We have brought in a training program that says the quality of staff requires specialized training and we have a program that is moving us towards having two-thirds of the people in our day care all trained by the year 1990; so we have taken a very firm position on training requirements for day care programs.

Non-profit is important. We don't have enough money; we need all our money to go into services and day care spaces. We haven't got money to put that money into profit, into giving people money for subsidized spaces so that they get a profit. It all has to go into subsidizing spaces to help families access day care, or it has to go into increasing day care spaces - one of the two.

Accessibility is important. One of the reasons we've gone into non-profit is for accessibility. Does anybody think that somebody who is setting up a business for a profit is going to put that business where there isn't any market, where there is no money, where they're going to lose money? Neither will they put day cares into communities where the people are poor, where they can't make a profit. So that means that there aren't going to be day cares - or very many - in the North, in some of the rural areas, or in the inner city, because that's not where the profit is. So if we want to build a day care system throughout the province that is accessible everywhere, then we have to make sure that the money is going into building and putting day care in that they all have accessibility to, not just those who have money.

Madam Speaker, what we've done over the years is that we have increased, we've got about 15,000 day care spaces, we've moved toward half of the day care spaces that we need, but we have the largest number of day care spaces in the country - that's only because of the leadership and the initiative taken by this government.

We've increased our grants and subsidies from \$8.5 million to \$27 million, from 1981 to 1987. That's a very significant increase in financial dollars, as you're in very difficult resource times, and I'm sure the members opposite are glad to have those increases in money going into the day care program to increase it.

Those eligible for funding, for subsidy, those that are provincially funded, that get subsidy, have increased from 8,200 to 11,200, which is a 37 percent increase, so that we're really putting our money where our mouth is, in terms of making day care spaces accessible to people in low income, people that couldn't provide them otherwise.

We're the first government to bring in salary enhancement. We're requiring training, and yet we know that the salaries are low, and they're still too low, and we want to improve them. But we're the only province that has the salary levels at the level they are, and that have brought in improved wages through our salary enhancement program, that are recognizing the importance of the work done by day care workers, and recognizing the training that they take to receive that.

Now, having said that, Madam Speaker, I think having demonstrated that we have a model that everybody

else is copying, I think it's very important that we look at the program that the Federal Government is bringing in and not only just how Manitoba feels about it, but increasingly how other provinces are beginning to feel about the federal day care program that we waited so long to hear about, that we waited so long to receive, and now that we are still waiting for its implementation.

Madam Speaker, they had an opportunity, I think, the Federal Government, to bring in a universal day care program that would have been like our universal Medicare, I mean to have established the foundation of a program throughout our country that would stand the test of time over years and give equity and fairness and accessibility to children and parents throughout the country. But they didn't do it. They had a chance, and they didn't do it. One of the reasons they didn't do it is because of where they decided to put the money, Madam Speaker.

First of all, they put in a total of \$5.4 billion. It's apparent to us now. We believe - and the feeling is growing daily - that we would have had more money in the day care program had we stayed under the old CAP program, which did not have limitations and ceilings, than we are going to have over the new program with the \$5.4 billion. — (Interjection) — Yes, absolutely. I think they're calling it, if I can find it, they're saying that it is a program that is restricted, not an increase program but where there are going to be limitations. Provinces like Manitoba that took the leadership and developed the program look like they're going to be the loser for the initiatives and the quality of the program that they had developed, and that concerns us a lot.

Now they're talking about bringing in 200,000 spaces with that money. We think it's more likely to be 100,000 spaces, and the 200,000 was falling far short of what we need. So it looks like it's going to be about 100,000 spaces over seven years for the whole country, which is very short of what the needs are.

The thing that concerns us the most is that they put 40 percent of it into not tax reform . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I interrupt the honourable member for a moment to ask the Honourable Member for Pembina to please remove the exhibit from his desk in conformity with Beauchesne, Citation 333. — (Interjection) — Excuse me, I did not ask the honourable member for an explanation. I asked him to kindly remove the exhibit from his desk.

The Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I want to go back to the point about the limitations. The stated objective is 200,000 spaces over seven years. That rate of increase is less than we've seen since 1974. The number of child care spaces doubled between '74 and '80, and doubled again between '80 and '86. People are referring to the proposal as the child-care restriction program since, under the Canada Assistance Plan funding, there was no limit to the rate of increase that the Federal Government would support.

So we're getting less than we would have had under the old program, but they're not allowing us to stay under the old program. Provinces have said, can we

stay under CAP if we prefer it, and the answer is no. It appears that one of the reasons is there's going to be a lot less money available to cover the programs.

The biggest concern is not only that they didn't put enough in but they didn't put it into the right places. They put 40 percent into tax changes. I can't call them anything else. You can't call them tax reform, but tax changes, \$2.3 billion that would have done so much for training to improve the salaries of the workers, to have added more day care spaces, to have built up the existing system, and it's going into tax changes that aren't even going to help the parents who are supposed to get it. The largest amount goes into the tax credit which gives them \$100 a year additional in the first year and another \$100 in the second year. Well what is \$200 a year or \$100 a year do for child care? It doesn't even provide informal babysitting, let alone child care that will allow the women to go out to work.

The other part is that they've increased the deduction. Our figures show us that only about 15 percent of the families in the country qualify for the maximum, so that clearly is designed for people who have money, who can afford day care probably anyway, and the working people do not get that benefit at all.

They put everything that wasn't covered somewhere else into a pot called special needs. They put a very small amount of money into it, \$100 million. That's to cover training. It's to cover research and special needs projects in every province throughout the country for seven years. It's a very good idea, special needs programs. We have brought in our own special needs program, where we've got 255 children of special needs and disabled children integrated into regular day care programs throughout the province. So we think that's a very important initiative. It doesn't have nearly enough money.

There should be a special program and special funding for training and recognition that something needs to be done for salary enhancement for the people working in that field. So they didn't do any of that.

But, Madam Speaker, the greatest deficiency is not related to money. It's related to standards. The Federal Government has brought a program in with no national standards, which leaves it up to the provinces to decide what the standards will be. I find it hard to believe, Madam Speaker, that we couldn't have found a number of basic standards that everybody would have agreed to. They would have been in the area of training, in the area of ratios perhaps, group size, health and safety. Who could complain about that? Program - have some standards in the program for child care and for parental involvement.

I think they could easily have identified five or six basic principles that all of the provinces could have and would have agreed to, and then said these are the national standards of the day care program. But they have chosen not to do that and to leave it up to the provinces to decide whether or not to have those standards. So what is the purpose of a national program that doesn't have any standards throughout the country, Madam Speaker?

We took the position that they should have distributed the money much more wisely. If they want to bring in tax reform - and they should - to make up the 1.5 billion that families have lost since the Mulroney

Government took office, they should be bringing in tax reform but they shouldn't call it day care. They shouldn't be trying to get two bangs for their buck, Madam Speaker, by trying to pretend to be bringing in tax reform that is going to help families on the one side, and calling it day care and putting it into the day-care program. What happens is, it does nothing for anybody. They don't have tax reform and they don't have an improved day care program throughout the country that they would have had, had they put all the money into establishing and building the day care system.

Madam Speaker, our greatest concern now is that nothing is happening. Initially, when needs were announced, Manitoba was about the only province that was indicating concern for where the money was going. Were there going to be 200,000 spaces, the lack of money for training, the lack of money for additional day care spaces, the lack of money for the special needs program. Now, increasingly, other provinces are joining us. They have the same concerns and they are beginning to voice them, loudly and clearly.

The biggest concern is that nothing is going on. The bilateral negotiations that should be taking place with each province are going nowhere because there's no criteria on the table, there are no standards on the table, there are no guidelines, there are no procedures for applications. If we want to tell community groups how to apply to the special needs program, which must be accessed by community groups through the Provincial Government, there are no application forms. We can't even tell them what the criteria is because we don't know what the Federal Government wants to do with that fund.

The program is supposed to be under way by April 1, and yet none of this is in place. There isn't anything that remotely resembles bilateral negotiations going on at this time.

So there is a growing concern throughout the country by all provinces over the lack of movement on the implementation of this program. Whether you agree with all the elements or not, people are saying, at least let's implement what you've got there. Let's develop it and let's get going on it.

Madam Speaker, I think that groups throughout the country are saying the same thing. The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women said that they were concerned that only one child in eight needing care had access to child care centres. They thought then there were going to be 200,000 spaces, and that was totally inadequate to meet the 1.8 million children needing care throughout the country. Wait till they hear it's only going to be 100,000 spaces, Madam Speaker.

They said the same thing about the income tax deductions, should be changed to fully refundable child care credit. The province's proposal is weighted in favour of deductions, which runs counter to current tax reform measures. You know, they're bringing in tax measures that run counter to their own reform.

They feel that the special needs of rural, immigrant and aboriginal families must be addressed. I might say that there is nothing in there for Native day care right now. We were told that it was going to be delivered through DIAND, I think, and have found that there simply is no money in either program for developing day care programs on reserves. That's a matter of concern that we will be raising with the Federal Government.

I think I would like to end by just making a few more points about the sort of commercial versus non-profit, Madam Speaker, and why we have chosen to put the limited resources and money that we have had, although this province has made a major effort to develop their program, why we have put it into non-profit.

Apart from the fact that you have better accessibility, you have parental involvement and parental control, you have all of your money going into the establishment of day care centres, of stabilizing their funding, of adding additional spaces, there are some other elements. We have found, through our studies, that the commercial centres have more provisional licences than non-profit day care centres. In other words, they have more of a problem meeting the standards and the requirements than the non-profit do.

So it doesn't mean that all commercial are bad, and it doesn't mean that all non-profit are good. It means that, overall, all studies show that the non-profit publicly-owned day care centres have higher standards and higher quality day care, and every study ever done is very clear on that. So we're looking at putting our money where we get the best bang for our buck, getting the best quality that we can, and giving the parents the right to be involved in the care of their children. Even when they have to be away working to support the family, they're still involved in determining the quality and the delivery of that care through the day care programs.

So, Madam Speaker, I think that I would just want to end by saying that we are proud of our program. We are going to continue it. We are going to continue to build on the base and the fundamental principles and the models that we have established, because we have demonstrated that they are the best that can be found anywhere in North America. We are going to continue to work with the Federal Government to try and implement the federal program, continuing to make our points about its inadequacies but making the major point, let's get on with implementing the program that is there.

So I thank you for the opportunity to participate in this debate. Hopefully, maybe by the time the Budget Speech is up, we'll have some more information about the implementation from the Federal Government, and we can stand up and applaud the efforts that they are taking to get this program once and for all off the ground and start spending the money for improving the day care program for the children in Manitoba and Canada.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, as I rise to address this Assembly in this Third Session of the Thirty-Third Legislature, I am reminded of something I was told many times by my mother as I was growing up, and that was that if you can't say anything nice it's best not to say anything at all. So, Madam Speaker, you won't be surprised then if I don't go running off to Hansard after I'm finished, and clipping out this speech I'm going to make today and send it off to my mother, because there will only be parts of this speech that are the kind of positive statements that mother would have expected of me.

First of all, Madam Speaker, as one of the newer members here, to make some comments about one of the most senior people who left this Assembly just recently, I'd like to put aside any comments I might feel about the method of the leaving of this place of Larry Desjardins and just make the point that no matter what I think, or no matter what anybody thinks, nobody can turn up his nose at about 38 years of service to the public and so I'm not about to do that.

Mr. Desjardins began public life in 1950, and in a sense, is still involved in public life, but as an elected official he left office a matter of a few weeks ago. That gentleman has been successful in many election campaigns, even the one that was in doubt; the doubt was cast aside shortly thereafter. So that a career in public life spanning that long cannot go without some commendation from all members, I should think, of this place, regardless of which party they happen to support. I thought I should say that, as one who many times has had disagreements with that former member, but I am one who wishes him well and I wish him good health and long life.

Madam Speaker, Larry Desjardins brought in many ways some sanity to the benches of this place, some sanity to public life and I fear that he is no longer present with his colleagues to bring that sanity to us now. There could be no better an example of where his influence would be needed than in the matter of the abortion issue raised recently by a ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada. I fear and I find it unfortunate that a Charter of Rights in our country that recognizes the supremacy of an Almighty is also a Charter that provides no protection for innocent human lives.

I read recently in a letter to the editor in the Brandon Sun, Madam Speaker, that a person can be fined \$5,000 for destroying an eagle's egg and the question of course arises: Well, is that an eagle from the moment the egg is laid, or does it have to hatch, or at what point in the gestation, if you like, of that egg, does it become an eagle and a life worth protecting? Well, apparently once it's an egg, it's an egg. Well, the abortion issue centers around an egg, too, an egg that is fertilized.

I know that I may be out of line here with some members on either side of this House but I have my own feelings about this and I have to put a few points on the record just to let it be known where I do stand. I am very supportive, Madam Speaker, of the position taken that section 33 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was put there for a reason, and that section is what is known as the "notwithstanding" clause.

I stand here again, Madam Speaker, to urge federal legislators to look at that section of the Charter of Rights and use it to restore to the law of this country, the law that existed prior to the Supreme Court decision, because I don't think there should be any time vacuum there, or a vacuum at all, in terms of legislation dealing with this vitally important issue. I believe that time should be taken to come up with the kind of legislation which will meet the concerns laid out by the Supreme Court of Canada, but which will ultimately provide protection at some stage, at all stages if that's what's necessary. But at whatever stage life really begins, protection should be there, protection of some kind for those in our society who have no voice, but require people like us to speak for them.

It's a tragic irony to me, Madam Speaker, that the same Charter of Rights which protects the right to life,

liberty and security of the person is used by the Supreme Court to snatch away the most basic of rights of the unborn, the right to live. It's sad to me but, Madam Speaker, that simply is the legacy of the Trudeau years. Mr. Trudeau, I'm sure, takes great credit and takes great pride in the fact that Canada has a Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but I think what we have here is a tragic example of how things can run amuck when we start codifying our rights and this discussion will come up over and over again, Madam Speaker. We go to great lengths, the people of Europe went to great lengths, the Green Peace Organization, Brigitte Bardot and others went to great lengths to put a stop to the seal hunt and protect those cute little baby seals, but it all just seems so inconsistent to me, Madam Speaker.

Well, as I watched the first day of this Session, Madam Speaker, I couldn't help but agree with what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose said in his comments, that the honourable members opposite looked like a bunch of boys and girls who had just returned from the woodshed. But as I thought about that - I know they're getting a real licking in public opinion right now - that may or may not be a permanent kind of thing. We'll have to see how things unfold.

But when we talk about them coming in from the woodshed, are they chastened after that visit from the woodshed? Well, none of the speeches that we've heard from honourable members opposite indicate any remorse whatsoever. Honourable members opposite are tearless, Madam Speaker. They're defiant and they're arrogant, and arrogant is the way they're going to go down. After all the damage that they've done to our province, after all the deceptions, the cover-ups, is there any remorse among honourable members opposite? Honourable members opposite, Madam Speaker, are remorseless for what they have done to the people of this province.

Predictions have been made in this Chamber. I predict that that lack of remorse will not be forgiven. The Honourable Member for St. Vital told us that Autopac was merely a reflection of the focus of people's anger over government mismanagement and manipulation. Well, that's true. As we look now, people are beginning to see that the votes they cast in 1986 were careful votes. They were not so sure in 1986. It was a close vote and I think that tells us that the electorate was up in the air on which party was the best one to represent Manitobans and to look after the interests of Manitobans and to run this province. Well, 1986 is over now. The people then, perhaps reluctantly, cast their ballot in favour of the New Democratic Party, not all of them, obviously, but enough to allow the NDP to form a government.

Well, this is 1986, and I predict that in 1986, whether it's next week or next month, or 1987 or 1988 or 1989, the people of this province will say, hey, in 1986 we gave them their chance and they blew it. The Honourable Member for St. Vital reminded us that Autopac was the jewel in the crown of the Schreyer Government. Well, Madam Speaker, the jewel and the crown have fallen into the gutter. Honourable members have allowed the jewel to tarnish. They've allowed the crown to fall into disrepair and its beauty is gone. It'll take a government, other than one composed of honourable members opposite, to restore that crown to the lustre that it once had, Madam Speaker.

We hear comments from honourable members opposite throwing up the red herring, as they often do whenever we criticize, whatever they do in health care, at Autopac or anywhere else - oh, you just want to privatize, you just want to destroy. Madam Speaker, we hear the Honourable Member for Elmwood agreeing once again, reaffirming that position. It's a cowardly position. It's not true, No. 1; and, No. 2, it is the red herring that honourable members opposite throw off every time they're criticized. It's a very good demonstration, Madam Speaker, of just how vulnerable they are right now and to what depths they will sink to defend a deplorable record.

This government, Madam Speaker, has gone beyond the point of returning in terms of support from the people of Manitoba. Members on this side of the House and other Manitobans, many other Manitobans, have been telling them for years to do something about beef stabilization. Well finally, in the wake of the troubles this government is undergoing, we see some reference to it in the Throne Speech. In a few minutes, I'm going to make the point that I see that as a bright spot in the Throne Speech.

MR. H. ENNS: There is no bright spot in the Throne Speech.

MR. J. McCRAE: There are one or two bright spots, Harry. There is. Now, you see we have caucus dissent here again, Madam Speaker, but Harry - I am going to do my best, Madam Speaker, to convince the Honourable Member for Lakeside that there are one or two things in this Throne Speech which, if carried through to their conclusion, would result in something good for Manitobans.

In the case of beef stabilization, I'll just repeat what a number of my friends have said. It's far too little now and far too late. We're talking about an industry which is all but dead.

We've been telling them for years, do something about education tax on farmland. Well last year, they brought in what they call a program of rebates. The program is being continued this year. After all they've been told about it, do they plan any changes in the program? Nothing's been mentioned in the Throne Speech, and I don't think I have heard anything from honourable members opposite to tell us that the program will be tightened up, that it won't be the bureaucratic nightmare that it has been, and it won't be as unfairly applied as it has been. We haven't heard that, but we have heard that it's being repeated again this year.

So I can't argue with a repeat of the principle of that program, but I wish honourable members opposite, especially the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, would listen to honourable members on this side of the House just once in a while. Because they are stealing so many policies that we have been putting out in the past, it would be good if they would listen to us and ask us about how to carry them out as well or, if they don't know how, why don't they just resign? They can't govern anymore. Why don't they just resign and let somebody else do a better job.

For years, Madam Speaker, honourable members opposite have been told to do something about the

losses and the gross mismanagement of Crown corporations. We now hear lip service to such a proposition in the Throne Speech but precious little in the way of substance. The answers of the Minister of Urban Affairs the other day to my questions about including Workers Compensation in The Crown Corporations Accountability Act, the flippant answers he gave just demonstrate to me how little commitment this government has to that act and to accountability, and to access to information and openness and all of those things.

We've been telling them for years, Madam Speaker, to do something about unfair funding for education. After all, Madam Speaker, their program of unfair funding for schools in this province is one major reason why I happen to occupy this seat. It was a very major issue in my community, and the honourable members opposite still appear not to have learned anything from that experience. But it's not just my community. It stretches across Manitoba into many school divisions, and this government is still studying it. They were studying two years ago that matter, and they haven't done anything about it yet.

Even when they were saying they were the people to elect to protect and enhance health care in this province, we made statements to the contrary, and the actions of this government shortly after the election bore out our statements about protecting health care. We've been saying, do something about that. Oh, they talk about health care reform which, in modern jargon, just means bed cuts and cutbacks in hospital services. We are talking about alternative health care. Let's put some alternative health care in place before we go around breaking our election promises.

We've been saying to do something about stopping the brain drain out of this province, Madam Speaker, referring to professionals and referring to certainly psychiatrists. We have a real problem with that. Executive types and professional types don't want to live in this province because of the tax regime of the government. If you don't think, Madam Speaker, that it's important to have professionals and to have executive types in your province, then you've lost sight of what is important in terms of the creation of jobs, which should be at the bottom line of all the things that we're here for. We need the help of those kinds of people, too. It takes all kinds of people to make a province, and certainly Manitoba, as diversified as it is, needs those kinds of people as much as anybody does.

We've said for a long time to do something about your poor relationship with the Federal Government, but it is hardly worth even mentioning that because they're obviously set on a course to destroy that relationship completely, so that whatever goes wrong in this province, they can blame on the Federal Government. All you have to do is look at the Order Paper to see the list of resolutions put down by honourable members opposite. I think 90 percent or 100 percent of them are bashing away at the Federal Government.

Madam Speaker, this is not my idea of cooperative federalism. I can't see how honourable members opposite are going to gain any brownie points, political or otherwise, or how they're going to improve the fiscal situation vis-a-vis Winnipeg-Ottawa, by the way they've been handling federal-provincial issues.

As labour spokesman for my side, Madam Speaker, certainly since I got elected, I have been asking honourable members opposite to do something to balance the labour playing field in this province, and I know my predecessor before me . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Member For Emerson on a point of order.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, there's a gentleman in the back row of the government side that is reading the paper in here. I hate to bring this up all the time, but, Madam Speaker, that certainly doesn't add to decorum of this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the honourable member please put the newspaper away?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The Attorney General, that's you.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I said a little while ago that there were some bright spots. I might have referred to one, but I'll go through what I think are the bright spots in the Throne Speech. I say this guardedly, Madam Speaker, because I don't have any great illusions about the ability of the people occupying the other side of this Chamber, their ability to carry these programs through, but let's hope for the best.

There is some commitment or reference to improvements in rural telephone service. If we can see something happen in that regard, I think that would indeed be a bright spot in the Throne Speech, but I wonder why the Minister responsible is being so cute when asked questions about future rates. I really would like to know why.

The Brandon University Institute for Rural Studies is a positive step, Madam Speaker. I hope the government, though, will not be front and center, claiming all the credit for this when the Board of Governors at Brandon University, supported by the president of the Brandon University, have been pressing for this and it seems that it's the right thing to do, certainly, in my community of Brandon, which is surrounded as it is by so many rural communities and so much farm activity.

I mentioned feedlot stabilization already and the rebate for the education tax on farm land. So, I think, Madam Speaker, up to now I could probably send this off to mom and everything will be all right. Now I am going to have to get into some of the other things.

Madam Speaker, as labour spokesman, I really have to reiterate some of the things that I have said before. I'll try to do it briefly. Actually, I don't really have to say too much because the Toronto Globe and Mail said it all for us today. — (Interjection) — Well, there are some parts here that I'd like to read.

"No government should be in the pocket of any organization. A government should be a government for all the people in the province." I've maintained this since I got into politics and carefully tried very hard to steer that kind of path. But honourable members opposite have done nothing of the kind, they're proud of it; they and some of their friends in the union movement make no bones, certainly with Mr. Jeffrey York of the Globe and Mail about the closeness of their relationship.

Now, we'd like to be able to have a close relationship with every group in this province. I'd like to have a closer relationship with the union movement in Manitoba and that may happen someday. — (Interjection) — Honourable members opposite laugh, but when members of the labour union movement see how honourable members opposite in the government are bankrupting them, they will soon wake up.

The rank-and-file members of the labour union movement do not agree with people like Wilf Hudson, people like Allan Mills, who says that he believes that there's an organic fusion between labour and the Manitoba NDP, at the elite level. Now that's important, Madam Speaker, to remember. Don't forget, we are not talking grassroots level; we are talking at the elite level. — (Interjection) — Even now he says, "Ambitious New Democrats" - the Minister of Urban Affairs should listen carefully - "Ambitious New Democrats must be persona grata within the union movement to advance in the party." Well, I am proud to stand here and say, Madam Speaker, I don't have to be persona grata in any movement to move up in my party, or in government in this province. — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Concordia, from his seat, is giving a testimonial to my penultimate predecessor, Mr. Ed McGill, and I am very proud to associate myself with those comments. In fact, if he wants to talk about Mr. McGill at length, I'd be happy to hear from him in further debates in this House, and I'll be asking for his comments.

But if we need evidence of this organic fusion between the New Democrats and the labour movement, we need only recall, Madam Speaker, that in 1986 the United Steel Workers of America contributed \$25,000 to the provincial NDP. The United Food and Commercial Workers donated a further \$25,000, and the Manitoba Federation of Labour donated \$20,000.00. Now, Madam Speaker, where do these union leaders get those thousands of dollars? Is it out of their own salaries, or is it off the backs of the workingman of this province? The workingman and woman in this province is paying these people opposite to raise their Autopac fees, to raise their Hydro fees, to raise their Manitoba Telephone System fees, and to assault their employers with Workers Compensation Board increases.

Madam Speaker, honourable members opposite, and their - what is that expression, Don? - huggy bear-kissy face relationship with the union leaders will be found out by the rank and file. We've been doing a pretty good job of making that point. It will be made even better in the months and weeks and years come.

Madam Speaker, "There is a friendly atmosphere," this says, "between the labour movement and the NDP Government." This is what Mr. Wilf Hudson said, and he acknowledged that union leaders have quick access to Cabinet Ministers. He says, and I quote, Madam Speaker: "Naturally, rubbing shoulders with them makes it easier to talk to them."

Well, Madam Speaker, time does fly when one's on one's feet, doesn't it? Madam Speaker, before I get to other matters, I see . . .

MR. A. DRIEDGER: You've got lots of time.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, this matter I'm going to deal with next might take more than a few minutes, but I'm

pleased to see there will be something coming in this Session regarding employment standards. No Minister opposite though has wanted to take me into her confidence and let me know what might be coming down. I'm dying to know because, if it's helpful to workers in this province, Madam Speaker, it will have our support.

Now I would like to call it six o'clock.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The hour being 6:00 p.m. I am interrupting the honourable member and will be leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m., at which time the honourable member will have 18 minutes remaining.

(English translation of Mr. Roch's speech in Volume XXXVI No. 6, page 147, Thursday, February 18, 1988)

Madam Speaker, I would like to know why the constituency of St. Boniface is not being represented in the House this Session. The Minister, or the former Member for St. Boniface, announced in September that he was resigning as Minister of Health. If he had wanted to, Madam Speaker, he could have resigned as the Member for St. Boniface as well, and given you, given the government plenty of time to call a by-election. However, Madam Speaker, the Premier did not want him to resign in the first place. And secondly, because he did intend to resign, he asked him to keep his seat until February 11. That gives him 12 months to call a by-election. We know what's going to happen, Madam Speaker. The Premier is going to wait for the end of the Session before calling a by-election. Because, Madam Speaker, he knows that the people of St. Boniface will not elect a New Democrat. Speculation has it that the Liberal Party will win the seat. Madam Speaker, after the stand taken by the Liberal leader on abortion, the people of St. Boniface have taken a closer look at the Conservative Party. The Premier doesn't have the courage to call a by-election in St. Boniface. He doesn't have the courage, because he knows that on Monday night and Tuesday afternoon the vote is going to be 28-27. With a member of the Opposition, no doubt a Conservative, what my colleague for Arthur says is true. We're not sure. But we know that it is guaranteed that with a Member for St. Boniface from the Opposition it would be 28-28. Maybe not. Maybe we would win.

(English translation of Mr. Roch's speech in Volume XXXVI No. 6, page 150, top of page, Thursday, February 18, 1988)

Madam Speaker, if the Member for St. Boniface would be in the House today, I don't think he would have the same attitude as that of the Minister of Health today, the Member for Transcona. I believe it is thanks to the Member for St. Boniface that the provincial NDP party has not completely adopted the platform of having abortion on demand, as the federal NDP has done. Mr. Broadbent is proud that his party has accepted abortion on demand. Madam Speaker, I believe that this is tragic, because people from different political parties have different views on this issue.

(English translation of Mr. Roch's speech in Volume XXXVI No. 6, page 150, bottom of page, Thursday, February 18, 1988)

There will be an opportunity for members to debate the merits of the trade deal, and my government will use that and other opportunities to ensure that Manitobans obtain the information they need to judge the deal. Madam Speaker, we know that the real reason for which the government wants to discuss the Canada-United States trade deal is strictly to divert attention from provincial problems. These are problems and a malaise which they created as a result of their own incompetence. They devoted a considerable portion of the Speech from the Throne to the issue of free trade, simply to divert attention from their problems.

(English translation of Mr. Roch's speech in Volume XXXVI No. 6, page 151, Thursday, February 18, 1988)

"Ensuring the fullest opportunity for employment for Manitobans will continue to be a cornerstone of my government's policies and programs."

Why then oppose free trade with the United States? The more businesses we have, the more jobs we have. There are a number of businesses which are here now, despite the NDP and not because of it. They are here in Manitoba, small businesses, as I have said, and they will stay small because of the government. As I said in English before, if free trade with the United States will create jobs in Manitoba, why oppose it? That doesn't make any sense at all.