

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 28 August, 1986.

Time — 2:00 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 Employment Services and Economic Security.

HON. L. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure of tabling the Annual Report of the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security for the year ending March 31st, 1986.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motions . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MTS - Sheik Al Bassam's visit to Winnipeg

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

On Tuesday, August 26, in question period, in reference to a visit by Sheik Al Bassam to Winnipeg, I asked the question of the Minister of Finance as follows: "I wonder, Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance, did he as well meet with the sheik when he was here last fall on that so-called courtesy visit," to which the Minister responded, "Thank you, Madam Speaker, no."

Madam Speaker, I have a copy of a news report - that is a news release - from Manitoba Telephone System that is entitled, "The MTS Echo," which is a monthly news organ that gives stories about events to do with the Telephone System, and in the August 1985 issue it says as follows, in reference to the visit to Winnipeg of the sheik and his wife, "The Al Bassam's were visiting North America on a business tour of which Winnipeg and MTS were on the itinerary. They also met with government officials, including the Honourable Al Mackling, Minister in charge of Telecommunications and Honourable Eugene Kostyra, Provincial Minister for Telecommunications Policy."

My question for the Minister is: is the story from the MTS Echo incorrect or did he misunderstand my question?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

Neither is correct. The answer I gave to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is correct. He asked me if I met with Mr. Al Bassam in the fall of 1985. The answer to that question is no, I did not meet with Mr. Al Bassam in the fall of 1985.

The report in the Echo of August of last year is just about entirely correct. I did meet with Mr. Al Bassam on July 18 at approximately 2:45 - 2:50 p.m. for approximately 10 or 15 minutes, along with some other officials who were in attendance from the Manitoba Telephone System. I believe it was the Chairman of the Manitoba Telephone System at that time, Ms. Jean Edmonds, and I believe Mr. Glover Anderson, and there may have been other people in attendance.

The portion of the Echo report of August 1985, which is not correct, is that it listed me as Minister responsible for Telecommunications Policy. I was not Minister responsible for Telecommunications Policy at that time; I had relinquished that responsibility in January of 1985. They had met with me in my role as Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, so I'm sorry if the member has not been able to get the information with respect to that correct, but that is the correct information, so — (Interjection) — the answer to . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: . . . his question, or the premise to his question, is that both were correct. No, I did not meet with them in the fall of 1985, which was the question that the member asked me. Yes, I did meet with Mr. Bassam on July 18, at approximately 2:45-2:50 p.m. of 1985, which is, just for the record, Madam Speaker, not the fall of 1985, but is the summer of 1985. — (Interjection) —

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Finance: was that the same time at which the sheik met with the Minister responsible for the Telephone System, Mr. Mackling?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I have to be careful, Madam Speaker, so that I'm technically correct, but no, it was not the same time that he met - if he indeed met - with the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System at the meeting that I held with him for that approximate period of time of 10 or 15 minutes. No other Minister was in attendance. It was just staff from the MTS who brought Mr. Bassam in to introduce him to me as the head of the organization that was in a joint venture with the Manitoba Telephone System, so it was not at that time.

Whether or not it was before or after the meeting that he held with the Minister responsible, I think that was something best directed to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, did the Minister of Finance have knowledge that the sheik, on the same visit to Winnipeg, was meeting or had met with the Minister responsible for the Telephone System, the Member for St. James?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I understand it, the question is whether or not I had knowledge at the time . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, I have not recognized the Honourable Minister.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Sorry.

MADAM SPEAKER: May I remind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition of Beauduchesne 359(6), "The Minister to whom the question is directed is responsible to the House for his present Ministry and not for any decisions taken in a previous portfolio."

The question was: was another Minister there? The question is out of order on two grounds. If the member wants to inquire about a Minister's attendance, he should ask that Minister and the question should also not be asked of the Minister of Finance.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, on the point of order?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I just want the record to be clear that I'm prepared to answer those questions.

MADAM SPEAKER: I'm sorry, that question is out of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance, and I want to know if he had knowledge of a meeting during the same visit of Sheik Al Bassam, a meeting between the sheik and the Minister responsible for the Telephone System.

MADAM SPEAKER: That is an identical question and it's out of order on two counts.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I am not asking about his responsibility for another portfolio; I'm not asking him about the decisions or the affairs of another Minister. I'm asking him if he had knowledge of a meeting during the same visit of the sheik to Winnipeg, a meeting that took place between the Minister responsible for the Telephone System and Sheik Al Bassam.

MADAM SPEAKER: That question is out of order, on the two grounds that I quoted.

Does the honourable member have another question or does he want to rephrase his question?

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Finance if he had knowledge of the fact that his colleague was meeting with the sheik during the same visit that the sheik made to Winnipeg in 1985?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

That question is the same or substantially the same as the question I ruled out of order.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, who wants to answer the question - or former Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology - has acknowledged that he met with him. Madam Speaker, there just does not seem to be any valid reason why this question should not be allowed and the answer given.

I would ask then, Madam Speaker, in view of the Minister's willingness to answer the question, if the House would give leave to the Minister of Industry to answer the question?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Leave, leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I have ruled that the question is out of order on two grounds. Many other times questions have been asked; they've been ruled out of order. Whether or not a Minister wants to answer is irrelevant. If the question is not in order, it is not in order.

The question very clearly was asking a Minister about a situation that happened in a former portfolio, No. 1; and No. 2, about the absence or presence of another Minister. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition can ask the Minister responsible for MTS if he was present. He cannot ask the now Minister of Finance.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, the Speaker is the servant of the House. The House has granted leave to the Minister of Industry to answer the question. I would suggest that you simply - in view of that - it's the will of the House that he be allowed to answer the question. Let him answer.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education on the point of order.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I do not believe that there has been unanimous consent to have the Minister of Finance answer the question.

Madam Speaker, you have quite correctly ruled the question out of order, as in accordance with the rules, and I believe you have been very lenient in your allowing the Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to rephrase his question in such a way that it is acceptable to yourself and in accordance with the rules.

Madam Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is not imaginative enough to phrase a question so that it is in accordance with the rules, then I don't know why this side should offer leave to cover up for his incompetence.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have ruled the question out of order. If honourable members are not happy with my ruling, they can certainly challenge my ruling. My ruling, in my opinion, is in accordance with the rules.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question for the Minister of Finance.

To his knowledge, did the Minister responsible for the Telephone System meet with Sheik Al Bassam in July of 1985?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

That question is again identical to the previous question. It is not in order, and I think it's a very dangerous precedent.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please.

Manitoba Hydro - Corporate Vice-President appointment

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro is: a news release, that is, a Hydrogram was released today announcing the appointment of Linda Jolson as Vice-President of Corporate Relations for Manitoba Hydro. I wonder if the Minister responsible can indicate whether a competition was held for that position.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'll take that question as notice, but I can tell the honourable members of this House that there are very few people, public servants in this province or in this country, who work as hard and as capably as Linda Jolson does. She has performed well as a servant of this province, be it with commissions in the past, where she has had recommendations to her from commissioners of this province; be it with respect to ensuring that Native hiring will take place on Limestone; be it with respect to other training programs. She has done well for this . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Labour with a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, I just wanted to answer a question, Madam Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please!

Question period will be conducted in the proper manner, not with people answering questions and asking questions back and forth across the floor.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is: have any concerns been expressed to him with respect to the appointment of Linda Jolson as Corporate Vice-President, having -(Interjection)- the Minister of Energy is upset by this line of questioning?

MADAM SPEAKER: Question?

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, have any concerns been expressed to him by senior members of the staff

of Manitoba Hydro with respect to the passing over of a number of qualified people, who have been long-term employees of Manitoba Hydro for more than 20 years, having been passed over for this appointment to the corporate vice-presidency?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I'm not aware of any complaints to me in respect to the appointment of Linda Jolson. If there is a letter which, knowing the Opposition, on its way to my office, or in my office, then the Leader of the Opposition should mention that if there is a complaint; but, no, I have not received any complaint to this point.

Grain handlers' dispute, Lakehead

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Ministers of Agriculture meeting in Victoria are calling for a \$1.8 billion to \$2 billion Federal Government injection into the farm community to address income shortages that are at a par with the years of the 1930's.

Madam Speaker, given that this government has done virtually nothing in a monetary sense in support of the farm community in this province, can the First Minister indicate why his government has not and will not take sides in the grain handlers dispute in the Lakehead, whereby the federal mediator has recommended that union members there receive an \$800 signing bonus, plus a 3 percent increase in wages over the next two years, where, at the same time, Manitoba farm incomes are dropping some 25 percent this year alone?

Why will the government not take sides on the issue, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Not only is a federal labour dispute not within the administrative responsibility of the government; neither is the Lakehead.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, I would ask why the First Minister doesn't care enough about the farm situation in this province that he will not take sides in this issue? It's costing grain producers in this province millions of dollars.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. That question is out of order again on two counts.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I listened yesterday when the Member for Transcona asked the First Minister questions dealing with federal matters. I now will phrase the question in a similar vein.

I ask the First Minister: has the Minister . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The member raised a point of order. A member does not raise a point of order, leave it open-ended and then ask a question.

The Member for Transcona asked a question that said what is the Provincial Government doing or going to do. I ruled his third question out of order, if you remember correctly. The Honourable Member for Morris asked why the Premier doesn't care, No. 1; and No. 2, why he is not taking sides. If the Honourable Member for Morris wants to rephrase his question and ask what action the Premier would take, it's quite a different matter.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, given that there are 25,000 farmers in Manitoba who will severely impacted in an income sense; given the mediator's proposal that wage-earners at the Lakehead, grain handlers will receive a 3 percent increase, can the First Minister tell me what he will do in his role as the Minister in charge of federal-provincial negotiations and relations, what advice he will give to the First Minister, the Prime Minister of Canada, with respect to this issue? Does he have a recommendation to give?

MADAM SPEAKER: Now that question is in order. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I reject totally and absolutely the suggestion that this government doesn't care insofar as agricultural prices is concerned. Madam Speaker, it was this government that increased the funding in the Department of Agriculture more than any other department of the government of the Province of Manitoba this year.

Madam Speaker, it is this government that has introduced Farm Lands Protection Act, to give support to the farmers as against unfair foreclosures by the lending institutions. It has been honourable members across the way . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

May I remind the Honourable First Minister that answers should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I accept your ruling. I think it's a fair and a proper one.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Morris asked me what advice I would offer. My advice is the common-sense advice that I offer in any situation of this nature, for the two parties to get together, to continue the collective bargaining process and to come to a fair and proper resolution of labour dispute.

Drivers' licences - interprovincial

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: My question is for the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

In view of the fact that the exchange of drivers' records and licensing information between provinces is difficult or impossible; and in view of the fact that this difficulty has resulted in cases being suspended; or disqualified drivers obtaining licences out of province,

does the Minister plan to implement a system or look at a method to solve this problem?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

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

This is certainly an area that is being considered by the Ministers of Highways and Transport across the country.

At the last meeting in Vancouver last fall, the Ministers approved a pilot project that has taken place now in Alberta and British Columbia, that we'll see the rapid exchange, computerized information for drivers' licences, between provinces. The report of that pilot project is to be presented to the Ministers in September in Toronto at the annual conference and a decision made at that particular time as to whether to proceed with expanding this program across the country, and we certainly will be supporting the introduction of such a program so there will be an immediate sharing of information between jurisdictions.

The cost estimate at this time is about \$1.3 million for the capital costs of putting this new program in place and operating of about three-quarters of a million dollars per year. That is not for the province, but that is for the whole system across Canada. Manitoba's share would be considerably less, about 4 percent of that, so it would be relatively minor.

At the present time, Madam Speaker, I just want to say, for the record, that there is a method of exchanging information, but it is by mail and it slow. It is done after the licence from the previous jurisdiction has been handed in and then it is sent back to get the driving records. That is not sufficient and we will certainly ensure that we support the new computerized sharing of information.

Farmers of Manitoba - assistance to

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Premier.

Given that the Minister of Agriculture put out a news release on August 22 of this year stating that the farmers of Manitoba will be facing serious financial problems in 1987, and about 27,500 farms in Western Canada will be in severe difficulty because of low world grain prices, and given that the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta have all given substantial financial assistance to their farmers in 1985, 1986 and are promising it again for 1987, whereas this province has done virtually nothing to meet that kind of farm support, and further, given that in the Constitution, agriculture is a shared and joint responsibility, I would like to ask the Minister, why has the Minister of Agriculture of this province, at the Victoria meeting this week, refused to participate in the federal-provincial program to provide much needed financial assistance to the farmers of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, first, I don't know of the program the honourable member is referring to, unless it is the proposal by the Federal Minister of Agriculture suggesting that there be a federal-provincial program, which I understand was not acceptable to the provinces, and I understand that, certainly in the words of our Minister of Agriculture that I support wholeheartedly, it is wrong of the Government in Ottawa, which this year '84-85 through the Farm Credit Corporation loaned farmers only \$22.9 million, while last year principal repayments by farmers exceeded loans by \$33.8 million.

It is totally wrong for that Federal Government to attempt to pitch the farmers and the provincial governments up against the Treasury of the United States insofar as the undercutting of prices to the western grain farmers, as a result of the subsidies by the Reagan administration. This is a matter that must be dealt with, must be dealt with decisively by the Ottawa Conservative Government, Madam Speaker, and I'm disappointed that the Honourable Member for Virden, the Agricultural Critic, would demonstrate his preparedness to support the Federal Government in Ottawa, to be the lap dog of the Federal Government in Ottawa, rather than to support the farmers of Western Canada.

MR. G. FINDLAY: In light of that response, I will then ask the First Minister of this province why he allows millions and millions of dollars to be thrown away on such adventures as Manfor, ManOil, Flyer and MTX, particularly the MTX? Some \$17 million seems to be going down the drain over there. Why would he allow that money to be lost while he's not doing anything to support the farmers of this province, the very members of this province that built this province within the last 100 years?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, unlike the Tory Government in Ottawa, this government has not cut back insofar as its expenditures on behalf of agriculture. Madam Speaker, this fiscal year the Department of Agriculture received a larger percentage increase than any other department in government.

Madam Speaker, in addition, it is a fact that this government has spent more towards the assistance of agriculture than any other administration, be it New Democrat, Liberal, Conservative, in the history of the Province of Manitoba during the past five years.

Madam Speaker, further let it be recorded that while we have stood firmly and strongly in support of legislation to protect the farmers against unfair foreclosures by the lending institutions, honourable members have continued all kinds of tactics in an attempt to block that legislation from passing this Chamber.

MR. G. FINDLAY: A final supplementary.

I will ask the Premier if he will withdraw his ill-fated Bill No. 4 and apply the accompanying \$5 million of farm aid support to a meaningful program of supporting the grain price problem the farmers are facing in this province.

HON. H. PAWLEY: We noticed the contributions by the banking institutions to the Conservative Party,

Madam Speaker. We've observed the contributions from the banking institutions, Madam Speaker. We know from which direction the Member for Virden is coming; we know from which direction all his colleagues come from across the way; the banks over the farmers of this province; my answer is no.

Beef Stabilization Program

MR. G. FINDLAY: In light of the answers I have received today, I'll ask the Minister why they substantially withdrew the support to the Manitoba Beef Commission Program this year by letters sent out on July 3 of this year, a substantive change in the contract, substantive change in support.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I am surprised at the critic. The official critic across the way to the Minister of Agriculture has apparently failed to use his ears to hear. The program that has been advanced provincially in the Province of Manitoba is much better; much better than the program that his party would propose that we enter into, the Tripartite Program involving the Federal Government in Ottawa. Madam Speaker, there is no comparison between those two programs. We stand behind our program and we'll continue with our program.

Manitoba deficit

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I took as notice a question on August 22 from the Honourable Member for Morris regarding the amount of borrowing that the government has done to date this year.

I'd like to report back to the House that the borrowing to date has included three public market issues: the first U.S. issue which was of \$150 million which yielded \$203,686,000 Canadian; \$150 million Swiss franc issue which yields \$118 Canadian; and the further U.S. issue of \$150 million which yields \$204,764,000 Canadian. There has been one non-public market issue dealing with the Canada Pension Plan and that's in the amount of \$95,679,000 Canadian. So the total borrowing to date that has been finalized is \$622,130,000.00.

Donations, political

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Premier.

Since he wants to leak or talk about donations by corporations or banks to political parties, did the donation by Coopers and Lybrand of \$1,000 and Mr. Les Johnson, partner of Coopers and Lybrand, of \$1,258 have any influence on his decision to hire that company?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, no; but I must admit that when I noticed this morning that Coopers and Lybrand contributed much more to the Conservative Party than to the New Democratic Party, then I did have some second thoughts for a second or two.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, about donations, my other question is: did the donations by Mr. Garth Cramer, Elaine Ettinger, Mike Carter, Michael Decker, Mary Eady, George Ford, John McGuire, does the Premier regard that as those people purchasing their jobs?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I suspect that those donations had much less influence than the \$6,000 contributed by Tan Jay to the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek with a final supplementary.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I would just ask, he mentions Tan Jay, I wonder if the First Minister can give the reasons why Tan Jay moved from Manitoba to Ontario?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, our progressive laws, in respect to labour, are laws I make no apology for. I do know that Tan Jay continues to operate in the Province of Manitoba and continues to operate in a major way, but if the Member for Sturgeon Creek - I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition - is insinuating that we must change our labour laws and we must wind back our labour laws 40 to 50 years, to meet the desires of Peter Nygaard, then I say to the Member for Sturgeon Creek, no way, no way will this government be bought out in that way.

Grandparenting Program

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

The Winnipeg Grandparenting Program has been successful in matching young families without grandparents with older members of our community who would like to have children in their lives, and to date 278 matches have in fact occurred. Is the Department of Community Services examining funding, in that it appears this organization may be in danger of folding this fall?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I did meet somewhere during last winter with that particular group. We are not adding groups at the present time because

the general fiscal situation means that we must meet our priority needs first, our basic responsibility. I think this is the type of program that is a good enrichment to programs available to people. I would hope that it is the type of program that can carry on largely on a volunteer basis and with the support of organizations like United Way or the Lotteries Umbrella Service. At this time, I think our primary responsibility has to be to maintaining and bringing up to really an optimum standard, the programs for which we already have primary responsibility.

MTS - advertising

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Can the Minister inform the House why the Manitoba Telephone System would spend its advertising dollars to place an ad at 10:43 last evening, and on other evenings, during the CBC Journal, one of the most expensive advertising slots, when immediately following, at 10:44, the same ad - exact same ad - was placed by Telecom?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I know that the Manitoba Telephone System, pursuant to an agreement with all the telephone companies in Canada, share in long-distance revenues. They do advertise extensively in respect to the long-distance market that they serve. I didn't see the ads in question. I know I have seen ads by the telephone companies, which emphasize the worth of the long-distance service they offer; I assume it was one of those ads, I will check on that. I can't see that there is a problem in that kind of advertising, that's arranged by the telephone companies that are involved, by agreement, in revenue sharing and it's my assumption that they are also involved in a joint advertising program.

MTS - judicial inquiry re MTX

HON. A. MACKLING: While I have the floor, Madam Speaker, I would like to confirm - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked me yesterday, in connection with a visit by Sheik Al Bassam, indicating that I had a visit in the fall of 1985 - I didn't assume that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was incorrect. I knew I had a visit late last year, sometime toward the middle of the summer or the fall, and I agreed that I'd had a meeting with the sheik.

I've confirmed with my office that there was no entry in my diary as to a meeting, that there had been a call from the Telephone System, asking whether a courtesy call could be made and, as such, was made on July 18, 1985, at approximately 3:00 p.m. It's not logged in my records, but that is the information given to me by the Telephone System.

MTS - advertising

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights with a supplementary.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A final supplementary to the same Minister, Madam Speaker. Would the Minister please investigate the validity of placing two advertisements, exactly identical, within one minute of one another?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I indicated that I will confirm the scheduling and why the ads were scheduled so closely together. It's my understanding that the station arranges the scheduling and, if such is the case, as I understand it to be, and the scheduling provided both ads, one following the other, I think that we weren't getting our money's worth and we will talk to the television station about that.

Wife abuse

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General with respect to a report in the Portage Daily Graphic of Friday, August 8 of this year, which indicates that a rural Portage woman was sentenced to jail for 90 days for failing to testify against her common-law husband at a preliminary hearing involving assault charges against the husband.

I would ask the Attorney-General if he would investigate that matter, inasmuch as I'm informed she had requested that those charges be dropped several times before they got to court, and whether or not this jailing of the wife is in accordance with his departmental policy with respect to wife abuse cases? I thought we were after the wife abusers, not the wives.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: It's a very good question and I share the member's concern. I'm glad he's bringing it to my attention and I want to assure him and members of the House that I will look into it immediately and see what has happened and report back to the House. It ought not to have happened. I think that it certainly is not part of our policy and I will take whatever step is necessary to make sure that that kind of thing doesn't happen again, and we'll do whatever we can under the circumstances.

MTS - advertising

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, one further question to the Attorney-General.

With respect to the rejection by the Manitoba Telephone System of a proposed ad in the Yellow Pages of the Telephone Book by the "Alliance Against Abortion," would the Attorney-General investigate that matter - although appreciating that he does not agree with the views of the Alliance - would he investigate that matter in order to determine if the Telephone System is improperly infringing with freedom of speech in this matter?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I'll take that as notice and consult with my colleague, the Minister responsible for the Telephone System again. On the basis of those

facts, it certainly, in my view, is not anything which ought to have happened and it certainly ought to be looked into and will.

MTS - services, rural Manitoba

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System with regard to the rural services that are being received by customers in rural Manitoba.

For some time now, there has been considerable concern with regard to the quality of telephone service in rural lines, and this lack of attention to problems which have been raised has caused some inconvenience and hardships to rural customers.

In view of the fact, Madam Speaker, that I have received at least three phone calls from three different communities regarding this problem, and in view of the fact that the R.M. of Rossburn on June 13 sent a resolution and a letter to Mr. Earl Hall, who's responsible for customer services, with regard to the problems which exist in that community, and further to that, the R.M. of Rossburn has also sent a resolution and a letter on August 12 to the Minister responsible for the Telephone System regarding this problem, can the Minister indicate what steps he has taken to answer the requests by the R.M. of Rossburn with respect to the problems that are being experienced by rural Manitoba telephone customers?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, as I've indicated earlier in the House, one of the problems we have in Manitoba is a good problem. We're suffering from growing pains. Our economy has quickened, and we have had to resort to bringing people from Alberta to work here to provide services that are needed for new business growth in Manitoba.

In connection with the concerns for improved service, the honourable members will recall that I have indicated that we have asked the Telephone System to confirm to us options for improved service throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba, including giving a commitment as to when we can eliminate party lines in the province, multi-line service, including also a commitment in respect to an expanded free-calling area in the province, and all of this, Madam Speaker, while we enjoy one of the lowest rates, if not the lowest rate, in North America.

Madam Speaker, while I have the floor, I would like to indicate . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

Before Orders of the Day, I was anxiously awaiting yesterday's Hansard as all members of the House, I'm sure, were. I just momentarily, a few moments ago,

asked the Clerk if I could receive a copy because I was concerned about remarks that members opposite made . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, so that the request that I'm about to make would be in accordance with the rules and that it be made at the first opportunity, I was anxious to get a copy of Hansard.

I would ask Madam Speaker to review the remarks of the Member for Lakeside during yesterday's question period in which slanderous remarks, certainly unparliamentary remarks, were made against the Member for Transcona.

I believe, in light of all that has transpired over the last few months in this House, it is most unfortunate and reflects on the integrity of members opposite that these kinds of remarks continue to be made. It is clearly out of order and I am serving notice that I will be asking the member involved to be withdrawing those remarks.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

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

Perhaps I wasn't present, and I don't have Hansard yet, but perhaps, when you're reviewing those remarks, you might consider whether you set the precedent for those remarks in describing the former Leader of the Opposition.

A MEMBER: Good point.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Education on the point of order.

HON. J. STORIE: On the point of order, Madam Speaker, the kind of remarks that were made, and unfortunate remarks by the House Leader for the Opposition is exactly the kind of concern that we have had for this entire Session, one allegation, one slander after another.

MADAM SPEAKER: Could we please have order? Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie on this point of order.

MR. E. CONNERY: On the same point of order of Hansard, Madam Speaker, the allegations of what the Member for Lakeside said.

But, Madam Speaker, we also have to be concerned that Hansard prints everything that goes on in the House. The Minister of Culture issued a profanity. It was not recorded in Hansard, and it is recorded on television, Madam Speaker. So how does this happen?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. We cannot have two points of order on the floor at the same time. Order please.

May I remind the Honourable Minister of Education that points of order on things that are said in the House have to be raised at the time they are said.

HON. J. STORIE: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I do recognize that. However, it has been customary when . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. J. STORIE: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is this a new point of order?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I believe it is.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Could we please have some order so that we can settle this. Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I simply point out that I could not know whether the comments were on the record . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. That is not a point of order. That is arguing with my ruling.

The Honourable Member for Morris on a point of order.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would ask you to take under advisement the words of the Minister of Education when he said that he was able to secure a copy of Hansard before all members of this House. Madam Speaker, you've ruled on this issue in the past as recently as a month ago.

I would ask you to take under advisement how it is that the Minister of Education was able to secure a copy of that Hansard before all other members of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member did not conclude his statement with a motion, so he does not have a matter of privilege, but I certainly will look into the situation.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Bring on Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker.

Just as we move into Orders of the Day, let the record show that the applause in the House was for the Member for Inkster and his wife for the birth of their daughter yesterday.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I rise on a grievance. I've done so very seldom in my career in this House. I don't

believe that there's very often been a more important reason to do so. I want to talk about the role of the government, of the media, of the Conservatives, the Member for River Heights and the Freedman Inquiry.

Madam Speaker, that has been a very difficult personal experience for the Member for Transcona, for Wilma Parasiuk, for Susan and for Michael, for their sisters, sisters-in-law, brothers-in-law, nephews, nieces, friends, mother. They have been harassed by the local media at all hours of the day and night, during the week, during the weekends. There have been attempts to take photographs; there have been some of the most disgusting displays by the media in the history of this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

If honourable members want private conversations, could they please do so elsewhere so they do not disrupt the business of the House.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, it has been a Kafkaesque experience for that family and for their friends. It has caused many sleepless nights; it has caused much aggravation and concern; and I believe it is time now that the people involved take a look at themselves, take a look at themselves very, very closely, especially the Leader of the Opposition and the Free Press. If there are any two groups who have been playing ping-pong with this issue, one says partner, the other says conflict, and then we see one saying one thing about it, the other one adds another item to it.

This has been happening, had happened for a period of days when the Member for St. Norbert and the Member for Lakeside and the Leader of the Opposition and that fine bunch at the Free Press, Paul Maloney, people like that, just played and played and played, with not only an individual, a whole family's reputation, when there was absolutely nothing behind it - absolutely nothing - built on a wisp of smoke. Just disgusting behaviour on the part of those people, Madam Speaker.

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

I've been looking at the media reaction and at the reaction, sorry to say, of people like the Member for River Heights as well. I would say, for the most part, the media in this province overall, were fair. The Brandon Sun, Winnipeg Sun, most of the electronic media attempted to cover an issue that was clearly becoming an issue, in a fair and reasonable fashion.

The Sun today, in keeping with its reaction throughout in refusing to sensationalize or to condemn an innocent man, gave the story Page 5 coverage and reasonable coverage, quoting the Honourable Sam Freedman, quoting the Premier, quoting the Opposition, even a reference in that particular paper by Peter Warren, obviously written before the determination, saying that in his books the man had been unfairly dealt with. So there was some understanding by most of the media, I would say, of what was going on.

The electronic media I was able to pick up, overall on the whole, tended to be balanced. And throughout this case, I should say about the electronic media, that to a large extent they've been forced to react to the initiatives of the Conservative Party and the initiatives of the Free Press. There's been the ping-pong back and forth, playing with false issues and they would have

to report because it became something that was newsworthy.

Having said that, however, I do want to say - and I don't pretend we're perfect; we all make mistakes and I think that local outlets would agree - that maybe it's too easy for them in an understaffed outlet to be simply reading the day's daily paper and rewriting it into a news story, turning, in this instance, unsubstantiated innuendo into fact. This has caused serious damage to an honourable, respected member of this Legislature. It doesn't go away in a day; it doesn't go away just automatically because of what has taken place over the last few hours.

Again, what did the Free Press do today in response? Just an absolutely shameful front page story, an absolutely disgusting piece of journalism that should not even be called journalism. I had expected today that Mike Ward's resignation would be on the table. I had expected that Mike Ward would slink out of this town, slink out of this province, out of this country in disgust. He should be so ashamed of himself for what he has been doing with his reporters, people like Paul Maloney, tremendous, just absolute disgust is what I have for that man and what he has done over the last few months on this issue.

I quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, had expected apologies from the Member for St. Norbert, from whom I expected more than silence; from the Leader of the Opposition; from the reporters; the Member for Lakeside - I wasn't, quite frankly, expecting it from him.

I cannot recall one time in this province's history, and I've read through a number of commissions of inquiry, cannot recall in fact in this country, not one, where we have ever seen such a strong conclusion, proving beyond the shadow of a doubt that the accused person was innocent.

I want to quote from Hansard of May 21, 1986, the Premier of this province set up the inquiry. He asked the Honourable Sam Freedman to determine whether the said, and I'm quoting now, ". . . whether the said Wilson Parasiuk is or has been in conflict of interest or has acted improperly." I just say, has acted improperly - not illegally - improperly. Was there any smirch whatsoever on what this man was doing with respect to the consulting contract and (b), I'm quoting again, ". . . his interest in certain real property in the City of Winnipeg commonly described as 115 Bannatyne Avenue, The Brokerage, and to make findings and recommendations with respect to the matters outlined in (a) and (b) above, consistent with the public interest and general welfare of the people of Manitoba."

He made the findings on both of those issues. He said on the last page of his report, all of the evidence is in and yet the Free Press today had the gall to run a front-page story and a headline suggesting that it wasn't, suggesting that we were still waiting for more evidence, suggesting that somehow the Auditor's Report was going to present evidence with respect to those two allegations with respect to the Member for Transcona.

Anyone who had read that document knows full well that is another falsehood, on top of falsehood after falsehood related to this issue and related issues which the Free Press has run and the Members of the Opposition have played to, over the last number of months.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for St. Norbert, rising on a point of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: A point of order, a point of privilege, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I rise because I think on two occasions the Honourable Minister has referred to me specifically and third, in a general way, as a Member of the Opposition.

I simply want to point out for the record to him and to the Member for Transcona that the statements - and if I'm wrong I stand to be corrected - I made were in view of the allegations made against the Member for Transcona, a friend of mine since university days. I thought the honourable thing to do was to have an inquiry. That inquiry was requested by the Member for Transcona, to his credit. It has now thoroughly cleared him and I commend him and I congratulate him for it, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It might be a clarification, but it certainly is not a point of order or a matter of privilege. May I remind all members of the House that under our rules, Rule No. 42: "When a member is speaking, no member shall interrupt, except to raise a point of order or a matter of privilege."

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I trust that will be deducted from my time. I have a lot to say this afternoon.

I want to say, as well, that the Member for St. Norbert has stood up here now and said the honourable thing to do was for him to resign, for us to have an inquiry and so on. He will recall - I think it's in today's Press - the Press is saying we never said conflict of interest; the Member for St. Norbert did. You will see how your friends are deserting you in the lurch.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as soon as they're in trouble, they're running and hiding and cutting and attempting to cut off the Tories from them. So their friends are not helping them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, here we have the House Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of this province standing up and saying, yes, the proper thing to do was for the Minister to resign. Yes, the proper thing to do - notwithstanding there was no evidence - the proper thing to do was to have an inquiry, yes. Then his leader, and the Member for River Heights, say after that inquiry, which they demanded, and the Member for River Heights demanded the inquiry and demanded the resignation, after they have done that, after the member complies with that, after it has been proven that there was nothing, that he was an innocent man unfairly accused by the Free Press and the Conservatives, after that, the Liberals and the Conservatives come back and say, well, he asked for it. There should be no payment of costs for the Member for Transcona. That's a nice way to treat a fellow member of the House who has been put in a position precisely because he's a member of this House. If he was not a member of this House, if he was an ordinary citizen of this province, that would never have happened.

One of the problems that we have here with respect to this kind of innuendo is that a member of this House is very, very vulnerable to attack on these kinds of things. They can pick up anything and then phone their

family, phone the children of people involved in Crown corporations and so on, ask them questions about things. That kind of thing happens because we're in the public eye.

When these things happen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let there be no doubt to Manitobans that this has a long-term negative consequence to public life in this province. Let no one believe that this incident will not have an effect, an impact on public life in Manitoba for many years to come. Let no one believe that people will not stop and think seriously - in fact, I have had numerous conversations over the period of that time, but especially since the inquiry findings came down, with people in this city who are saying, you know, I wouldn't have that job for a million bucks, to have people like the Free Press go after me in that kind of a way.

I would hope that at the end of this, some of the mud which the Free Press has thrown at people, some of the mud - you look at "Records Reveal Partner Paid by Department," by Mary Ann Fitzgerald. "Partner." A mockery of the English language is what this piece of garbage is. A mockery of the English language! That is what it is. They refer to partners when they know full well there are none.

What do we see today in the Free Press? Do we see something like, "Free Press proved wrong. Apologies to Parasiuk's family." Something like, "Parasiuk innocent. Parasiuk clean." Or something like that? No. The innuendo on the front page of the Free Press is that somehow there's more evidence to come from the auditor when they know that according to the Honourable Sam Freedman, all the evidence is in and he is innocent. All the evidence is in.

I want to say a word about the Commissioner, the Honourable Sam Freedman. One of the best minds produced in the history of this country. I very specifically didn't say legal mind because he's certainly that as well, but one of the best minds in the history of this country. The fact that his firm represents the Free Press did not concern this government, which knew about it when we appointed him after the resignation of the Member for Transcona. We never doubted his objectivity. When he appointed another Free Press lawyer to, in effect, be the prosecutor, we did not flinch. The Member for Transcona, secure in the knowledge of his innocence, went into the hearings, where the basic roles of judge, jury and prosecutor - because the judge in that case was the jury - were filled by legal counsel for the paper which had by smear and innuendo, together with the Conservative Party, been the root cause of the hearing.

Mr. Freedman cleared him. Today there's no story saying reporters Paul Moloney, Heidi Graham and the others today apologized for their abominable behaviour in reporting the Parasiuk affair, admitting that they had unjustly, between them, been parties to harassment of the Parasiuk family; between them, making a mockery of our language; innuendo; distortion, among other things. Nothing like that. No facts reported. No resignation, as I said before, from Mike Ward for writing headlines that Goebbels, the Nazi propagandist, would have been proud of. "Pravda" would love you, Mike. But you say, look at the great editorial. John Dafoe did a great job. What a great job.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Madam Speaker, just as the good cop and the bad cop are both part of the same organization, so are the

different parts of the Free Press all one organization together with the Conservatives. The editor of the editorial page of the Free Press cashes a cheque earned by the sale of newspapers generated by the news department, or does he really believe - does any editorial writer really believe that the editorials, so little read, are what pay for that paper?

That news department made sure today that the strong statement by Mr. Freedman, and I quote, "The evidence on the Parasiuk inquiry is all in." I go on, further down, "The evidence establishes that Mr. Parasiuk was not guilty of either the first or the second charge set forth," and I've already enumerated those charges, 115 Bannatyne, conflict of interest, all of those things, has said the evidence is all in and he's not guilty; he's innocent.

Yet the front page talks about somehow something left dangling. The Member for River Heights and the Leader of the Opposition play games with the Free Press, part of the ping pong game and say, oh, the auditors, oh, well, my goodness, well maybe we shouldn't reappoint the Member for Transcona to the Cabinet until that has come in. Part of the same game.

That wasn't contained on the front page, that quote that the man was cleared of both charges and that the evidence was all in. It talked about costs of the inquiry. There's a good one to kick around. That's a good first part of a story. And it's good to talk about Opposition reaction. You know, Madam Speaker, that story did not refer to the statement made by the Premier of this province in reaction to an attack on a Minister of his which had taken place for a number of months; did not refer to it but referred to the statements of people whose calculations on the issue had been proven wrong.

Madam Speaker, at least the Free Press is generally consistent. It doesn't matter whether it was a news department or an editorial page running an article just a few months ago, as an example, quickly, on the potash miracle, the potash that had been bad in 1980-1981 was better now, totally failing to recognize that we were talking about different fields from then and now with differences in quality of up to 10-15 percent of the grade, ignoring that totally.

They would never touch the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, talking about Limestone - getting on to Limestone for a bit - the Leader of the Opposition during the election campaign, and before, was being told by his northern candidates that the Native hiring issue was a good one, feed that one up. His candidates at nomination meetings - one in Thompson is an example - said the bad thing about Limestone was the Native hiring preference which was separating people on racial grounds.

Then we had the Leader of the Opposition get up at that same meeting and say, well, we'll have to do something about that; we'll have to do something about the hiring policies. He had letters from other people from the North that said this is a good one, this is really going to fire the troops up, up here, get on to this one. He had the gall, in the House, later on, to say no, I never said that.

The Member for Radisson was clearly on the record as saying that he was opposed to the Native hiring preference. They're entitled to that, but I think what they're not entitled to is the right to be able to say we're here one day and there the other without having

their inconsistencies pointed out. To talk about other things that — (Interjection) — sure, I'm sorry, Niakwa.

Then we have the Leader of the Opposition - Gary, I wasn't there - saying today it wasn't me, I was on vacation - Pontius Pilate washing his hands of the whole affair - I wasn't there. It was just my House Leader who was speaking on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party. I wasn't there.

With his incestuous relationship with the Free Press, and I can understand, if you look at this overall arrangement - and if they don't like the word "incestuous," Madam Speaker, that's the word the Leader of the Opposition used to describe the activity which Mr. Justice Freedman found to be absolutely innocent on the part of people on this side of the House, in this House.

We have the Member for St. Norbert playing block for the Free Press, going back for a second to the time when they discovered that Mr. Justice Freedman and the counsel for the inquiry were lawyers for the Free Press, they wanted to make sure: well, let's not talk about the Free Press. They were afraid; he was afraid. He was playing a nice big block for the Free Press to make sure that their role would not be covered.

We have the Free Press, in its investigative journalism, Madam Speaker, going only on one side of the street. They have never investigated the blind trust of the Leader of the Opposition.

We have now come through an examination of a member on this side of what it means to be Mr. Clean when it comes to a blind trust, a real blind trust where you put your shares away, have other people to whom you do not talk about your business taking control of that business and determining whether to buy, sell, expand, detract. Whatever they wanted to do, they never talked to him about his business from the time of the election in 1981 until the time of the hearing, and those professionals testified, a lawyer and an accountant, as to how that blind trust was run.

There was another blind trust - 1979, 1980, wherever - the Leader of the Opposition put his affairs in a blind trust, and he's admitted to the activity that I'm referring to here.

John Harvard of the Free Press, of the CBC - I'm sorry, John, I should never accuse you of that - was interviewing the person who was in charge of Success College for the Leader of the Opposition. He said, "Gary and I are good friends." - Mr. McLellan. "We play squash regularly, see each other socially and, as part of my reporting, I send him a copy of our statement in budget on a regular basis."

Then Harvard says, "But even if Filmon didn't handle the day-to-day running of Success, he was in constant touch with Dave McLellan, the man in charge."

McLellan comes on again, "I will mention things of importance or staff matters I think he should know about. I don't feel I have to consult him in making any of the decisions in operating his school."

Question: "You stay on as the president of the company, the director of the company, this family company, you maintain a close relationship with Mr. McLellan during all this time. So why did you bother, insofar as the school is concerned, why did you bother setting up a blind trust?" I just want to step back a bit before I go on. That's a question to the Leader of the Opposition by John Harvard.

Madam Speaker, he was a Minister in the Cabinet of the Lyon Government. Before he came into his office, his school - and I will not suggest today that there was anything improper in terms of Success' relationship with the Province of Manitoba; I'm not going to get into the same gutter with him - but his school was doing about \$20,000, on average, business with the Government of Manitoba, collecting fees, 1977 to 1978, 20,000 roughly in fees each year; '79-80-81, the three years - he was elected in 1979 - so in those years when he was a member of this Legislature with us, he averaged \$30,000, and I am not suggesting for one second that it was because of his membership in this House.

"Why did you bother setting up a blind trust?" - John Harvard.

The Leader of the Opposition: "So that the beneficial ownership of the shares was transferred out of my name into a trustee."

John Harvard: "Doesn't that make a sham of the blind trust?"

The Leader of the Opposition: "As a matter of fact, it may well do that but the point becomes, John, there is very little indication that I use my position for any personal benefits."

Isn't that great! The Free Press never touched that. The Free Press said, oh boy, you know our investigation is so busy with other things, we're not going to touch that. And this morning - to come back to this - we have people from the Opposition - I never heard anybody from the NDP or the Liberals federally complaining when people said that Sinclair Stevens' fees should be paid from the public purse. These people who demanded an inquiry, who demanded the widening of the inquiry, we had the Member for River Heights out there saying we want it widened, we want to know all about this, that and the other thing, and we were going to have the Member for Transcona paying his own legal fees on the basis of those kinds of representations. We had the Leader of the Opposition demanding the inquiry. He was in the House demanding the inquiry before the inquiry was set up.

Today, they are saying oh no. Notwithstanding the fact that no private citizen of this province could be put through something like that, they're saying oh no, he should pay his own way.

You know, Madam Speaker, this business of the blind trust of the Leader of the Opposition is an example that we don't, quite frankly, like to use. You may say that I'm getting into the gutter a bit with them when I start referring to their people, but you know when Bob Wilson was a member of this House, I was a backbencher sitting way up on the other side, I never asked a question about it, our justice critic never asked a question about it. There was an investigation, but nothing about, to the Attorney-General, to the Member for St. Norbert, when were you told that the wire taps were on; when were you told that the man was under investigation; when did you know that your caucus room was being tapped? Those kinds of things. We didn't play those kinds of games.

We don't prejudge people who are in the middle of trials. You won't find us having said anything about Sinclair Stevens, which is a more current topic, and, quite frankly, I think many on this side would hope that he would be found innocent, because he was a very

good Minister when it comes to, at least a Manitoba regional perspective, he understood some of the problems that we were having. There's no question we would like to see him back in that portfolio. We haven't been playing games with that, not for one second.

Never have I addressed an individual. In the press conference that I held on that one, four different times I said - if you want to use my judgment, then use mine; if you want to use yours, use yours - four times I said in that press conference, I do not blame individual investors. I do not attack the investor, I attack the system which is wrong. Whether they're my friends or not, that's not the issue, that's not the issue at all. So if you want to use my judgment, use mine; if you want to use yours, use yours.

If you want to use my judgment, in my judgment the Free Press has, in a dismal fashion, failed in its responsibility. They and the Leader of the Opposition

A MEMBER: They were quoting you correctly.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Talk about quoting me correctly. They never quote - well I shouldn't say never - they have so many stories. There was one on dealing with partners, Hydro boss gets husband a job, or something like that. They managed to have about eight things wrong in one of the stories, eight factual issues wrong. Wasn't it their publisher who said that if there's one thing wrong in a story then I'm not going to bother reading it. So, I imagine he doesn't read the Free Press very often.

One of the little ones that they took a shot at us on last week, Madam Speaker, was where they were quoting Gervin Greasley as saying that 60 percent of the people at Limestone were from outside of Manitoba. What he had told them, that 60 percent were not from the North. Of course, what they didn't say was that about 50 percent, roughly, were from southern Manitoba. It gives you a little bit of a different context on what is going on there, quite a different context.

They never put it in context with what happened in Quebec under the Liberals and Bourassa. How many jobs did the Natives get there? What kind of preferences did the Natives get there; or in jobs in other parts of this country? Never put that in context.

Take a look at what we're doing here. Don't compare us to the Almighty; compare us to the alternative. When you look at the alternatives, we look very good. We are not perfect, but we do attempt, to the best of our ability, to use our talents to the betterment of this province. I believe that this kind of activity, which has taken place over the last three months, a concerted attack between several people on the Opposition bench - and I should say that there were a number who never took part in any of it. Quite frankly, I appreciate that. I know that some of them have had sometimes accusations that were unfair levied against them. I think that some of them understood that and kept their mouths shut waiting for justice to be determined.

But the Leader of the Opposition, he began, he demanded the inquiry. He demanded that the terms of reference be broadened. He was satisfied when Mr. Freedman was appointed. Then when it became obvious to everyone but Mike Ward and Paul Maloney that the

man was falsely accused on the basis of a mockery, the Leader of the Opposition referred to the commission as a whitewash. Well, I'm sorry, I shouldn't say he did; I should say, he was quoted in the Free Press as saying it was a mockery. There's a difference, I admit that. It may well be, but that was another invention of Mike Ward.

Now, "after all the evidence is in," that's what Mr. Freedman said, that's what the man said whom the Opposition, at the time he was appointed, said was a good appointee, and I believe certainly he demonstrated that he was, after all the evidence was in on both charges - we don't have to wait for any Auditor's Report to hear about those charges - the Leader of the Opposition pretends that the Auditor will somehow add something regarding conflict, regarding wrongdoing. Again, he joins with the Member for River Heights in insisting, in a pretty self-serving, negative fashion, that the member pay his own costs.

What do they say about all those other people, those innocent people who were dragged into this, Parasiuk partner. How about that other side of it? They have families; they have loved ones; they have friends; they also have legal bills. They're not wealthy people. They had to hire a lawyer and look after their own interests because they were being implicated in this affair. Have you no feeling? Do you believe that is fair, that people can be dragged into something like this in a peripheral fashion, have abusive headlines on them month after month in the Free Press, come out of it with the Honourable Sam Freedman saying the whole argument fell down like a house of cards, and you're going to say, tough. We really put you through that one, ho, ho, ho!

Do you think that is in the best interests of Manitoba in the long run? Do you think it's in the interests of getting membership in this House, getting people to stand for employment in our important Crown corporations, to be running them through the muck? Madam Speaker, the people who they've attempted to run through the muck, the Leader of the Opposition especially, with respect to Hydro, have been the very people who are the activators, the people making sure that the important social programming that we are taking on with Limestone will take place, people who stepped in when we couldn't get the regular bureaucracy to move fast enough, people who were prepared to work seven days a week, people who were prepared to give of themselves, give of their holidays, give of their health to make sure that we would have a successful completion, that we would have more people from the North, Native Northerners working there so that they would have their fair share out of this important economic project. Those are the very people who were attacked by the Leader of the Opposition so viciously and so unfairly.

He has made no apology. His argument fell down like a house of cards, and no apology, and only negativism and only a request for more punishment for these people who I, quite frankly, think have been put through enough. I wouldn't want people from the Free Press to have their families hassled on the weekends. I wouldn't want John Dafoe to have his children bothered by reporters in the evenings and on weekends. I wouldn't — (Interjection) — well, Mike Ward, I don't know.

Overall, I don't want those kinds of things to happen to those people, but I ask them, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition, through you, Madam Speaker, in your attacks, let us make sure before we move that we have the facts and that those facts, when all put together, stand for something; not just some isolated fact which with three or four other facts makes a very reasonable circumstance; not just some fact which, if you pull it out of context with what has happening at the time may make things look bad when they are not bad at all, when they are good, as the Honourable Mr. Freedman has demonstrated in this particular instance. Be a little more careful.

None of us know everything. None of us, as I said before, are perfect. We all at times have to do a little bit of soul-searching about our role in this House, our role with respect to the province, our role with respect to decision-making, policy formation in this province. When I reflect back, I admit there are many areas where there could be improvements with respect to what I'm doing. I'm doing my best.

I think the people on the Opposition benches should reflect on their behaviour, their glee, their wish to want to believe, Madam Speaker, their wish to want to believe the worst of other members, because that's where it comes down to. They wanted to believe so desperately that they had somebody here who was doing something wrong, something improper.

So what if somebody denies it? We'll run the headline about "Wife Pushes Job to Husband" and so on, and then we'll come into the House and kick that along, because that must be true because the Free Press said it. — (Interjection) — Well, they say McCarthyism. I believe that there is some truth in that. There's an awful lot of truth in that. In fact there's a lot more truth in the statement that what has happened over the last few months has been McCarthyism, than the statement certainly that people on this side have done anything wrong; they have not.

Our Member for Transcona did everything properly. There would be nobody in this House who could say, you should have done it this way instead; you should have done it that way instead. He put his affairs in a blind trust, he refused to subvert that blind trust by in any way peaking around the corner as the Leader of the Opposition was doing with his, unreported. He did nothing wrong and yet his family and his friends were put through something nobody should be put through. People who expected not to be in the public eye, but were expected by us to do a good job for the province, were put through an awful summer; many sleepless nights, lost holidays, those kinds of things. Those things happen and people have to, in the end, recognize that there is responsibility.

This is not just some little game people are playing; this is serious. We're talking about real people, not only people - not only on a personal basis - we're talking about a province that cannot afford this kind of internal dissension among its decision-makers. It's one thing to have a disagreement on philosophy; it is an entirely different thing to be throwing personal mud in that fashion against - and to do it all against one particular party, constantly, day after day, bringing in anyone who looks like they might be associated, subvert the word, make a mockery of the word "partnership" in order to make it look a little better, build your little house of

cards, only to have it torn down when the white light of truth shines, as the Commissioner of Inquiry found, only to have that house of cards fall in the white light of truth. These things have, as I say, Madam Speaker, more than a personal effect.

That is why I'm up on a grievance today. I have not, as I said when I started, very seldom I've used an opportunity to be up on a grievance. I don't think, quite frankly, that there have been many occasions when I've been in this House, when there has been as important a reason to have a grievance on behalf of members of this House than we have today.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Madam, I rise on a grievance.

Madam Speaker, as will soon be seen, there is some relationship between what I have to say about the MTX matter and the splendid speech of my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. I simply want to say, with respect to that speech, the best speech I think he's given since I've listened to him in this House, that with one exception, which I'll mention and he'll forgive me for it, I concur with that speech in its entirety.

Madam Speaker, I want to say a few words, to begin with, about the relationship between - in general about questions of criminal investigation and judicial inquiry. I think it's important that we try, collectively, to understand that relationship. We may not agree with the opinions expressed; that's one thing. But I think it's important for those members opposite who believe, and many of them do, that we're all here trying to seek the best public policy for the Province of Manitoba to understand some of the legal questions and the practical questions that are involved.

And what I say with respect to the relationship between a criminal investigation and a judicial inquiry is equally applicable to the relationship between a criminal investigation and a commission of inquiry under The Evidence Act. There has been more nonsense spoken about that in this House to this date than I've ever heard on that question.

First of all, some practical considerations.

Questions of time. Madam Speaker, given the nature of the issues which have been raised in the MTX matter - and I do not say they are unimportant issues, no one has said that - given the nature of those issues, given the geographic questions, witnesses in the United States of America, witnesses in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, witnesses in various parts of Canada, it is, in my considered opinion, virtually impossible to consider that a commission of inquiry could complete its work in anything less than six months to a year and likely, it could be over a year; a year in which the clouds which hang over the questions of the corporations and of individuals would continue to hang unabated and that could have, everyone must recognize, a continuing serious effect on the functioning of the corporations involved. Six months to a year.

You know, had we taken the decision at the beginning to launch a commission of inquiry - I think it would have to be that. I don't think there is a judge available for a judicial inquiry - we would still not be off the

ground; we would still not be off the ground. You have to have the terms of reference; you have to find the person; a person of quality is not instantly available; all of the parties who might be involved would want to be legally represented. In my view, had we gone that route, we would still not be off the ground and yet, just by way of comparison on this one point alone, the RCMP investigation is well along the line, and in my judgment, on the basis of reports to me from time to time, it might well be the case that we could have a report from the RCMP in three to five weeks from this date. And even at that date, it is not likely that a commission of inquiry, even if appointed, would be able to commence its hearings.

Certainly the RCMP, for example, is now in a position, Madam Speaker, where having interviewed a number of people in Winnipeg, are now going further afield. They will be going, in fact they may be even in these days, into various parts of the United States to interview certain persons there.

A commission of inquiry cannot do that except by the greatest of difficulty, the most complex of legal procedures, and the expense of considerable time. A commission of inquiry simply cannot move with that degree of dispatch.

Again, the RCMP has, through its Interpol connections, the ability - I'm not saying it will necessarily be successful - it has the ability because some of those Interpol connections are in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia - has the ability to get information about certain individuals, about certain commercial relationships, that a commission of inquiry could not do. A commission of inquiry, a Canadian commission of inquiry could not set foot in the Kingdom of Arabia. The RCMP are there through Interpol; Coopers and Lybrand are there through 75 people employed in Saudi Arabia. That has to be understood. Coopers and Lybrand have in effect a 60-day mandate so that within approximately 60 days, we will have at least an Interim Report from Coopers and Lybrand. It may well be the case that had we - and again I say - started a Commission of Inquiry back a few weeks ago, that it would not even be off the ground by the time we have both the RCMP Report and the Coopers and Lybrand Report.

That has to be borne in mind, if there is indeed serious concern with getting to the essential facts so we can deal with the issues that have been raised, deal with individuals who must be dealt with, either in terms of a criminal charge or in terms of corporate discipline. That has to be borne in mind. A Commission of Inquiry could not come forward with a report in anything like the kind of time we anticipate through the RCMP investigation, through the work of Coopers and Lybrand. In my opinion, Madam Speaker, we will have all, or virtually all, the bases covered at about the time a Commission of Inquiry could have begun its work.

Now those are pragmatic, but not unimportant, considerations; but there are even more important considerations in terms of the legal relationship between one and the other. If, Madam Speaker, as may be the case - I'm only here talking about the realm of possibility because I am not privy to, nor have I asked to be privy to the work of the RCMP other than what progress they are making in a time sense - but if, as is possibly the case, the RCMP investigation leads to a criminal charge, and that cannot be ruled out, any inquiry that

would be under way, assuming it to be under way, would have to stop dead in its tracks.

You must understand the way in which the law has developed in this country beginning with a very important decision of the Supreme Court in 1966. Mr. Justice Cartwright, dealing then with the relationship between a Coroner's Inquest and a preliminary investigation on a criminal charge, and he said and I'll quote just in part: "Mr. Justice Cartwright, one of the great Liberal lawyers and jurists of this century, now deceased, says, 'It would be a strange inconsistency if the law which carefully protects an accused from being compelled to testify at a preliminary hearing should permit the hearing to be adjourned to enable the prosecution to take the accused before a coroner and submit him, against his will, to examination and cross-examination, as to his supposed guilt,'" and that's what would happen. Should there be a criminal charge, then all bets would be off in terms of any inquiry, it would have to stop dead in its tracks. There can be no question about that.

That jurisprudence was recognized in the Province of Manitoba when we enacted The Fatalities Inquiry Act in 1979, and we put in a provision based on that decision, which allowed a judge, once that judge is informed that a criminal charge is being preferred, that the inquest is to be stopped. Even that jurisprudence has gone much further because of developments since the proclamation of the Charter of Rights. Just to quote one section from the Charter of Rights, and I would like the members opposite to bear this in mind so that they understand - as they must understand, they are here as responsible legislators - what the issues are.

Any person charged with an offence has the right to "(c) not to be compelled to be a witness in proceedings against that person in respect of the," matters related to that, "offence." That's the law. I'm not making up this law, that is the law, and that is why the way we have proceeded, when there have been suggestions of a criminal offence, whether it was kickbacks in the Highway Department or kickbacks in Government Services relating to the supply of electrical equipment, lighting equipment, or with A.E. McKenzie; in each and every instance we have been utterly consistent. We have called in the RCMP and we have said that the RCMP must investigate and as long as the RCMP were investigating - and I'll talk about the nature of that investigation - we have said in this House, if questions were asked, that we must await the results of the investigation or, if the investigation led to a charge, we must await the results of those charges. We have been absolutely consistent.

Let me repeat again what was said yesterday, when the Opposition weakly attempted to draw some equivalence, some similarity between the Parasiuk matter and the matters in the MTX, there never was the slightest suggestion that there were any criminal wrongdoing. As bad as the rest of it was, it didn't stoop to the utter depth of that suggestion. There was no case to call in the RCMP, the RCMP were not called in, and therefore it was appropriate to answer the call of the Member for Transcona for a judicial inquiry.

I want to touch upon one or two other legal issues, Madam Speaker. They must be clear. If I'm wrong in my opinion, I'll stand to be corrected, I don't think that I am. I've been thinking about this and looking into it, concerned that the right thing should be done.

It's a question that has been raised time and time again, particularly by the Member for Pembina, who talks about evidence under oath. Let this be clear. I believe I may have said it in the House once before, but I'm taking this opportunity to get as much as I can on the record. It is equally a criminal offence - and I'm addressing this to the Member for River Heights as well, that I have no doubt that she starts from the premise of wanting to do the right thing - it is equally a criminal offence to lie when you're not under oath, as it is to lie when you're under oath, if the intention is to mislead and is before an inquiry such as a Committee of the House.

It is equally a criminal offence, Section 122.1 of the Criminal Code: "Everyone who, not being specifically permitted, authorized or required by law to make a statement by affidavit, solemn declaration or orally under oath, makes in such an unsworn statement before a person who is authorized, by law, to permit it" - and that would be a parliamentary or legislative committee - "an assertion with respect to a matter of fact, opinion, belief or knowledge, knowing that the assertion is false, is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction." The law hereto is clear, unequivocal, has to be borne in mind.

If it is suggested, Madam Speaker, that taking of an oath turns a person determined to lie into a paragon of truth, then it flies in the face of experience completely. I would think that the Member for Brandon West knows that. He has sat there as a special examiner or a court reporter for years, and no doubt he knows, himself, that people get up and take the oath and thereafter proceed to tell untruth after untruth. The taking of an oath does not turn a liar into a paragon of truth, let there be no question about that.

I saw letter, I couldn't believe it, I saw a letter from three employees of the Manitoba Telephone System - and I won't speak about their political connections, I don't know enough about those connections to speculate - saying, oh, we require the oath in order to tell the truth. Well I say if anybody tells me that they require to be sworn in order to tell the truth, then I say they're a damn liar.

Do any of you require the oath to tell the truth, that if you don't have the oath, you're going to go around and lie? That is so patently ridiculous that even the Member for Portage couldn't believe it. The Member for Springfield might. That's just not so, nor does the taking of the oath grant any immunity. As I said a few moments ago, it is perjury to swear to a lie under oath; it is a criminal offence, of a like character, to tell a lie not under oath.

Now, let me follow this through for the Member for Sturgeon Creek, who says it's very simple. I'm glad, because that's about the level he gets to start understanding things.

Madam Speaker, let me follow this through with a particular example. The question of the \$1.5 million unauthorized loan . . .

A MEMBER: It's best to be a smart-alec lawyer.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, it's better to be a smart-alec something than a know-nothing.

There can be no question - let's talk about certain undisputed facts - there can be no question that the

\$1.5 million loan was an unauthorized loan. One only has to read the Articles of Association to know that that is so. I mean, that's a matter of record. We don't need witnesses under oath to tell us that that's unauthorized, that was an unauthorized loan.

I think we would all agree that the fact it was repaid doesn't change the character of the original wrongdoing, so the question arises, who did wrong? Once that is ascertained, then the appropriate action has to be taken. Now in committee there was clearly a difference, at least of recollection. It may be no more than that. I would not be prepared, as the Member for Pembina who likes to jump to conclusions in this way, to assume that therefore one of the two is lying - that may be the case - but I'm going to tell you how we're going to find out about that.

Page 195 of Hansard for Thursday, 21st of August 1986, "Mr. Orchard, Mr. Aysan, Mr. Provencher has again confirmed that you informed him of the loan of \$1.5 million. Have you had a chance to rethink your answer while you were sitting over and listening?"

I think there can be no doubt, if one follows the sequence, that the partners had put in the money into the Saudi bank to be held in trust. It couldn't be released until the Certificate of Registration. Certificate of Registration issued, the money could be released, but it was there for corporate purposes. There can be no doubt that there might have been some contra accounts because one of the partners had spent money in leasehold improvements acquiring leases and would want to be paid; but equally there can be no doubt that the payment out of that money would have to be authorized by the unanimous consent of the board; but put aside the fact that these two people do not have precisely the same recollection of whether or not Mr. Aysan informed Mr. Provencher - he later thinks maybe he did, he's going to check his record - or whether Mr. Aysan, in fact, was one of those involved in the "authorization" of the unauthorized loan.

There has to be a cheque or a bank draft that drew that money out of the bank. That has signatures on it. It has to be one of six people. Coopers and Lybrand within the next few days, if they haven't already got it or the RCMP, will have all of those documents. Don't you understand that? That a judicial inquiry couldn't get at, because they can't get to Saudi Arabia; and on the instance, regardless of anybody's evidence, under oath or not under oath, we will know.

We will know the nature of the allegations, in terms of the commercial fraud, allegations of commercial fraud, allegations of unauthorized payments, allegations of unauthorized investments, allegations of the payment of kickbacks, all of that has to be the subject of documentary evidence where you don't have to rely on the recollection, three years back, or on the possibility that someone will not be telling the truth. You see, that's the process that is being followed; that is the only process which in fact objectively can get at the truth.

The Member for Minnedosa was a banker - he may be retired now. He looks so happy, I think he must be retired. I want to tell you, the Member for Minnedosa, I wish I were.

You know as well as I do you're not going to sit with \$1.5 million or an equivalent sum in a trust account, and somebody comes out and says, please give it me,

and you don't even ask the name. You've got to have documents, you've got to have authorization, you've got to have the whole bit, and the National Bank of Saudi Arabia, because it's in Saudi Arabia isn't some kind of two-bit little rinky-dink little outfit that's going to let money go. They've got the documents; they've got the documents and we will have the documents.

So, Madam Speaker, here you can see, if you just take that example which has become so much the question of concern, the \$1.5 million — (Interjection) — I think he wants to give out cigars and I would ask him for a box of chocolates instead. I gave up smoking cigars.

Let me relate this same example to the question of evidence under oath. Mr. Provencher and Mr. Aysan were in the equivalent position of giving evidence under oath before the committee, and yet there's a difference in recollection. The objective evidence obtained by documents, obtained by Coopers and Lybrand or obtained by the RCMP - the judicial inquiry, a commission for inquiry could not obtain it - will tell us the story about that. It has to be documented. Coopers and Lybrand can get it, the RCMP can get it. A judicial inquiry has no such ability. So we have embarked on the course; but I want members of good will, like the Member for Niakwa, the Member for Minnedosa, the Member for Morris, to understand why we have done so.

So they say, "cover-up." Now just think about that for a moment. If you want to cover up, do you send for the cops? Now really, just think about that for a moment. Is there anything in the way in which we dealt with matters of this kind which suggest cover-up? Who were the people involved in the main, in the A.E. McKenzie? They were high profile NDP people. — (Interjection) — Yes. Well, one of them was, but look at our actions there and judge whether I acted politically or not politically, a judge acted fairly, and it was not a political question and we called in the RCMP and the RCMP, incidentally - and I'm coming to another one of my points - and the Member for Morris may be interested in this.

The RCMP has a Commercial Fraud Unit which is one of the best in the country. The Member for Minnedosa, the new Chief Superintendent of the RCMP in Manitoba - I'll wait till the Member for Dauphin and the Member for Morris have had their conversation - the new Chief Superintendent of the RCMP in Manitoba, who has a hands-on relationship in this affair, is a Master of Business Administration, chosen specifically for his abilities in this area. The Commercial Fraud Unit of the RCMP, incidentally, does not cut a narrow swath.

When they looked into the affairs of A.E. McKenzie, they did so in the same way that a high-powered, reputable firm of chartered accountants would do. That's the way they work. They make no assumptions; they go and they get everything — (Interjection) — Well, we can be sure about the RCMP. I can if you can't. They went to Edmonton; they went to Brandon; they went to other places where the evidence led and they got the documents. They were able to do an analysis. They called in experts to help them do the analysis. They laid out the documents; they charted the documents; they drew the picture; they put it in the hands of a Crown Attorney; the charges were laid; the trial was held; the convictions were rendered.

Those, incidentally, who were convicted - and incidentally on a direct indictment which I drew because for most of the charges they were not committed for trial at preliminary - haven't even appealed. The evidence was overwhelming, drawn by the RCMP, by the best Commercial Fraud Detachment in the country.

So, too, with the highway scam. As the Premier was pointing out, slightly tongue-in-cheek, the highway scam centred in Carman when, for a short period of time, August through to the end of November of '81, the Member for Pembina was the Minister of Highways. We could have said, did that Minister ask the right questions and all of that sort of nonsense? We knew it wasn't a question of ministerial responsibility. How could he have known what was taking place back there on the line? He couldn't have known. We knew that. We knew that there was nothing in that that touched him.

But by innuendo, you can make just about anything appear. Wherever there has been, and I repeat, a suggestion of criminal wrongdoing, we have started out with respect to that matter or those matters by a criminal investigation. Where the evidence has warranted, we have laid charges and even where, as in the A.E. McKenzie case, the judge presiding over the preliminary, in his opinion, thought there wasn't quite enough evidence given the intricate nature of criminal fraud, I directed an indictment and subsequently, on trial, those who did criminal wrong were convicted.

It has been said by the Leader of the Opposition that between the nature of the RCMP investigation and Coopers and Lybrand, in terms of mandate, you could drive a truck. That is simply not true. In fact, the two overlap and mesh so you couldn't drive a needle through. The whole field is covered. There will be left nothing undone, no stone unturned, no voucher unrevealed, no signature undetected, between what Coopers and Lybrand will do and what the RCMP will do.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to come back to a theme that was developed by my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. We have here again the makings of trial by innuendo; off with their heads and then have a trial. They're weeping crocodile tears about the precarious future of MTX; going to lose \$17.5 million. It's almost a self-fulfilling prophesy because given the way in which that matter has been treated, and there is clearly something that has to be looked into and is being looked into, but given the way in which it's being used as a palpable political weapon by the Tories, the commercial future of MTX — (Interjection) — Yes, of course, it's been admitted that there's a high-risk element there, but both the previous Minister responsible for Telephones and the others have thought that this is a way in which, with a lack of an industrial base, we do have technological capability that we can sell. Incidentally, we can give you a dozen examples where we've sold technology overseas successfully.

There will be losses. There may be losses here, but I wouldn't go predicting them the way you are. I wouldn't go predicting them in order to make political points and then, presumably - I hope I'm wrong - hoping that we will lose that money in Saudi Arabia. I hope we succeed. I hope we get to the bottom of the problem,

set it right, and in a rising economy and in a rising market, continue to sell our technology because with deregulation, which is coming in the long distance sector of the telephone thing, we will not be able to sustain our low domestic rates unless we have other avenues of using the technology. It may be the case that in certain instances, as with any private sector firm, there may be losses here and losses there. We want to do everything, and I hope you want to do everything to make sure that we minimize that exposure in Saudi Arabia.

You know, there's a carelessness about the way in which members of the Opposition are talking about \$17.5 million going down the drain. — (Interjection) — I see that I'm getting to the members opposite but I wish I would be given the courtesy of some . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: We had the trial by innuendo of the Member for Transcona, a more shameful episode I have never experienced in my life, and it's longer than the life of most people in this House.

And now, in addition to what is happening with respect to some individuals who may have been wrong - that will be found out and be dealt with - there's an attempt to try by innuendo two other Ministers of the Crown. Members of the Opposition, be careful. You know, as I know, that in the Member for Dauphin and the Member for St. James, we have two intelligent, honest persons of integrity who may have erred. I may have erred; I have erred in the way in which I fulfilled my ministerial responsibility from time-to-time and I'll take responsibility for it. I'll put myself on the line in the political forum. I'll put myself on the line here. But don't try me by innuendo; don't try me by character assassination; don't try me by fixing labels on my brow and saying, ah, we can deal with Penner by putting a label on his brow; we can deal with the Member for Dauphin in that way. He, too, has a family. He, too, has a character to protect. The Member for St. James, he has served his House for longer than most of you here, and served it well. And what are you doing? What are you doing? Again, trial by innuendo. Will you never learn? Will you never learn? — (Interjection) — Yes, I am, and deservedly so.

Here I want to come to the point where I said — (Interjection) — Well, you know, given your record I'll never be in Opposition.

Madam Speaker, there is one point upon which I want to differ with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

How much time have I got, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has nine minutes remaining.

HON. R. PENNER: Fine. He referred to John Dafoe, the editor of the Free Press, who presumably - we don't know but I would think so from the character of the writing - wrote the lead editorial in the Free Press today, "A Minister Cleared." I must beg to differ with him. I know John Dafoe. I respect him; he's a man of integrity and I think it took a man of integrity to write that editorial. I hope that, on reflection, my colleague will

recognize that there is, both here and in the way in which other papers are published, a very distinct difference between the editorial group and the news group. If there's fault to be found and there is, obviously, and it was done brilliantly, it is with the news group. There are many things that are said on the editorial page with which I disagree. Those are matters of opinion and we're not talking about that. We're talking about facts reported as facts which aren't facts, innuendo reported as a truth when it is not the truth.

But in his editorial, which I thought was the greatest and good editorial, there is something said by the writer of that editorial which I think has to be repeated: "Mr. Freedman makes no comment on the role of the press in the affair, but his report contains a clear message for journalists. It is possible to take facts which are essentially true but also essentially innocuous and to juxtapose them and display them in a dramatic way which would lead a reader to conclude that something nasty was going on. Journalists should recall with some chagrin that Senator Joe McCarthy was a master of that technique. The Free Press came dangerously close to it when it set out the facts against Mr. Parasiuk." Some of us would think that they passed the line. But he says, "dangerously close." "When those facts were examined objectively and dispassionately by Mr. Freedman, the inference of wrongdoing turned to dust."

I think we have to remember that. When you start to deal with the characters of other Ministers, take care. Do not act recklessly because you're not only getting at them, you're getting at the parliamentary institution.

I want to conclude in that theme by referring to a portion of a speech delivered in this city by Gordon Fairweather, a great Canadian in my view, when he reflected in another context about the role of parliament and I want to conclude by just reading this passage: "A major role of parliament is to provide a forum for debate but that debate should be a civilized debate, carried out for the good of the people that Parliament exists to serve. I firmly believe that ideas, not personalities should contend. When the debate is concluded, Legislatures have an obligation to stand and be counted.

"The reason" - he goes on - "we are not in a totalitarian society, the reason why we have freedom and respect for human rights is that we have institutions like Parliaments and Legislatures where issues can be debated in full public view. We have elections so that people can know where their respective representatives stand and vote accordingly. Anything that erodes these processes and institutions brings us a step closer to totalitarianism, a step closer to the dark world that Orwell warned us about."

I ask all members of the House to bear that in mind when they would indulge in character assassination, when they would indulge in innuendo, when they would have sentence pronounced and then say, maybe let's have a trial. That may, in some instances, be the path to political power. If so, political power will have been gained at too great a cost. Don't do it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I rise on a grievance, Madam Speaker.

We are now almost, Madam Speaker, into four months of this Session. Throughout that time, I've had great difficulty in understanding the behaviour of members of both sides of this House. I have found and I have said so publicly that their behaviour is frequently similar to a very bad school class. In fact, I received a letter the other day from a professor at the university, who asked me if it was true that the Legislature occasionally acted like a Grade 9 class having a bad day. I responded by saying, yes, it was true that the Legislature occasionally acted like a Grade 9 class having a bad day, but in that case, the Legislature was having a good day.

Madam Speaker, we have heard today in two other grievances about the concern of the government with regard to innuendo and comments made by members of this side, but I take equal offence at comments that are made about this side of the House and in challenging our stands and our points of view. The Minister of Energy waxed in what he thought was an eloquent fashion, spewing the name of my constituency throughout his remarks. I feel that he did my constituency and, therefore, me an injustice.

I would like to take this House through a few incidents which have occurred since this House began. In the very first speech which I gave to this Legislature, my maiden speech in response to the Speech from the Throne, I said most distinctly, we must all be careful to judge personal decisions lest our own be questioned and, therefore, matters of no concern to this House should be left outside of this House. I think there was no question in anyone's mind that, at that point, I was making reference to the questions being asked about the SRTC involvement, about the Honourable Member for Radisson and the Honourable Member for Transcona. I did not believe it was appropriate, and I stated so.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

When the allegations were raised in the Free Press with regard to the Honourable Member for Transcona's participation in the Bannatyne building, I was asked for comment by the media. I can't show the tapes of what was covered in the electronic media, but I can quote from what I said in the Sun of the day following. I asked, in fact, for the creation of a Public Ethics Committee. I asked for a place that members could go where they could ask if they were in conflict. I further stated, and I quote: "We're dealing with a cynical electorate, and they believe a gain has been made, but they're never given the opportunity to fully evaluate the evidence."

I went on to say, with regard to the Honourable Member for Transcona: "It's difficult to know whether he has crossed the line or not. We need a public inquiry to see if there is a genuine conflict of interest." I made no allegations that there was. I wanted to know if there had been.

When the questions began to be raised in the House, again I tried to temper my remarks in a manner which would reflect well on the Member for Transcona until the evidence was in. "My question," I said, "is to the Honourable First Minister. Mr. Premier, I think we all felt as members some regret over the weekend at the allegations that were made. I think also we felt that the announcement of a public inquiry would clear the air. Are you not concerned that the limitations placed

on this public inquiry will, in fact, not do that, and that our former Minister of Mines will still live under the burden of guilt?" My concern, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was to make sure that an inquiry cleared the Honourable Member for Transcona.

Once that inquiry was called, that was the extent of the statement that I made, that I hoped it would clear his name. I think both the First Minister and the former Minister of Energy recognized those statements for what they were.

Since the inquiry has been taken, I have made no public statements. Yes, I have engaged in private conversations, as I suspect have most of this House. In each one of those private conversations, I have indicated that I believed that there was only innocence on the side of the Member for Transcona.

Yesterday, in responses to the media questions on the Freedman Inquiry, I indicated that I was pleased with the result. I did, however, make two statements upon which the now Minister of Energy seems to take great exception. I would therefore like to explain those in my grievance.

One was that I said that it was appropriate that, having called two inquiries, one the Freedman and the other the audit, it would be more appropriate that both be delivered before the member was welcomed back into the Cabinet, but that I had no difficulty with him being brought back into the Cabinet, and that in fact I welcomed him. I felt it was good news for this government, because his fine mind is much needed on the front bench.

As to the statement with regard to the payment of legal fees, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many people in our society are charged with criminal offences. Others are taken to court on the basis of civil charges. Until we are willing in each and every case to pay those legal costs, I don't believe that we should be prepared to pay the legal costs of any other individual attempting to clear their name.

We have already learned that the soon-to-be Minister is launching further legal action, and I wish him well in that legal action. If he is successful, he will in fact have great opportunity to achieve the payment of his fees.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the member back into the Cabinet. I congratulated him yesterday. I think that the public inquiry served a very useful purpose, not a negative one, a positive one, because as soon as the allegations were made, the member called for an inquiry. The member received that inquiry. The member was cleared of any allegations and that will, I believe, raise the tenor of political debate and discussions in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

It gives me pleasure and pain at this point to rise on a grievance, mainly because to some extent I feel very vindicated by the events of the past couple of days, but in some sense very saddened by the reaction of both the Opposition and the press.

Some honourable members will remember on May 26 in my response to the Speech from the Throne, I discussed the role of the press in this matter and

cautioned all members about the fact that we are fair game to an irresponsible press. This met with some heckling; it met with some tongue-in-cheek; it met with some severe criticism, which at that time I predicted would come from the press.

In my role, for example, the Free Press editorial on June 1 is entitled, "A Master for the Press." Interesting to compare that with today's editorial which says, "A Minister Cleared."

I would like to go through some of these editorials, because I think we all as members of this Legislature have some responsibility, as I said on May 26, and I will repeat again, to exercise some fair control on what is and is not fair comment in the media. For example, the headline, "A Curb Proposed for the Irresponsible Press" was on the same day as the editorial Master for the Press.

At this point, I would also like to belatedly apologize to one W.A. Wilson. During my speech on May 26, 1986, in my responses to the Throne, I suggested that W.A. Wilson and Fred Cleverley were one and the same. I would like to apologize to W.A. Wilson, because that is not the case I have since learned.

I would, however, like to explain to the honourable members on both sides of the House why I made this mistake. I would like to read from a Cleverley charge, Brian McNulty for the Sun. "Frederick (Fred) Cleverley, a Winnipeg Free Press editorial writer and free lance broadcaster has been charged with public mischief as a result of a June 14 automobile accident. Cleverley, 55, of 186 Kane Avenue was charged with giving another person's name when exchanging particulars with another driver after their two cars collided on the corner of Maryland Street and Sara Avenue." — (Interjection) — June 15 I believe the date was. It's not dated here, but the Free Press reports it on October 14, this is 1982. "The Crown alleges he used the name W.R. Wilson in place of his own. Cleverley has also been charged with failing to exchange particulars at the scene of the accident and he's been remanded on both charges until October 5 when he will appear in Provincial Judges Court." The Free Press of October 14 points out, "F.P. columnist fined \$125.00."

The reason I made the mistake is an error, I think, we all fall prey to is I believed what I read in the paper. I believed what Fred Cleverley said. He was charged with using the name W.R. Wilson. I assumed it was a pseudonym. Obviously, I was incorrect and it was not. So, to Mr. Wilson, I apologize and I would like that apology on the record. To Mr. Cleverley, I have no intent to apologize for anything.

I would like to point out some of the other matters I raised, because I think this issue has been pointed out. Let me give a scenario that I brought out and was brought out by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology today and the dangers that we all face. I would like to point out the danger faced by the scenario that could be faced by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition was quoted from an interview on CBC by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology today as having said his blind trust was not really a blind trust, etc. I quoted some facts and figures in my May 26 speech about a corporation called Jangar in which the Leader of the Opposition holds preferred shares and which his wife, I believe, is the principal officer - I don't know what the case is today but at that time that was the way it was registered.

I would also like to restate a call from the Leader of the Opposition, Tuesday, May 20, 1986, quote from the Free Press:

"Filmon said yesterday he will call upon the Legislature today for a full-scale investigation of all Parasiuk's business affairs." The word here is all. I think the reality is let's look at the potential scenario raised for the Leader of the Opposition who sat there on his white horse and made that call to the Minister of Energy and Mines who, once again, tomorrow will thankfully by all the people of the province be again the Minister of Energy and Mines. The scenario is now there is an allegation made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. There are facts from documentation regarding a corporation which the Leader of the Opposition has an interest in. If the same scenario were to take place, that the Leader of the Opposition himself called for last May, what would happen is we would once again have Chief Justice Samuel Freedman being put back to work to look at the allegations, to look at the innuendo made. I think that's a very dangerous situation for all of us as members.

I pointed out on May 26 - and I reiterate - that by standing here in the House, as a private member elected by my constituents in the democratic process that went on on March 18, 1986, in the Province of Manitoba, I stand accused by the press for daring to have stood in this House to state that I think the press has to exercise responsibility, and that if the press does not exercise responsibility, we, the members of the Legislature, must determine some way to insure that this kind of incident or the kind of potential scenario I've just described does not occur.

I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition as an honourable member of this House has done anything dishonest. I do not believe there was any malevolent intent on his part. I believe, because of the fuzzy rules and regulations that govern conflict of interest, which hopefully will be cleared up, there is a possibility a hostile press could look at the Leader of the Opposition in that manner and cause him the same kind of chagrin, the same kind of pain, the same kind of personal embarrassment the Minister of Energy and Mines went through. I think that is a terrible situation, and it is a frightening scenario for us to waltz in here and have to be subject to.

I would like to look at some of the other editorials, because the press bands together. I noticed yesterday in the hallway - now this was my perception and perhaps the Leader of the Opposition could correct me if I'm wrong - as having taken a lead from the Free Press and its accusations on the Minister of Energy and Mines, the Honourable Wilson Parasiuk. The Opposition took its lead from the Free Press at the time which I pointed out and I cautioned them at the time for doing this, because I said that can lead them into troubled waters. — (Interjection) — Basically - excuse me.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has there been an agreement or an intention on the part of both sides of the House to waive Private Members' Hour?

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're prepared to waive Private Members' Hour.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It's waived, by leave.

MR. M. DOLIN: The scenario that develops with the press and a danger I pointed out. As I was walking through to the hall yesterday, and I noticed a gaggle of paparazzi gathered about the Leader of the Opposition and they were cross-examining him. They were cross-examining the Leader of the Opposition attempting to put blame on him for having fingered the Minister of Energy and Mines. He didn't do it. I pointed that out on May 26 he didn't do it. He was doing what he thought was his job as Leader of the Opposition, taking his cue from the irresponsible journalists at the Free Press who were linking innuendo with quasi-fact with unrelated and non-adjacent information to try and create an impression.

Unfortunately, I think the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Opposition House Leader, who also called for the Minister's resignation at that time, was sucked in and it's unfortunate they were sucked in. Now the media is trying to get off the hook.

I also do not think that we, as members of this House, should allow the responsibility of the media to be dumped on the Leader of the Opposition because I don't think he did the wrong thing. I think he did what he thought was the right thing but for the wrong reasons. The wrong reasons were he was misinformed, he was sucked in, he was led on.

I warned him on May 26 that this is what is happening. He fell into the trap; that's unfortunate. It should not happen to any of us on either side of the House again. We should not be allowing the press to play this game.

Let me look, for example, at what the editors of the Free Press, who still do not sign their editorials, much to my chagrin, point out in their editorial today. There's a little trick here. The Honourable Attorney-General pointed out a few situations here. One of things it says in here in, "A minister cleared":

"The curious nature of the inquiry reflects the way in which the issue first arose - in the form of an article, prominently displayed on the front page of the Free Press alleging that a contract related to the Limestone power project had been awarded to a 'business partner' of Mr. Parasiuk. That article was accompanied, and followed, by others, setting out in detail the affairs of Mr. Parasiuk, Mr. Davison, and the Brokerage building. Those articles prompted demands . . ." A correct view of the situation from the Leader of the Opposition. ". . . from opposition members for an inquiry into whether Mr. Parasiuk was guilty of impropriety . . ." Got you guys; the Free Press got you on that one. ". . . but, once the inquiry was called, none of those calling for it had any information to offer."

Of course you didn't have information to offer. You trusted that the Free Press had information. They had innuendo, they had hyperbole, they had lies and damn lies.

"Mr. Freedman makes no comment on the role of the press in the affair, but his report contains a clear message for journalists." Let's examine that phrase, and I say this very clearly to the journalists on the Free Press, on the Sun, in the electronic media, it's not their fault either; it's the editors - the editors who write this sham editorial - saying mea culpa, we are guilty, we apologize; while never apologizing, dump it on their

staff. The reporters are to blame. It's not the editors, the anonymous editors of the Free Press; it's the reporters. And then they say "you reporters."

"It is possible to take facts which are essentially true but also essentially innocuous and to juxtapose them and display them in a dramatic way which would lead a reader to conclude that something nasty was going on." I never knew, and I did write for a newspaper for some considerable length of time in my younger days, I never knew a reporter who had the power to juxtapose anything in a newspaper. The reporters do not even get to decide their final copy. So for the editors of the paper to accuse their own staff is irresponsible and a bloody lie.

Then it says, "Journalists should recall with some chagrin that Senator Joe McCarthy was a master of that technique." Journalists should recall with some chagrin? Editors of the Free Press, the Murray Burts, the Mike Wards, the John Dafeos - these are the people who should recall with some chagrin the technique of Joe McCarthy. "The Free Press came dangerously close to it when it set out the facts about Mr. Parasiuk." Hell! it came dangerously close to it; it copied it. It did exactly the same thing.

"When those facts were examined objectively and dispassionately by Mr. Freedman, the inference of wrongdoing turned to dust." It turned to dust - I could use a nastier, more scatological term. Dust, my eye! Dust is the same way one refers to his night soil as soil.

"Responsible journalism involves more than digging up facts." Oh, they've seen the light, but they're saying the journalists and not the editors. It requires intelligent and fair-minded assessment. Well, I guess that leaves the Free Press out of their significance and of their relationship to each other.

"That quality was lacking in too much of the reporting about Mr. Parasiuk." What bloody damn hypocrisy. How dare these people write another unsigned editorial and blame their own reporters and not take the responsibility themselves? It is the most . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has been indulging in unparliamentary language.

MR. M. DOLIN: Am I? I apologize if I have, Mr. Deputy Speaker. -(Interjection)- three times? Oh, okay, sorry about that. The topic does make one somewhat heated when I look at what the newspaper said about me at the time I made my speech.

I perhaps remember that the Member for Sturgeon Creek, not sitting in his seat, he is making remarks, and I remember a term, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which he used which was considered parliamentary and I would consider that perhaps that term would apply - "a smart-aleck." I don't think it's necessary to be a smart aleck on this issue. I am not being hypocritical; I am not being a smart aleck. I am pointing out what I think is a danger to all members of this House, and I would suggest to the Member for Sturgeon Creek, as well as everybody else who sits in this Chamber who can be subjected to this kind of nasty journalism.

I suggested on May 26 that there should be controls. Now I did not say, "muzzling the press," as the Neepawa Press pointed out on June 5th. I never suggested we

muzzle the press, but they ban together, they circle the wagons when we politicians stand here and say, whoa, you can't do that to us, that's unfair; we demand fair treatment when we do that. And I knew I would get this kind of attack because they would circle the wagons.

Well I think we should circle the wagons, too, and I said that at the time. If the press cannot act more responsibly than they have in the Minister of Energy and Mine's affair, and in the potential scenario I can see for the Leader of the Opposition or any member of this House on that side or this side, then we should take some responsibility of doing something about it.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Let me read some of the adjectives and hyperboles used by the press. "Shackles on the press. By wanting a supposed impartial body to determine what is fair comment, he is virtually leaving the door wide open for censorship." "Joseph Goebbels" they call me. Achtung! Joseph Goebbels.

The other paper, I might point out, says I'm a supporter of Pravda. Now where in God's name do I fit in the scenario? Do I go from Joseph Goebbels on one hand to Lavrenti Beria, on the other hand, of Pravda? Where do I fit?

I am suggesting, because I fit in the middle as somebody who is trying to be a voice of reason for all of us in this building, that somehow they feel I am subject to attack and they can call any names, use any hyperbole because they have no shackles on them. They have no responsibility, they have no accountability. They do not even have the same accountability that we have of not being able to avail ourselves in a cloak of anonymity. We are referred to by our constituency and by our names as long as we operate in this Legislature. They do not.

I do not see, in the Neepawa Paper or in the Carillon or in the Free Press or in the Scratching River Post, in these editorials that have attacked me, any name attached to these editorials. I cannot respond to my accuser because I don't know who my accuser is. I will never know who my accuser is. I don't know, for example, if the person who wrote today's editorial, "A minister cleared," and the person who attacked me for what basically what they are saying in this editorial, "a master for the press," is one and the same. I have no idea and I have no way of finding out.

Let me show some of the other things. "Rookie MLA's views bizarre." That's what they suggest: my views are bizarre; that a responsible press is a bizarre view. The Member for Brandon West, with great glee, around this time sent me an editorial across the floor, from the Brandon Post, which says basically the same thing.

"This young kid . . ." And I was pleased, you know. I like being a rookie; I'm not that young anymore. ". . . doesn't know what he's doing. It's his first time in a House. What does he know?" He's attacking the press; he's obviously either a Fascist or a Communist or some other bizarre kind of cult, because what does he say? What's he saying? He's saying that the press should be responsible, that the press should take some responsibility for what it says, that it should not be anonymous, that there should be some impartial body to take a look at what the press does, when it does it, and if it makes false accusations.

And I warned the Leader of the Opposition; I think they are setting him up. I think they're setting him up to take the fall for this.

The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, the Honourable Attorney-General, the other members who are speaking on this issue, both publicly in the press and in the House, the Honourable soon-again-to-be Minister of Energy and Mines, have all pointed out very clearly that the press did the wrong here.

When the inquiry was looking at the evidence presented about the Free Press having misled and juxtaposed irrelevant or incongruous facts, Freedman ruled that inadmissible. So we could not get details about that, but it was noted that was put out.

I think what is going to happen to the Leader of the Opposition, and I give him fair warning, and if he remembers, you know, as bizarre as I may be and as irresponsible as I may be according to some of the press - oh, political chameleon is another one that I've been called - I warned them on May 26th.

I am warning you again, and I am warning all of us again, that when the editors of the Free Press today have taken a trip of not - they're saying, here's what happened, it was bad, it was wrong, it was the kinds of things that I said, and I hate to quote myself, but I will: ". . . they don't make accusations; they just throw a bunch of disconnected facts and let the public draw from the hyperbole and from the adjectives used; that kind of thing you can't defend against . . ." Quote, Marty Dolin, Hansard, Page 309, May 26, 1986. I warned you then.

I warn you again that the Leader of the Opposition, first they're saying a terrible thing happened here, someone was wronged, just as Freedman pointed it out, a terrible thing. Whose fault is it? It's the reporters. It's the reporters. I, the anonymous editor of the Free Press, do hereby judge it was the journalists; the journalists who juxtaposed, the journalists who edited. It was the journalists. They're going to get bored with that.

I warned all members of this House on May 26 when they get bored with us, they are going to attack some other group in society, and they will. But I think when they get bored with dumping the blame on somebody else and scapegoating their own journalists, because their own journalists, I think, are not going to take that very long. When they get sick of that, they're going to start dumping it on the Opposition. They are going to say it was you guys. I mean it was the Press who had the article, you didn't have to stand up in the House and make these accusations, you didn't have to ask questions, you didn't have to demand resignations; which also reminds me of the somewhat less than I consider straightforward comments of the Member for River Heights.

The Member for River Heights stood next to the House Leader and called for the resignation of the Minister of Energy and Mines in the Free Press, if I can believe it, for the allegations made in the Free Press. "It would be a mistake for him to hang on now," Conservative House Leader Gerry Mercier said yesterday. "The only honourable thing he can do now is resign." Liberal Leader Sharon Carstairs echoed this. The fact is that she stands up today and denies this, I would suggest, as one honourable member commented to me while she was talking, "If it walks like a duck and it quacks like a duck, it's probably a duck." She cannot get by and say that she did not take any responsibility for this either.

I hear some quacking from the back benches in the Opposition, too. More ducks. Is that quacking like a duck I hear? There was a lot of quacking at the end of May and early June. That quacking has turned to flying. It's flying, tails facing north, heading south. You know when I first came into this building, as a rookie MLA, I was told that the Opposition benches are where the members hang out. I think that's true.

There are a few other items I would like to discuss here. I would like to talk about one of the things that I think the Attorney-General mentioned because we're in this kind of game where I have heard, since the beginning of this Session, the cry from the front bench of the Opposition, particularly from the Member for Pembina, the cry that all mankind has longed to hear the answer to "what is truth?" What is truth? Well, I think we know what truth isn't now just as Samuel Freedman has shown us what truth isn't, and I would suggest that we have to do something about that.

But I would also like to point out, on the whole truth of MTS-MTX, what are we looking for here? What is the Opposition looking for? What were they looking for in the case of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines and their demand that he resign? What they said they were looking for was the truth.

I am a member of the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee and I have sat on that committee with honourable members, and I thought the questions posed by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Pembina were excellent. I thought they were really getting at the facts of what was happening at MTX, how did it happen, who was responsible, and how could it be done.

One of the reasons when I was quoted in the Press the other day as saying that I don't think there's a need for a public inquiry was because they were doing such a good job. They were bringing out all the facts at that public inquiry called the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee that were pointing out and absolutely verifying the allegations made in the affidavits by Ferguson and now the new affidavit by whomsoever which verifies Ferguson's affidavit.

The problem is with all their cries for truth, what came to me, very clearly, is looking at all the facts they have brought out into the public light and putting them all together and trying to determine who did what and when and who was responsible and who erred by commission and who erred by omission, trying to learn this, I have been led to believe that they were searching for the truth. What I have found out is they wouldn't know the truth if they tripped over it; the fact being because they have tripped over it. And they are so busy trying to make political gain and trying to point the finger at present Ministers and present staff.

Nothing in those affidavits, by the way, if people remember very clearly, happened after September 1983. This is now the third annual anniversary of the last of those events. What happened before that and who's responsible, I think, is very, very clear on the record. It was brought out by an excellent line of questioning by the Member for Pembina. The Member for Pembina brought out the facts; the Leader of the Opposition confirmed those facts. I asked a few questions, myself, and got some additional facts. The facts come together and point out that certain conclusions can be drawn. Those conclusions are validated by the affidavits.

Now I stand here and think to myself: why are they still howling for some kind of public inquiry? Not only do they not need it, they have proved that it is not necessary because they have done such a good job that they have brought to light the facts. If we call more people to the committee, some of the significant people, the main one who nobody wants to talk about who was, to my perspective and the facts that have come out, the main culprit in the whole scenario is Chafe Abou Richeh, who was the President of the company — (Interjection) — is that parliamentary? I've been asked, is that parliamentary? I'm not sure. I'd need to translate. This was the main culprit. There were other people there with him. Now, why has he not been called?

Also, it was pointed out at the hearings that he was charged with trying to bribe or, I think the term was, attempting to make an unwarranted payment to a Saudi Arabian government official. That's not the same as a kickback to a bank representative, which he also was the one responsible, for which was brought out in the line of questioning by members of the Opposition.

On December 1, 1984, he was fired. My understanding - and I have not seen any confidential documents. I have just looked at the cross-examination provided to me in the minutes of the meeting, which is public record. My understanding and a rumour I've heard is that he's still happily living in Saudi Arabia. What happened to the charges? Why was not the Ferguson documentation sent to Saudi Arabian authorities, not only the RCMP, because a crime was committed in Saudi Arabia violating Saudi Arabian law by a person who's still there? Now, why did not the Opposition seeking truth decide to do this?

Because the answer, I think, to all honourable members becomes very obvious, is they are not seeking the truth. They are seeking political headlines. They sought political headlines back in May 20, 21, 22 of this year with the Minister of Energy and Mines. I would suggest that, there, they were sucked in, as I said earlier. There, they were conned, and they believed their masters on Carlton Street. They got sucked in and they will be punished for it, because their masters of Carlton Street will no longer take the blame. They need some scapegoat to put it on. After the journalists will come the Opposition.

But I suggest, in this case, they are doing more than just playing the game. Here, they are doing something that I consider irresponsible. I consider it irresponsible because, if their search for truth and this riding the white horse and seeking the Holy Grail of truth to get at the bottom, as they put it, of the MTS-MTX "cover-up," they are not doing that. They have not taken the documents and supplied them to the correct people as soon as they got them. They didn't supply them to the Mounties. They waited five days to bring it up in the House, and they passed it around to all their members on that side of the House without showing it to any of the other members. This is no longer public business. This is Opposition business.

This affidavit did not come to me the day it was tabled in the House, but I saw it being distributed to every member of the Conservative benches. If this is information that is responsible, public information, then it is not only the right, it should have been seen as the responsibility of those members of this Legislature knowing of criminal activity to provide this document

to all members of the House. But they were not playing that game.

They were playing a game of j'accuse. They were playing a game of let's zap it to the Minister responsible. If we can't dump on him, we'll dump on the Premier. This gives me a great sense of *deja vu*. On May 26, I warned them about this kind of activity. It doesn't make you look good, and it doesn't do anything for the people of the province. As a matter of fact, what we will see over the next three years is this will come back to haunt them. The public does not like political grandstanding. They don't like dishonesty. They don't like false accusations. The public will not accept this. It's great for a day or two's headlines. After the day or two's headlines, you've got to reap what you sow. The fact is, you should not sow badly. You should not sow dishonestly, because you are going to reap that ill reward. I warned you.

I think that members of this House can work together on the MTX scandal, because I think there was a scandal there. I agree, and I have been in the press to say that, yes, there were wrongdoings. There were criminal acts done. There was mismanagement there, ending in September, 1983. I don't know what's happened since then. There has been no record. It seems to be that it was cleaned up, but I think certainly the message for all members of this House is that we've got to make very sure that control is exercised on Crown corporations and government departments. It's not unique with our government. You had the same problems from 1977-81. It just makes it clear, if you do not keep adequate control, you can have problems. The fact is we have responsibility to do that.

The Member for Arthur is laughing. I'm not laughing. I think it's a terrible thing that happened. I think the fact that there were criminal acts committed by a Crown corporation and they were in a country where I don't think we belong in the first place because of discriminatory policies, I think that's bad. It's bad on our part. It's bad on the part of the people who got us there in 1978 under the Bell sub-contract. It's bad policy. It's bad control. It's the taxpayers' money. I think we've got to do something about it.

But by standing in this House and trying to pin labels of dishonesty, of you should have known - "should" is a magic word. Nobody "should" anything. There's a responsibility, and people have to take the responsibility. You can't know everything about everything as a Minister, and the Member for Arthur, having been a Minister, I'm sure is aware of that. You can keep adequate control of your department. You can keep adequate control of your staff and good management makes for good policy. I think that's what is going to result out of this, and I think the members of the Opposition have done the province a service in bringing this to light.

The fact is that, once they brought it to light, they now are playing Free Press games, as I will call them, and taking this kind of thing, taking facts and using them and misusing them and bending them and twisting them trying to get the political brownie points that they think they can get out of it.

I suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen of the other side and on this side, anybody who does that, that's a mistake in the long run. In the long run, I think it's a gross political mistake. I think the Opposition could

have got a lot more points by following up on the dishonesty, pinning the nails to the criminals, to the people who didn't manage properly, to the people who didn't have control, and I think we should still be doing it. But we should be doing it with the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee. It's been done very well so far, and I think we can keep it up.

This constant howl for a public inquiry, a judicial inquiry, what would that accomplish that has not already been accomplished? There is nothing that has come out in those affidavits which has not come out at the committee. The affidavits verify what's come out in the committee. Good stuff. Let's go and get the Mounties to lay the charges. Let's go, and look at the mismanagers and remove them. Punish them. Do whatever has to be done once we know the facts.

So I would suggest to members, do not get sucked in by your own glee in being able to make headlines. You did it two months ago, and I think we have had three of us standing up on grievances. Every one of us has had a good justification for those grievances. But one who has not stood up with a grievance is the person affected, and the fact is I am ashamed for this House and what happened here two months ago. I am ashamed that I was a member sitting, not because of what the members of the Opposition did but because of what happened here, what happened to a decent, honest person, the kind of horror he went through in the last two months. I rejoice with him at the kind of pleasure he must feel in being vindicated now. But I don't think anybody in this House should take any pride in having sat through the last two months of watching him sit in the back benches, where he did not deserve to be.

I think that fact is, as I warn all members of the House, we have to have a responsible press; we have to exercise some joint control; and I think we should consider that as adults in a responsible manner, how do we keep this kind of thing from happening again? I think we should do this together. Let's stop the games-playing. Let's stop the games-playing around your silly public inquiry which is not necessary and around press reports which you jump on without thinking. We have the tendency to do that too, and we should all be careful as members.

I feel vindicated too for my statements of May 26 and the kind of vituperative remarks I had to take. I feel good today that this has happened. I feel bad that it happened here, and it should not happen again.

I thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

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

I'm getting up to speak because I really believe the charges and the accusations and slurs from the Opposition have not only affected the Member for Transcona, it affected all of us, even the members of the Official Opposition, because when people put on question period and hear all that noise, they think we're all acting in a wild fashion and irresponsible fashion.

Those slurs, time and time again, have made us all lack credibility in the public's eye. Go door to door; hear what people say about politicians. They don't

necessarily say it's a Conservative or NDP; they say it's those politicians on Broadway. When you go ahead and do that, you in effect cast a shadow on yourselves, and I think that all of us have been affected by this mess and especially, quite truthfully, not so much just the time when the news media were going at it but during the last few months in the House. Taunts and slurs from the Opposition at all times.

I really felt that when the paper revealed, Madam Speaker, that the Member for Transcona was absolved from all blame, I would have expected the Leader of the Opposition to get up and congratulate the Member for Transcona. I would have expected the whole House to get up and give a standing ovation to the Member for Transcona. This did not occur.

I would like to take exception, however, today, with the statements from the Member for Rossmere regarding the Leader of the Liberal Party. I have not heard her in this House cast slurs and accusations at all times. Sure, she may have made a few mistakes in talking to the press but I think all of us, in her position, might have done the same. I think she's acted as a responsible person, a responsible member of this House.

A MEMBER: She still quacks like a duck, though.

MR. H. SMITH: I don't think that she quacks like a duck; I disagree with you. I think she has been generally a responsible member. I've never seen her make a taunt or a slur. I've never seen her act in an irresponsible manner.

A MEMBER: She demanded his resignation.

MR. H. SMITH: Look, none of us are perfect. I'd like to just say that I think she is a fairly credible person. She makes mistakes like we all do, but I don't think she deserves to be put in the same camp as the Leader of the Opposition.

You know some of you do not know your history well. I notice you shout the name of Joe McCarthy around, but it already started in North America with Father Caughlin who gave propoganda for the Nazis on radio stations throughout the U.S, and then we had Joe McCarthy do much the same thing in the early days of television and, of course, in recent months we've had the Leader of the Opposition fulfilling the same role. — (Interjection) — Well, how could we forget Donny Orchard? I'm sorry; how could we forget the Member for Pembina? But you know, he's not here today either.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Could the honourable member apologize for using another member's name?

MR. H. SMITH: Yes, I apologized for using his name, though it is his name, but under the Rules of the House, I apologize formally for that.

The Member for Pembina is the worst member of the Opposition, absolutely appalling. If you took the whole Conservative Party, their total membership, and put them up in the galleries and had them watch this House and heard the Member for Pembina, I think they

would all denounce him. His behavior has been absolutely incredibly bad and I think it reflects on all of us.

I don't say that to make political gains. I say that as a member that we have all been hurt by this episode and I think we should all feel ashamed of some of the behavior of some of the members of this House.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Madam Speaker, I rise to take advantage of the rules that permit a grievance.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice is finished?

MR. H. SMITH: Yes.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Education.

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

I appreciate that members are offered this one opportunity to express their concerns. I think it's an important opportunity for all members. Given the intensity of the Session and the sometimes complex and difficult issues that we deal with in a Session, I think every member probably feels there are occasions when his sensibilities have been challenged and when he feels that things are not going as they should.

Certainly, Madam Speaker, although my experience in the Legislature has been relatively brief, this Session has, without doubt, caused me a great deal of anguish. I say that because of not only the behaviour of members opposite in every instance, but behaviour on both sides of the House, because of the tragedy which occurred with respect to the Member for Transcona; a member, I believe, who is respected by his colleagues, by the public at large, and I believe by some members of the Opposition.

Madam Speaker, I want to say, at the outset, that there is a very, very clear distinction between responsible investigation, responsible questions and allegations and innuendo and questioning designed to impugn the reputation of individuals rather than to uncover facts and to deal with issues.

I take exception to a comment that the Member for River Heights made about her involvement in this issue, and I make it very specifically to the point that the Member for River Heights claimed that her request for an inquiry was based solely on a belief that the Member for Transcona had a right to have his name cleared.

I want to make it very clear that if that was the case, then what should have been asked for is a review of the contracting procedures that are used, a review of tendering, a review in the Estimates process in a more detailed way, a review of the structures government uses to provide funds for its various activities.

So, Madam Speaker, I want it very clear that there is a significant difference between a call for a review of process and the call for a public inquiry of an individual, because a call for a public inquiry suggests guilt, not innocence. All of the protestations

notwithstanding, there is no question in my mind that the calls for resignation, the calls for inquiry were the suggestion of guilt without reference, without consideration of the possibility of innocence. That's the tragedy in all of this and that's the consequence, Madam Speaker, of an Opposition possessed with the notion that members on this side are deceitful or ill-intentioned rather than a sincere belief that all of us are here to promote the public well-being.

Madam Speaker, I also believe that under the bravado we see today, in light of the decision handed down by Justice Freedman, behind that bravado, behind those smirks, behind some of the comments we heard from the Member for Lakeside perhaps yesterday in question period, perhaps there is a conscience and perhaps the members opposite will be reflecting on their role in this very unfortunate affair.

Madam Speaker, I don't take the same tact as my honourable colleague from Rossmere. I believe that certain individuals in the press who were involved in this did so with no ill intention. They have a difficult job to fulfill and for them to assume the role of responsible reporter in a 20-minute period, in a very hectic situation with tremendous complexities involved, is asking a lot.

Madam Speaker, what I want to do is to take some time to outline my concerns about the role of the Opposition in this affair and in the Session as a whole.

Madam Speaker, one of the first speeches that I gave in this House outlined my view of the role of the Opposition. I can't speak with authority because I've never filled that function, but I know what I would expect in terms of behaviour and decorum and what I hope we would all believe was the important opportunity and role for the Opposition to play, and that is to deal with issues. Certainly if any members of this Chamber reflect on this Session, if any members would care to take time to read Hansard over the last four months and see the number of questions devoted in question period, in the Estimates process, in committee, devoted to personalities, devoted to defaming, deriding individuals, they would be shocked and dismayed and, I hope, saddened.

Madam Speaker, the reflections of members opposite on individuals in the Civil Service, individuals on this side of the House, and even reflections I believe on the Chair, are unfortunate, degrade the parliamentary system and degrade all of us together. Remarks have been made by other colleagues that that is something to be devoutly avoided.

There is no question that there are issues we need to discuss. It is an unfortunate truism that this Session has not seen the discussion of those issues, certainly not in the questions that have been asked by members opposite. Madam Speaker, I think it's quite obvious why the current Session has focused on personalities, on trivia, on allegations and not on the issues, and I think that's quite obvious to the members of the public and it was obvious in March, before the election.

This government's record in terms of the economy is excellent. I have not heard one question about the important issues of jobs, the important issues of provision of service. Madam Speaker, the public has recognized that the last four years, four-and-a-half years, five years now has been a record of good government, of jobs, of investment, of housing, of

construction, of building, a record of good management and a record of good rapport with the major groups in our community.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Morris reminds me that it's also a record of debt. No one on this side has said otherwise. There has been significant borrowing, but we said that borrowing would result in a healthy economy and it has. We have said that in times of economic well-being that the role of government is to reduce spending. That is an undertaking this government takes seriously.

But, Madam Speaker, I want to clearly indicate that the focus of this Session has not been on issues because they have none. And that perhaps is the most telling comment about the affairs of this government and I think it reflects well on this government to date.

It's easy to make allegations; it's easy not to be concerned about the veracity of those allegations, but when those allegations concern the lives of individuals, it is both unfortunate and unwarranted. Madam Speaker, the Members of the Opposition, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, takes some delight in reviewing a litany, he would claim, of mismanagement of problems that have arisen in the Crown corporations of this government.

Madam Speaker, we, too, on this side could stand and review a litany of mismanagement and a litany of errors of omission and commission on the part of previous governments, and particularly, previous Conservative Governments.

Madam Speaker, I have said on many occasions that when I'm reminded by members opposite that Manfor has lost considerable money over the years, that I have reviewed the minutes of the board of directors of Manfor from 1977-1981, and I would compare the actions of this government any day to the actions of the Conservative Governments and the Ministers responsible for Manfor in terms of making rational business decisions.

I have seen board minutes in which the management and the board of directors were crying for capital investment, when there was no investment, no decision on the part of government to make the appropriate choice. I've seen board of directors' minutes in which layoffs were recommended and a political decision was made to make no layoffs, not in the interest of the taxpayers, not in the interest of the corporations, and if that is good management, Madam Speaker, then Manitobans are well out of it.

So, Madam Speaker, we too can have our review of the history, CFI, the biggest boondoggle in the world, as a result of the actions of the Tory Government. We have members rising continually to remind us of the wrongdoings at A.E. McKenzie. Madam Speaker, members opposite know and we know that the roots of that problem began in 1979 when the Minister responsible for A.E. McKenzie had his own special assistant on the board of directors and none of the wrongdoing was uncovered, none of it. Our record of dealing with wrongdoing when it is brought to our attention or when we uncover it is impeccable. A.E. McKenzie has been dealt with. We have dealt with other wrongdoings in other areas of government, in other Crown corporations, so we need no lessons from members opposite.

We have, I believe, the Opposition, led by the Member for Tuxedo, following the charge, similar to the one he

lead against my colleague, the Member for Transcona. The Member for Kildonan I think has adequately warned members opposite about the dangers that lie therein because, just as the tragedy that befell the Member for Transcona, the anguish that he went through, rests largely on their shoulders. Madam Speaker, the allegations that are currently being made against civil servants, against individuals employed by Manitoba Telephone System, just as their reputations are being impugned, with no respect to the facts.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek will have his opportunity to speak if he so wishes. The Member for Sturgeon Creek will call facts anything that he hears without regard, without any knowledge.

Madam Speaker, we have had calls for resignation of individuals in MTS, impugning the motives and the reputation of those individuals with no facts. We have had information that has been transferred from one individual to another individual. We have had that kind of information called lies. I want to point out to members opposite, and particularly the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that because an individual misinforms someone does not mean that he is lying. It may mean that he has been misinformed. We do not jump to the conclusion that because the Member for Sturgeon Creek misinforms accidentally this House by providing the wrong information that he's necessarily lying. We do not draw that conclusion necessarily. The Member for Sturgeon Creek maybe does . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . but that's because he has no sense of what is fair whatsoever.

A MEMBER: No sense, period.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, what concerns me most about all of this affair and, indeed this Session, are the kinds of allegations that have been made.

Innocent people, whose reputation has been impeccable for many, many years are now being dragged through the mud and I believe we will find that many of them, certainly some of them, unnecessarily so.

Members opposite seem to have no regard for the innocence of the individuals involved. They seem to have no regard for the circumstances in which those individuals find themselves; they have no regard for the truth; they have no regard for the individuals who are associated with the condemned, if you will; they have no regard for decency.

Madam Speaker, the only thing they do have regard for is what they believe is political advantage. That is the tragedy of this matter; not that it's political advantage associated with an issue which is ideologically based, but an issue which is being created around personalities and around individuals' reputations. Where are the issues? Where are the issues that we should have been dealing with this Session?

Madam Speaker, we have introduced some 50 pieces of legislation. There has been little debate on those, save for perhaps one exception. I have indicated that we have seen hours and hours of question period wasted; wasted in fruitless allegations, in unfortunate allegations being made against individuals.

Thursday, 28 August, 1986

Madam Speaker, the Member for Morris has asked whether they did anything of value in this particular latest series of allegations that have been made. Yes, Madam Speaker, something of value was accomplished. That was accomplished and could have been accomplished by the immediate tabling of the original affidavit that the Member for Pembina chose to keep secret for some length of time; five days, whatever it was. Madam Speaker, there can be no doubt that the affidavit that was submitted to the Member for Pembina could have been — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, I have no objection whatsoever to members opposite raising those questions.

I believe, like the Member for St. James and the Member for Kildonan, that there was wrongdoing. There have been errors in judgment and they need to be corrected. What I dislike intensely is the impugning of motives, the sacrificing of reputations, without any knowledge of the facts. And that's the point that we have made continually; that we want to know the facts before those kinds of things happen.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Kildonan talked about the trap that can be set. I want to tell members opposite that if you want traps, if you want to cast allegations, I can paint any number of individuals on that side into a trap by making allegations, by putting facts together and having conclusions drawn that are totally erroneous, but they can nevertheless be drawn on the basis of the facts. — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek challenges me. I, Madam Speaker, will attempt to illustrate a couple of examples.

Madam Speaker, let's talk about the first trap. I find it regrettable; I find it funny, frankly, that the Member for Tuxedo, the Leader of the Opposition, can so sanctimoniously stand up and call for the resignation of the Member for Transcona when he himself is an acknowledged violator of conflict of interest. Madam Speaker, he acknowledged it on a CBC interview. I have the transcript; I will provide members opposite with a copy. He acknowledged that he did that, Madam Speaker. The facts are clear. From the pre-Lyon Administration, the amount of money that was transferred to Success/Angus doubled, went from roughly \$20,000 a year to \$40,000.00. Now, I have not stood up, nor have any of my colleagues, to impugn the reputation of the Member for Tuxedo, unlike what the Member for Tuxedo's behaviour has been. Madam Speaker, we could put those facts out there and we could make all kinds of allegations, but I'm going to leave that.

Madam Speaker, I want to make clear that I'll put these facts to the House only to make the point; not to make any allegation, not to suggest that what I am doing is anything but painting a scenario. I don't happen to believe that these facts need to be put together in the way that I am going to construe them.

The Member for Fort Garry introduced a resolution in this House supporting a 50-50 funding of independent schools. It could be pointed out that the Member for Fort Garry's wife is a fund-raiser for St. John's Ravenscourt. It could be pointed out that he has children attending an independent school. It could be suggested there is conflict of interest. It could be suggested that there is self-interest, self-serving, self-dealing in that kind of resolution. Perhaps we should have an inquiry

on the Member for Fort Garry. Perhaps we should inquire into his reputation and his motives in this regard.

Madam Speaker, we could talk about the Member for Brandon West; the member who waxed so eloquently about the sins of Brandon University's Board of Governors. Madam Speaker, we dealt for three weeks with that issue. The member continued - and even though he admitted to me privately that he did not understand what the issue was between Brandon University and Mr. Perkins, why, what motivated the dismissal - even though he admitted, he continued to maintain that the Board of Governors had erred, that they had been wrong in their action. He continued to maintain that someone should be dismissed, despite the fact that he had no information to suggest there had been wrongdoing and he admitted so to me.

So Madam Speaker, I want to paint another scenario - I wonder to myself - and this is a scenario - I make the point that all I'm doing is showing how conclusions can be drawn. I ask myself, why is the Member for Brandon West continuing in this pursuit when he's admitted that the new president is doing a remarkable job; when he admitted that he wants the university to get back on an even keel? Why is he doing this? Why, Madam Speaker?

Then it came to me when I saw an article in the paper which said that Dr. Perkins was working on Mr. McCrae's campaign; working on his campaign - is this a payoff? How much did Mr. Perkins contribute to his campaign? How much did his wife contribute? How much did his children contribute? How much time did he spend on it? Do we need a public inquiry to find out the truth? Is the Member for Brandon West for sale or is he for rent?

Madam Speaker, I make the point only that it is easy to make allegations; it is easy to juxtapose facts and make them look like there's a connection. We have to be careful . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West on a point of order.

MR. J. MCCRAE: . . . apologize. The Minister seems to have made a reflection or an imputation of motive on my part, Madam Speaker, respecting Dr. Perkins. I invite the Minister to look through every mention of the Perkins affair, both when his Estimates were before the Committee of the Whole, Madam Speaker, or in this House. At no time have I taken the position of a defence of Dr. Perkins. The Minister seems to be making that impression today and I'd like to have him straighten that out.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. On the point of order.

HON. J. STORIE: There is no point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: I've listened very carefully to the honourable member's remarks and he very clearly said that he was going to lay out several examples of how allegations could be done and that they were all hypothetical. So in terms of impugning motives, I think he's very clearly not, and on — (Interjection) — order

Thursday, 28 August, 1986

please. The Honourable Minister very clearly laid out several examples and said that he was going to lay out examples of how allegations could be done and facts could be put together. He was not putting those facts together.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, the words that I take the most offence to uttered by the Minister was the rhetorical question as to whether the Member for Brandon West was for sale or for rent, and I wonder if the Minister, on reflection, would like to comment further and make the record clear, because Madam Speaker, coming from an Honourable Minister, I can't accept that, so I have to assume that he didn't mean it quite the way he made it sound.

MADAM SPEAKER: First of all, a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

HON. J. STORIE: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I do want the record to be clear. I did indicate - and I say it again - that what I was painting was a scenario.

I did not believe any of the things that I was about to say were anything other than theory . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. That is on the same point of order, which I ruled out of order.

Order please, order please.

MR. C. MANNES: Have you ruled on the point of order?

MADAM SPEAKER: I ruled that there was no point of order.

The time is now 5:30 p.m. Order please, order please. When this matter is before the House when we . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

When this matter is before the House again when we reconvene at 8:00 p.m., the Honourable Minister has 16 minutes remaining.

I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m.