

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 3 September, 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 Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to table the report by the Provincial Auditor with respect to the Workers Compensation Board of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I would like to table the Interim Report on questions relating to retail gasoline prices in the City of Winnipeg.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MTS - Telecommunications equipment returned from Saudi Arabia

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Telephone System.

On July 30, I asked the Minister responsible whether he could indicate what the cost of removing the Timeplex equipment from bond, that equipment that was being held in storage at the Locher Evers Warehouse here, and he undertook to bring back the information on that. I wonder if he now has the information.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thought that I had provided that information; I regret that I haven't. I did have it. My understanding is that it was in the neighbourhood of \$2,000-some-odd for a period up to two years in storage, but I will confirm the exact amount at committee tomorrow.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, is that just storage costs because the question had referred to the cost of any duties that

would have to be paid in order to remove the equipment from bond?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I will endeavour to ensure that all of that information is available tomorrow. As I recall, I did indicate to the House that the officials of MTX and MTS had taken up with Customs Canada - that's the appropriate name for that body - the disagreement about irrelevant custom fees that were payable, and I believe that they have been able to secure an understanding that it's not the maximum custom duties as was earlier indicated.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, further, on July 31 I had asked the Minister if he could indicate whether there was any other equipment being held in bond elsewhere in North America with respect to equipment that had been sent over by MTX to its companies and related operations overseas.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I believe that I had indicated, not to my knowledge, and I haven't had any further indication to me that there were any other shipments of equipment held in bond in Canada or elsewhere. I'm not sure of the arrangements in some of the overseas destinies of equipment. Certainly we'll be in a position to verify that through the officials tomorrow.

MR. G. FILMON: On July 31, as well, Madam Speaker, I had asked the Minister whether or not the Saudi partner accepts responsibility for 50 percent of the loss on equipment that has to be returned to Canada, resold at a loss or other expenses in reclaiming the equipment. Do they accept 50 percent of the loss?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I'd assumed that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition understood that in any partnership where there was an equal sharing of risk and equal investment that if there was a loss there would be an equal sharing in respect to any loss.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in this particular case, MTX is sending the equipment over to the Saudi company for ultimate retail sales and MTX, in this case, in the absence of any agreement, wouldn't be entitled to share any loss with them. Is there any agreement that allows them to share the loss on these transactions of equipment being sent over there?

HON. A. MACKLING: The specifics of the risk involved in those shipments can be dealt with tomorrow at committee meeting. I'm sure that officials should be in a position to confirm how the risk sharing takes place in respect to shipments.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, on July 31, I asked the Minister, with respect to that information that originally had been wrongly provided to the Minister,

about the equipment and the reasons for its return. I'd ask the Minister who had been responsible for misinforming, either the Minister or his executive assistant, who had made the telephone call and the Minister had undertaken to provide us with the information on that, has he the information on that?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I thought that I had clearly indicated that out of a concern to provide information to the Opposition in respect to questions arising regarding a shipment held in bond that I immediately put inquiries to MTX staff here, and when I had information I conveyed that, regrettably, outside of the House to the media the next day. I confirmed that what I had advised the media appeared to have been incorrect, because the information I'd received indicated that there had been a change in ownership in the bank. There had been no change in ownership; there'd been a change in a philosophy in respect to the operations of systems operated by the bank and I explained that in the House.

I pointed out in my answer - and the honourable member may recall this - that I received that information from my special assistant who had taken it down by telephone from an official at MTX, I believe Mr. Plunkett, the CEO of MTX, and there may have been some misunderstanding as to what the answer was given by telephone. I don't find fault with either my special assistant or the CEO of MTX because I am not certain whether there was some misunderstanding by telephone of that information.

MTS - Aysan, Theresa, employment

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, on July 31, upon learning that Theresa Aysan had been re-employed by the Telephone System in a new position, the question was asked of the Minister whether or not a competition had been held for the job which Theresa Aysan had been given, and he undertook to bring back an answer on that.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I'm sure that question can be put to Mr. Holland, the Chief Executive Officer of MTS, and he can clarify the manner of filling that position.

MTS - MITEL International and Al Bassam

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question for the Premier is: on August 15, I asked whether or not he had been informed that MITEL International had cut off the credit to the Telecom Division of Al Bassam International prior to MTX entering into a 50-50 partnership with them. I wonder if the Premier now has an answer for that question.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I thought that question had been addressed in committee. I will check, but I thought I had read that answer had been given in committee, that there had been no cutoff to such credit.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, given that the Premier presumably has read the answer, I wonder if he can give us the answer to that question.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I will check to see whether those questions were dealt with in committee or not.

MTS - MTX Royal Bank Account

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my further question to the Minister responsible for the Telephone System is: in committee on July 15 the question was asked what the purpose was for the MTX bank account with the Royal Bank of Canada.

We had received explanation as to the purpose of the Bank of Nova Scotia account and there was also evidence of a Royal Bank account, and the question was asked, what was the purpose for the Royal Bank account. I wonder if the Minister can indicate that information.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for MTS.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I will have to check that question. I believe that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition or the Honourable Member for Pembina had pursued that question at a subsequent meeting of the committee. If that is not the case, then I will make sure that the answer is given. But I did ask the Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Holland, to have provided answers for each of those questions and I believe that he had dealt with them at the opening of the committee meeting on August 21. If he had failed to answer that question, we'll make certain that an answer is provided.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is indicating that he prefers not to answer any of these questions in the House, but that the only vehicle for receiving information is going to be the committee sittings.

HON. A. MACKLING: Not at all, Madam Speaker. I certainly want to provide as responsibly as I can the answers to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's questions. He appreciates the fact that the committee is meeting tomorrow and would be a suitable time when the officials, who would otherwise relate information to me, would be available to answer those questions on my behalf.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, so that the Minister understands, all of these questions that I'm posing had been taken as notice prior for the last committee meetings, in fact, the last two committee meetings, and I'm reminding the Minister of them so that somehow, some way, we will get answers to these questions.

MTS - suspension of senior officials

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, on August 25, the Minister indicated that he would check into why Mr.

Plunkett - who had his duties removed from him as CEO of the corporation - continued to be involved in the operation of MTX, and what his duties and responsibilities were now with Mr. Curtis in place. I wonder if the Minister could indicate that today.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I again thought that I had given the Honourable Leader of the Opposition an answer to that question. Perhaps the answer wasn't to his satisfaction. I won't quarrel with him. I indicated that Mr. Plunkett, at the request of Mr. Curtis, was preparing as much information as possible to deal with the concerns that had been raised in respect to the operations of MTX, and continued to assist Mr. Curtis in responding to the concerns about the suspension order that we issued, because, as the honourable members know, there were ongoing contractual obligations. We have to determine in which instance there must be a continuance because there is a legal obligation, and in what instances where we can suspend any further initiative pending the management audit as we have indicated is necessary.

MTS - business plan with SADL and financial statements

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder as well if the Minister could indicate - he has been asked previously and I know that he has taken that under advisement - if he's had an opportunity to establish whether or not the original business plan for SADL will be available to us in committee tomorrow, and whether or not the financial statements for SADL for years ending December 31, 1982 and December 31, 1983 will be available in committee tomorrow.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside is admonishing me to be careful. Madam Speaker, I take care to provide answers as quickly as I can to all questions that are asked . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . and in answer to the questions of the Leader of the Opposition, the Saudi Arabia Datacom Ltd., the acronym SADL, -(Interjection)- was received it . . . Well, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition apparently doesn't want to listen to the answer; I don't know whether he's concerned or not.

Saudi Arabia Datacom Limited, the joint venture, the acronym for which is SADL, received its formal corporation number in June of 1983 and, as such, there would be no financial statements for that joint venture up until that time.

I've asked staff to prepare an indication of the financial statements, the working relationships that were entered into between MTX and Al Bassam International in the pre-corporation registration time, so that information will be available to members. In respect to the business plan, I've received some documentation from staff; I have queried that that is the business plan that honourable members are referring to. I have a document called a business plan, of Datacom. Presumably, that is the document the honourable member is referring to that was marked as a schedule

to an agreement that was already provided. If that's the document, I can give it today.

MR. G. FILMON: So, Madam Speaker, is the Minister saying that now the corporation is reconstructing financial statements for year ends 1982 and 1983, for some three years or four years down the road? How did that information show up, in which financial statements? Was it financial statements of MTX, or financial statements of MTS? How did that financial information show up if there are no records available, per se, under SADL?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I hear the Honourable Member for Pembina saying "unbelievable." He knew, when he asked the question the other day, he knew that the joint venture was not officially incorporated until June 1983; and I indicated that where financial statements are available, I will provide them.

Madam Speaker, there was a necessary accounting in respect to the relationship between MTX and Al Bassam International and I've asked for that accounting, and members are entitled to get that accounting. I've asked that we get that accounting in the pre-incorporation period because that is information that I want to see and I'm sure they want to see. So if the honourable member is suggesting I'm cooking something, I regret that categorically. I'm trying to provide them with the kind of information they're entitled to.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question is: why did the Minister responsible for the Telephone System, or his predecessor, not want to know this information three years ago? Why is it three years later that they finally decide they need to know what was happening in that company that was being funded by MTX and by the people of Manitoba?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I say with sincerity that there was a stage some weeks ago when I felt, as a Minister, indebted to the Honourable Member for Pembina for the kind of investigation that had exposed what I consider to be inadequacies, to the extent where it was obvious that there was a need to call in the RCMP; and even go further, establish a management audit and suspend operations pending that management audit.

I am, as Minister, concerned to ensure that every stage of accounting which is necessary will be done by the management audit, to make sure that there has been a full accounting in respect to all of the dealings of MTX in this matter.

I am not an accountant; I am not an expert. I have asked my staff to produce further documentation because I think that documentation was lacking, there wasn't a sufficient accounting, Madam Speaker. I think honourable members are entitled to that kind of accounting. They are going to get it through the management audit; they are going to get it through an RCMP investigation and I will be happy to insure that that full accounting is placed before the committee.

Dental Programs - accreditation of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

The Canadian Dental Association has denied full accreditation to Manitoba's Undergraduate Dental Program and to two graduate dental programs citing inadequate lecture space, poor quality labs, and staffing problems; all of which certainly suffer with lack of funding.

Has the Minister spoken with the President of the University of Manitoba regarding this problem, in that Manitoba has failed to meet the standards for dental accreditation twice in seven years?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

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

Yes, Madam Speaker, in fact the president of the university did contact me and indicate to me that the accreditation in certain programs in the Faculty of Dentistry were in jeopardy. I believe that it came somewhat as a surprise, as it indicated in the paper, that three programs - two undergraduates and a graduate program - did not receive full accreditation.

As the member indicated in her question, this is not the first time that has happened. I believe that some 10 years ago was the first time when full accreditation was denied. It is not unusual; it is part of the process of developing and continuing an acceptable set of standards in any program, and I believe the university has responded in the past to the lack of accreditation, and certainly will be responding to any perceived deficiencies in the current programming. They will, in the course of their budgeting, I am sure, be allocating sufficient funds to cover any deficiency that exists.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, with a supplementary question to the same Minister.

Can the Minister tell the House why, in a study released last spring of 10 dental schools across Canada, that dental students from the University of Manitoba expressed the greatest dissatisfaction of all students across this country?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Madam Speaker, I have not spoken to any of the graduates of the Dental School. I assume that it has something to do with perhaps the perceived inadequacy of the space. I know that as early as 1980 the Canadian Dental Association had indicated that there was more space required in the faculty.

Certainly in the early years, 1981-82-83, this government was providing funding in the area of 10 percent, 11 percent, 13 percent increases, and I assume that the board of governors and the administration at the university, if they had deemed that problem significant enough, could have directed additional capital funds to the faculty so they could have addressed some of those problems. I think I indicated earlier that, if there are problems, they will certainly be addressed. They have in the past and they will in the future.

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

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Yes, with a final supplementary to the same Minister.

Madam Speaker, can the Minister explain how our universities are to cope with accreditation problems when their operational funding is less than the rate of inflation?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, if that statement were accurate, I would agree that our universities do have a problem. Since 1981, increased funding to the universities in this province has been 8 percent above inflation.

Grain handlers' dispute, Lakehead

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

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

Last week, in reply to a question I posed, the Premier indicated, in essence, that his government didn't have concern, or certainly did not wish to interfere, in the grain handlers dispute at the Lakehead. Today, Madam Speaker, all of Saskatchewan Pool's terminals have been struck. I understand that all the other grain company terminals are deciding whether to lock out their employees, shutting down, Madam Speaker, virtually all of Manitoba grain export movement.

I ask the Minister of Agriculture, Madam Speaker: has the government today made representation to the Federal Government to end this dispute immediately?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for his question.

I wish to indicate that both the Minister of Transportation, myself and the Premier have had meetings on this and we are in fact telexing both the Federal Minister responsible for Labour, the Wheat Board, and the Minister of Transport, as we understand that conciliation services have been removed and there should in fact be conciliation services. And short of getting both parties to the table to resolve this issue - as I understand, of course, that Manitoba Wheat Pool is not on strike because there is a separate collective agreement - that grain cars in fact be made available to make sure that the utmost use of the Port of Churchill is maintained, Madam Speaker.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, given that Churchill handles roughly 2 percent of the exports of Western Canada, given that there are no quotas in effect, that the total license system is totally plugged with wheat . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. C. MANNES: . . . that there is no income coming into farm communities, will, Madam Speaker - my question - this government put dogma aside and request of the Federal Government to institute legislation, if necessary, to end that strike and that dispute immediately?

HON. B. URUSKI: It's very clear, Madam Speaker, that there is a lack of income to western agriculture by virtue of a 24 percent reduction in grain prices brought forward by their colleagues in Ottawa, there is no doubt; and the lack of commitment, Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Federal Government, in an attempt to pit provincial treasuries against the treasuries of the United States. There has been no commitment to guarantee the incomes of western grain farmers.

I certainly would not recommend a situation of confrontation in a labour dispute, but what we want to have is to bring both parties to the table to work this agreement out, and that's what conciliation services are, to be provided by their colleagues in Ottawa, and that's what should happen, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, given that there are no quotas, so regardless of the price of wheat that there is no movement of grain, so there is no income coming in; and given the fact that when there was a hog dispute embargo and . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a supplementary?

MR. C. MANNESS: . . . a countervail in effect, the First Minister, Madam Speaker, found it politically expedient to act immediately. I ask the Minister . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Question period is not a time for debate. Does the honourable member have a supplementary question?

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, I ask the Minister of Agriculture a new question.

Given that the Premier of this province found it politically expedient to act quickly, supposedly, over the hog dispute, I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether or not his government will be prepared to act quickly on this very major dispute, such that it could cost Manitoba grain producers \$10 million a week with that port closed . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, as always in this Session, members opposite not only want to pose the question, they also want to provide the answer.

Madam Speaker, members of this government had acted on this issue even though it is strictly a federal responsibility. Madam Speaker, in the case that the member opposite mentioned, the hog dispute, the Federal Government knew one year in advance on the chloramphenicol issue that there would be an embargo and they did not act. This government acted

immediately when the States moved. That's the reason we took action at that time.

MR. C. MANNESS: The Honourable Member for Morris with a final supplementary.

MR. C. MANNESS: A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

Can the Minister of Agriculture tell the House and the grain farmers of Manitoba how long he will sit and how long this government will sit by watching the conciliatory process evolve, given what has occurred, Madam Speaker, over the last month, how long this government will continue to sit back and watch that process evolve before it has the guts to stand up and do something and make strong representation to Ottawa to end the dispute?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, it's clear that honourable members opposite didn't want to hear the answer I provided. We have acted on a provincial basis in the interest of farmers of Manitoba and Western Canada, but Madam Speaker, we will not put the interests of farmers ahead of political expediency as is being expressed by members opposite. Have they, Madam Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Clearly I indicated, Madam Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation and myself sending a telex to all the Federal Ministers, both of Transportation, of Labour and responsible for the Wheat Board to grain conciliation services to act. Madam Speaker, we are putting the interests of farmers ahead of political expediency, unlike members opposite here who have sat in this House for three-and-a-half months keeping the farmers behind and the banks ahead in terms of the argument on Bill 4, The Family Farm Protection Act.

Land Titles Office - Registration Fee Increase

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

The Estimates of Revenue of the Province, which he tabled, indicated a revenue from the Land Titles Office of \$11,000,500 in this fiscal year. In view of the Estimates of Revenue from the Land Titles Office now that revenue will be in excess of \$14 million, some \$2.5 million more than he estimated, would he explain to the House why he has imposed, as of September 1 of this year, an additional charge on registrations of transfers of land and mortgages in the Land Titles Office?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I think, in answering that question, it should be context; that is, we have, in dealing with problems of the Land Titles Office, agreed to add a considerable number of staff and to step up the rate of computerization to better serve the people of Manitoba.

But, Madam Speaker, the real answer to that question is that we have a responsibility in line with the budget policy announced by the Minister of Finance to make sure that we maintain and, where possible, with as little hardship as possible, increase revenues in order to either hold or reduce the deficit while maintaining programs.

I don't see what's wrong with that. That, it seems to me, is the kind of policy they say they support. If they support it, they support it, but are they now reversing their position?

Land Titles Office - revenue

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the fact that the costs of operating the Land Titles Office, shown in the Estimates, is less than

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I'm trying to hear the question from the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. I would hope other members would cooperate. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A supplementary question to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the fact that the costs of operating the Land Titles Office are shown in the Estimates to be less than \$4.5 million, and the revenue is in excess of \$14 million, how does the Minister of Finance justify gouging the users of the Land Titles Office for a \$10 million profit when they're providing such dismal service?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, the premise behind the question is not entirely correct.

The Attorney-General has indicated how he is dealing with the run on the Land Titles Office as a result of the continuing improvement in the housing situation in the Province of Manitoba; and it's as a direct result of the unanticipated continued growth in the housing sector in Manitoba that we have the problems with respect to the Land Titles Office. But the Attorney-General has taken steps to insure that there are resources and that the backlog is being dealt with, both in terms of overtime, in terms of facilitating other staff, and the addition of additional staff in order to deal with that, and he's clearly outlined that's our intention.

To somehow suggest that the only costs associated with housing in this province only relate to the direct expenditures in the Land Titles Office is not telling the whole story. There are other expenditures throughout government that relate to housing.

Also, it hasn't been the practice to look at one area simply on a cost recovery basis. The member somehow

suggested we ought to reduce those fees and reduce the revenue. At the same time, other members on the opposite side, particularly the Finance critic, is suggesting we should do something about the deficit. Here we are, in one area, looking at increased revenues and making some impact on the ongoing deficit of the province and it's being criticized by the member opposite.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Finance.

Is this \$10 million tax on users of the Land Titles Office, people who are buying and selling perhaps their first or second homes, is this the type of tax reform that we can expect from his government?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: If one compares the costs associated with those fees in Manitoba as against other provinces, you'll find that we are well in line.

But the fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that we imposed far greater revenue increases and far greater tax increases on banks, on large corporations, on interprovincial pipelines, which every member across criticized us for, saying we're taxing the large companies, and to somehow suggest that isn't prudent, Madam Speaker, is doing injustice to the truth.

Crimes, violent - increase in immigrant groups

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Attorney-General.

In the recently released report of the Criminal Intelligence Service, a Federal Government report, it states, in talking about immigrant groups: "However, more recently triad groups have emerged. With their emergence, crime within the Asian community in Manitoba has become distinctly more visible and violent in 1985. Extortion, armed robberies, vicious assaults, loan sharking and gambling became more evident as new immigrants continue to establish themselves in criminal sub-culture."

Can the Attorney-General verify from statistics from his department if this is true?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

May I remind the Honourable Member of Beausheue Citation 362, "Reading telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to an oral question is an abuse of the Rules of the House. It is not good parliamentary practice to communicate written allegations to the House and then to ask Ministers either to confirm or deny them."

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I'm reporting from a Federal Government Annual Report.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member's question is out of order. He asked the Minister to confirm or deny certain statistics. Order please. It is the member's responsibility to ascertain the truth of any statement before he brings

it to the House. Did the honourable member want to rephrase his question?

MR. H. SMITH: Can the Minister give us the statistics to show such increases in crime within the immigrant community?

MADAM SPEAKER: What did he say? Order please. Could the honourable member please repeat his question, I didn't hear it?

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, my question is as follows: can the Minister give us the statistics in violent crime showing the increased crime rate within the immigrant groups in Winnipeg?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, in fact, such statistics are not only not available, but in fact the statistics that are available indicate that kind of report, which has been referred to, those kinds of allegations which have been made, do in fact come perilously close to amounting to racial slurs.

I want to say, as Attorney-General of this province, I reject them; I think that's an unfair allegation concerning the immigrant communities in this province, who everybody who has any dealings with them know, are law abiding communities who come here to make their home, to participate in the economic and social life of this province, and I intend to discuss this matter with the RCMP with whom I will be meeting in a regular meeting next week and, quite frankly, call them to account.

I will be, in fact, writing the Commissioner, Mr. Simmonds, and calling him to account. I don't think that kind of allegation has any place in our community.

MTS - Venture Capital Program re MTX

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Venture Capital Corporation Program was designed to lever private investment in small businesses. To be a part of Venture Capital Corporation, a company or a person cannot have more than 10 percent equity in the operating company; and the Government of Manitoba, through MTS wholly owns MTX, will the Minister tell the House the nature of the business venture and the amount of the capitalization of the proposal that was made to the government?

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

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, just to clarify the Venture Capital Program that the question is relating to, it's the MTX proposal that he's asking about? Yes, I signed a Letter of Agreement that was conditional, Madam Speaker, on I believe it was July 24, and the agreement will not be confirmed until the terms of the agreement have been completed.

Some of those terms may, or may not be, be altered from the original proposal, and that's one of the things that will be under consideration by the review that is presently under way by Charlie Curtis, so that we are reviewing this project on two counts. One is that it meets the requirements that we have set down and the conditions for a Venture Capital Program; the other is that it meets the legal requirements and there are legal commitments under the program that are being determined by Mr. Curtis.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, would you please call the Adjourned Debate on Bill No. 56, standing in the name of the Member for Minnedosa?

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL 56 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986 (2)

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

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

In rising to join the debate on Interim Supply, Bill 56, there leaves little, I suppose, to be said after many of the speeches that have been heard already from this side of the House. But when we consider we're giving approval to the granting of some \$3 billion to this government to handle a large portion of it as they see fit and mismanage, Madam Speaker, it's with some grave concern and reluctance that we grant passage to an Interim Supply Bill of this size.

We see a government that's been rocked with scandal, who have been stumbling from one fiasco to another, and it makes one wonder just how they're going to manage the taxpayers' funds for the next several months, until we finish this Session and come back into a new one.

Madam Speaker, the list of blunders and embarrassment and broken promises, I am sure, must make some of the supporters of this government just wonder why they have been giving it support over the years. We've seen not only a dramatic increase in the deficit, far and above that even forecast which has been staggering in itself, when we consider year after year this government is spending something like one-half billion dollars in excess of the revenues that they take in. That, in itself, has to be of grave concern to the taxpayers, Madam Speaker, and there has to be some meaningful action taken by this government that is going to put a stop to this hemorrhage of taxpayers' dollars, a large amount of it going down the drain.

It has already caused a lowering in the province's credit rating. We all know what that does, Madam

Speaker, it increases the cost of our borrowed funds. We're borrowing funds, a large amount of it offshore, and when we consider the dollar values and the changes in not only the Japanese yen, the American dollar versus the Canadian dollar, the interest charges that we're going to be faced with could be dramatically more than what we're already budgeting for.

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

We already see some 11 percent of our income now going to service our debt, service the money that we've borrowed up till now, and that I'm sure is of great concern to the Finance Minister because this trend cannot continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This trend cannot continue before this province is faced with an insurmountable debt that the children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren are going to just wonder why the legislators of our province let the country get into such a mess.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've not only seen the lowering of the credit rating, we've seen this government just rock from one scandal to another. We have the Brandon University affair, where they fired the chief executive officer and president without cause, with an out-of-court settlement which is costing the taxpayers of this country something like \$1 million.

We're seen the firing of the Autopac chairman. We're not sure what the outcome of that is going to be yet. The Minister is conducting a search for a chief executive officer and I'm sure that he'll receive a number of applications in that job. Hopefully, he'll be able to put someone with some good sound business knowledge back into that position and get that corporation back on a profitable basis, because the forecasters are going to lose \$4 million or \$5 million this year, and I don't know whether we can blame it all on bad snowstorms, hailstorms or sleet storms.

The suspension of the chief executive officer of Workers Compensation I'm sure has caused the government some concern. I'm pleased to see the report come in today that he has been cleared of any wrongdoing and is now back in his role as chief executive officer of the Workers' Compensation Board.

We've seen the "fire sale" of Flyer Industries and that's the only way it can be described, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a "fire sale," because we had to really pay the Dutch company to take it off our hands. There was a loss of millions and millions and millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, to say nothing of the Manfor Forest Industries in The Pas which is losing millions of dollars year after year after year, and it's now being partially closed down they say for a lack of timber resources. I suppose they maybe have reasons for not having the timber in, but it doesn't seem to have hindered the other sawmills in the country. I was by the Roblin Forest Products not too many weeks ago and they have a tremendous supply of logs there that will keep them going throughout the year. If they're able to manage their operation, it seems odd that one the size of Manfor has got into the fix that it's in.

The MTS and the MTX scandal is ongoing and we'll hear more of that later, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We've had the Parasiuk affair which we hope is behind us now. We've had hiring problems with Limestone.

We've had problems in Natural Resources that has resulted in a special audit that may help clear up the problems there. We have a Minister who forgot about his student loan.

So we've had a Premier who's done a flip-flop on free trade. The government is no doubt without direction, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are going to be many other things that will come to light before the Session ends, I'm sure, but the general public must be wondering what type of government they voted in last March 18, a government that has lost desire; it has lost direction; it has shown itself to be incapable in so many areas of managing the affairs of this province that I'm sure the people have lost confidence in it in a very, very short period of time.

The hue and cry that comes from the government benches when we mention different programs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and say, well, you want us to spend more money, you want us to cut the deficit, and yet you want us to spend more money. They seem to be able to find more money where it's needed. They're finding roughly \$20 million when it's all washed out for a bridge north of Selkirk in the Premier's riding, and yet other areas are left wanting.

It seems that the \$20 million that we've poured into Saudi Arabia on a venture, which was probably nebulous to start with, has got the ordinary telephone user in Manitoba just wondering why his service can't be improved. In my particular area, we have many, many municipalities, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where they have five and six councillors living five, ten miles from each other and they're all on long distance. Their telephone bills are \$75 to \$100 to \$150 a month. They have considered that a normal procedure, but when they see a misadventure such as we see now in Saudi Arabia, where we're going to lose \$17 million to \$20 million, they're saying, why am I putting up with this poor service with three and four and five telephones on a party line? Why am I having to put up with this when we're throwing our money away elsewhere?

Those are the things that the people are asking, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and when questions are asked in the House on their behalf, we get half answers, we get no answers, or we get a tirade against the Federal Government and two minutes of hand clapping on the other side of the House. That's not good enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is just not good enough. The cost to the taxpayers of borrowing the funds that are needed to keep this government going, are becoming staggering as I mentioned earlier, and I don't know how long they're going to put up with it.

We've seen the questions that were asked during question period by the Member for St. Norbert on the increased fees in the Land Titles Office bringing in millions of dollars of additional revenue to this government. We've seen the increase in the hydro and water rates, an increase in the natural gas tax. We've seen an increase in many, many incidental fees. We've seen increase in trappers' licences, in hunting fees, in fishing licences, in drivers' licences.

The price of gas, they run through The Trade Practices Act and they're going to try and do something to regulate the price of gas, when the main reason right at their fingertips is the provincial gas tax which is the highest in the country. They could remove some of that gas tax and get our gas prices down more in line with our sister province of Saskatchewan which sees one of the cheapest gas prices in the country.

These things are having an effect out there on the ordinary Manitoban, that they're so prone to stand up

Wednesday, 3 September, 1986

and say we are supporting the ordinary Manitoban. Well, there's an awful lot of ordinary Manitobans out there who support members on this side of the House. I know there certainly are in my riding.

Election promises were thrown out. My colleague, the Member for Emerson last night mentioned the closeness, the quality of the popular vote, so it wasn't a strong mandate that this government was given to govern this province. There were a lot of election promises thrown out and a lot of them have just gone by the wayside once the election was over.

There is a good example of one, I think, that I feel that should be read into the record. There's an editorial in the Stonewall Argus on July 23, 1986 and I'm quoting from it: "Little Substance to Election Promises. With the provincial election four months behind them, promises made by some NDP politicians are dissipating like smoke in a prairie wind."

In Selkirk - I'm glad the Premier is here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because he's mentioned in the editorial: "In Selkirk, Premier Howard Pawley said during the election campaign that the provincial government was willing to pump \$2 million into the town's development project. The Federal Government matches the contribution. The local M.P. cried foul." Of course, accusing the province of trying to shame Ottawa into coughing up \$2 million. It made front-page headlines in the newspapers, though, generating the kind of publicity politicians like to see come election time. The deal collapsed quickly.

In a letter dated April 4 about two weeks after the election: "... the then Minister of Business Development and Tourism, Jerry Storie, informed Selkirk Mayor, Bud Oliver, that the offer was withdrawn because of lack of response from the Federal Government regarding the cost-sharing agreement." What a surprise.

"Last summer, with the whiff of an election in the air, Selkirk was promised \$300,000 to help upgrade the town's water supply system. Early this summer, the town was informed the provincial funding for the project had been withdrawn. Let Selkirkers drink Winnipeg's dirty water.

"Last November, the Rural Municipality of Coldwell and the province signed an agreement to cost-share a sewer expansion for Lundar. Premier Howard Pawley and Agriculture Minister Bill Uruski appeared in person to sign the agreement making headlines in the local paper and no doubt hoping to foster a bit of good will in the community of Lundar shortly before a provincial election was due to be called. Earlier this summer, the residents of the community were informed that funds for the project were unavailable and that it had been postponed indefinitely. Everyone agrees that the sewer extension is needed, but in the words of one government official, Lundar hasn't ranked in priority, yet it was ranked high enough to attract the presence of the Premier and a powerful Cabinet Minister when the agreement was signed less than a year ago. Is it any wonder that people doubt the words of politicians?"

HON. H. PAWLEY: If you believe everything in editorials then you've got some learning to do.

MR. D. BLAKE: The Premier is making some comments. Do we believe everything we read in editorials? It must . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: I find it offensive when he talked about truth power.

MR. D. BLAKE: The comments of editorials, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm sure are bothering the Premier, because there has been more than one, there's been several editorials in various papers that have just lambasted this government something unmercifully.

So, I'm sure editorial comment is giving this Premier some concern, because it's little wonder that when one sits and watches the political scene in Manitoba for any length of time, they can't help but write the type of editorials as being written. A government that's inept, it's incapable of managing anything, it's lost its sense of purpose, its sense of direction, it's old and tired. We've seen a big shuffle in the chairs, in the Cabinet benches lately. We don't know whether that was supposed to be a Cabinet shuffle, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or merely rearranging the deck chairs on a sinking ship. It's hard for us on this side of the House to realize what we may have there.

We have before us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a government that is asking for the support of members on this side of the House to grant them the authority to continue on their wild spending spree, and it's with some reluctance that members on this side of the House have to pass this bill, but we realize the consequences, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we do not pass it.

A MEMBER: Tell him the facts.

MR. E. CONNERY: We have had many comments made by previous speakers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on how the government goes about raising money. During the Public Accounts meeting this year, the question was asked by my colleague, the Member for Morris, in connection with Manitoba Properties Inc., and we were finally provided with the information. He wondered if there was a list of the buildings that had been sold to raise something like \$200 million under the Manitoba Properties. The list came in, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it was surprising the buildings that have been sold to raise funds, including the University of Fort Garry Campus buildings and the liquor commission buildings and various other buildings that were once owned by the people of Manitoba, that have been sold off and we're now paying rent. We're now renting them back for millions of dollars a year. People out there, I don't think, realize what had just happened with the Manitoba Properties situation and that is being brought to mind.

We have a government that is in so much trouble, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the minute there's a bit of a tight argument shows up, we have back benchers jumping up on points of order and various stall tactics used to try and change the trend of thought of someone who may be attacking from this side of the House.

That wasn't seen in the government of 1977-81, the government of Sterling Lyon, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We had a strong enough front bench and a strong enough House Leader that if there were points of order needed, it was handled up there. It had nothing to do with members of the back bench.

Here we've got experts on rules and procedures in the back bench that haven't been here long enough

to find their way to the washroom hardly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and yet they've become experts on the rules all of a sudden. I would say, guard your position jealously because there are many in the back bench who feel they're completely capable of taking over the operation of this whole Legislature, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so just guard your position jealously.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Interim Supply Bill is something that comes before us each year. It gives members an opportunity to carry on some wide ranging debate, maybe go into some of their constituency problems and I'll take that opportunity now.

The constituency of Minnedosa, as you may be aware - I don't whether you've had the opportunity to visit that fine part of the province or not - but we've been blessed so far this year with what appears to be a bountiful harvest. We have had some hail disasters in some small areas. It's serious to those who were affected, but on an overall picture it hasn't been that serious, so it would appear that we're on our way to a reasonably good harvest, but that doesn't detract from the problems that are facing agriculture.

The price of the commodities has continued to shrink, while the cost of farm inputs, fertilizer, fuel and chemicals has continued to increase dramatically. This has put a tremendous price squeeze on the farm community.

I had the opportunity to talk with an American farmer who was one of the few tourists who have visited Manitoba this year, I might say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and he informed us he's paying 47 cents a gallon for diesel fuel down in his State of Ohio. That's compared with, what, diesel fuel of \$2 and what would we pay up here? Diesel fuel of \$2-and something a gallon here compared with 47 cents. Now that is a very difficult situation to compete with when they're buying their fuel at that price. On top of that, offering Russia some \$15 a tonne subsidy if they'll only buy the surplus wheat from the United States.

So far, that offer hasn't really been grabbed up by the Russian grain buyers. They're still buying a lot of their grain from Canada and we hope that we can protect some of those markets because one of the benefits that we have in Canada is that we grow one of the finest quality Red Spring wheat grown in Canada, grown in the world. This is required to mix with a softer wheat for milling purposes, but there's no one else who can grow as good a grade of grain as we do and that, I think, is a plus for the Canadian farmer.- (Interjection)-

The Member for The Pas says, how about the grain up there? I happen to have spent some time up there and I agree with him, they grow some fine quality grain. If they would only enlarge the area there and allow a few more farmers to become established, it might bring them a packing plant; they can raise some fine cattle up in that country. There's lots of grazing land; that would improve the economy of that particular area also.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, please come to order. I cannot hear the member who has the floor.

MR. D. BLAKE: I'm having a little difficulty myself, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The farm economy is a pretty bleak situation right now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I say I've seen it happen

before. There are some of us who are old enough to remember the tough years through the Thirties and things did improve.

We've had several small recessions and recoveries since then and I'm sure we'll see another, especially in the agricultural sector, because there seems to be tenaciousness with rural agricultural people, that they have a stick-to-itiveness that doesn't seem to be prevalent throughout the rest of society. They will prevail; they'll hang in there and they'll wait for the recession to turn around and they'll have their good years. They'll do their fair share of grumbling; they'll do their fair share of criticizing of government, but yet they'll go out and do their job and do it better than any other trade or occupation of that type, I would say, in the free world.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are some of the things that I think are the brighter side of the picture in agriculture. As I say, we've got tremendous problems at the present time, but they're going to turn around. I'm confident they'll turn around with the general improvement in the economy and we're seeing . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if you'd ask the Minister of Education if he could just remind himself that he's in class for awhile and . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I remind all members, under Rule 44.(1), "No member shall engage in private conversation in such a manner as to interrupt the Business of the House."

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I even forgot where I was now. What were you arguing with me about?

A MEMBER: You were telling us how tenacious farmers are.

MR. D. BLAKE: There's no question about it that the farm economy will return and the whole economy of Canada is showing a slight improvement; it's going to get greater, with the programs and the policies that are going to be brought in by the present Mulroney Government in Ottawa. They haven't been without their problems. They inherited such an unholy mess, as we're all aware, after 16 years of devastation under the Trudeau regime, that it's taken them a couple of years to finally get a handle on things down there and try and redirect the ship because it was on the rocks so badly it just takes a little time to get it redirected and get it back out into safer, calmer waters.

We hear great hues and cries across the way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about tax reform. There is no doubt the federal Finance Minister is looking seriously at tax reform. That is going to be a plus. We've seen a tremendous increase or improvement in our deficit position already this year. It will continue to improve. But all we hear from members opposite is strong criticism of the Federal Government. They're crying cutbacks here, cutbacks there. When a government takes over the situation they took over and is trying as hard as they are to improve the situation without inflicting hardships on those who are unable to look after themselves, it presents a pretty bold picture for

them to face up to; but it's being faced up to and it's being faced up to as strongly and as capably as they're capable of doing within a short period of time.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

So we know that is one of the bright pictures, Madam Speaker. Another 10, 12, 15, or 16 years of Federal Conservative Government will see this country back and take its rightful place as a trading nation and see our economy rolling again, where the free enterprise system and the entrepreneur is able to go out and make his way with as little hindrance from the government as can be possibly put forward.

Certainly government help is needed in a number of ways, but we don't need the impediments that have been put in the way of the government that we've seen with various legislation that's been passed by the present government in Manitoba; and I don't have to relate to the 1.5 percent sales tax, the labour legislation.

The Minister now has announced that pay equity's going to file \$17 million into pay equity in the next three or four years. Everyone's in agreement with pay equity and it can come about through the private sector in its own free time without any enforcement by government. But these are the things that I mentioned earlier, that we can always find \$10 million or \$20 million for something like that, but we can't find millions to put in agriculture, when we consider what our sister provinces have done in agriculture.

Saskatchewan and Alberta have poured millions of dollars into the agricultural sector and what have we put in here? The Minister says we've poured more money in agriculture than any other provincial government in history. Sure, he took \$20 million away from the Highways Minister. I don't know how much he took out of Northern Affairs - only about a million. He took some out of Natural Resources and put it into Agriculture. Well, no one can criticize that except Highways, and our transportation system is as important to rural agriculture in Manitoba as anything else.

We've lifted the expectations in some of the rural areas up to the point where we rebuilt the road halfway between Neepawa and Minnedosa, with the full expectation that we're going to get the other half this year, and all of a sudden we find there's no money, that's been cancelled. It could have something to do with the vote in March, we're not sure.

We don't want to accuse the Minister of that, but we're getting very, very suspicious when we look at some of the roads that are getting priority and some of them that aren't, especially with the threat he made to one or two of our members, that if they didn't go along with him they might not see any roads for awhile. The Member for Morris tells us that the six good miles of road, they've torn it up on him. So we sometimes wonder about the direction, Madam Speaker.

I have touched on a number of fiascos, Madam Speaker, without mentioning Bill 4 of the Farm Bill, while I'm discussing Agriculture. Here's a bill designed to save the family farm and it sounds catchy, protect the farmer. When we take a deep and intense look at that bill, Madam Speaker, it's going to do none of those things. It's probably going to increase the cost of borrowing to farmers. If the bill comes through in its present form without any changes, it's probably going to dry up a lot of the traditional sources of funding for farmers to operate their farms. That's not going to be

a help, it's going to be a hindrance. There are many, many of those things that we're very, very concerned about, Madam Speaker.

We've seen the Attorney-General come up with a scheme to provide aid to crime victims. It was a promise which was made during the election and everyone was in agreement with that, because I think the victims have been overlooked for so many years that the criminal now gets more attention than the victim does, so we thought that was a good move and we could applaud that. But now we find out he's going to fund it by another tax of 12 percent on the fines imposed on the perpetrators of the crime or those violating provincial laws and it allows for a maximum of 20 percent. Well, that's just another tax, Madam Speaker, and the critics have condemned that bill already, so there are a great many of the promises which this government made that have been kept - or half kept - but the imposition and the hardships imposed on the taxpayers of Manitoba, I don't think are going to benefit this government in any great way.

So, Madam Speaker, as I've said in my earlier remarks, we are going to pass the Interim Supply Bill in due course. We have a great reluctance to see it go to a group of spendthrifts - incompetent, mismanaging spendthrifts that this government has proven itself to be.

A MEMBER: Socialist maniacs.

MR. D. BLAKE: Someone's referred to them as socialist maniacs, Madam Speaker, but I don't know whether I would use that or not. I won't get into the "Typhoid Mary's" and coming from the "socialist swamp," that some other MLA's in this House used to use. I don't know whether that would really describe them properly or not, but there is no doubt the incompetence and mismanagement that has marred this Session of the Legislature, Madam Speaker, has been highlighted over and over and over again.

I can understand the Premier becoming a little unravelled when I read that little editorial from the Stonewall Argus that showed what his election promises meant and really what he was up to, because there have been many stronger editorial voices added to that small editorial that have spelled it out clear and loud, the incompetence, the mismanagement, and the inability of this group that we have opposite which are supposed to be governing this province, Madam Speaker, because they have displayed a total inability to grasp the situation, to handle it competently, and to come up with the proper solution or to solve any matter quickly.

They've ordered a few investigations. They've ordered a few audits that have showed up wrongdoing, but there's only so much the Auditor can do. We can't have him continually investigating something. It would appear that one scandal or one problem after the other crops up, that we should have a group of watchdogs investigating all of the departments over there.

We do our best on this side, but I don't know whether we're getting to the bottom of it all or not, Madam Speaker, and that brings us to the public inquiry to do with MTS and MTX. The members on this side of the House have asked for, in as strong as possible terms as we can muster, because nobody has criticized the

RCMP. They certainly do their job very, very thoroughly and they're very competent, but they won't investigate any areas that aren't brought to their attention that aren't of criminal nature.

So we've asked for that inquiry, in order to have employees come forward with immunity, to be sworn before an impartial group, and maybe spill the story out that they're not going to come before an RCMP investigator; they're not going to come before Coopers and Lybrand unless they're directed; and we say there are loopholes in that call for an inquiry that you can drive a truck through and there is no question about that. We may get some of the answers when the inquiry is completed. We may get a few more tomorrow in the public hearing before the committee.

A MEMBER: Eventually we'll get them all, Davie.

MR. D. BLAKE: That's right, eventually we'll get them all, and if we don't, the government will get the final answer when the next election is called, and the sooner the better, Madam Speaker. But the answer will be there loud and strong at that time.

So, Madam Speaker, with those remarks, when the time comes, I will be adding my support to the passage of the Interim Supply Bill to allow the government to operate and to pay out the various sums that they're required to pay, such as salaries and social assistance payments and payments to those others who are less able to look after themselves than some of us are.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Almost two years ago now, or even a little more than that, when I decided I was going to run to be the MLA for Portage la Prairie, I was doing it because I had a deep concern for the constituency of Portage la Prairie. Madam Speaker, I didn't need the job of being an MLA. I could have quite nicely stayed at home on the farm with the boys and probably made a little more money and probably would have enjoyed the summer an awful lot more than we had this stupid year, but I had a deep concern for my community in many different ways.

I had a concern for the philosophical way that this current government has been taking our province, to what it's doing to the imagination and viability and vigour of the people of this province, by making everybody dependent on government, looking to government for whatever they can get before they even try to do things on their own. This really has concerned me. But my deeper concern was the financial future of ourselves, but not so much for the generation that I am in, but the future generations of my children and my grandchildren, Madam Speaker. With the way we're going, I don't think there will be much of a future by the time my grandchildren get to be ready to pay taxes.

I think the Member for Inkster, who is just celebrating the birth of his first child, Madam Speaker, I think that member should be very concerned that having brought somebody into this world that he should be concerned about the future of that child. I think the irresponsibility of that member, along with the members opposite, by not looking at the fiscal responsibilities, are jeopardizing

the future of that child along with all of the other children of this province.

Madam Speaker, we take a look at the first quarter statement, not as quite as late as the fourth quarter, I must admit, but the Minister of Finance says that well we're only 27 million over our predicted deficit. He said to us, Madam Speaker, that was because there were timings in the payment or receiving of money. Well, any business will tell you where these shortfalls or incomes have come. The Minister doesn't tell us that in the finance sector, they are up \$20 million over last year - \$20 million - and he doesn't tell us, though, the breakdown of where this \$20 million is going. How much of that is going to pay the increased interest on the debt we are incurring in this province?

But, Madam Speaker, they talk about the 27 million greater deficit than projected, but I think much more severe than that is the \$101 million more in expenses than what we incurred last year in that period of time - \$101 million more spent than what we had spent the previous year of the first three quarters.

They also show, Madam Speaker, that the income is up 98.5 million. That sounds like a fairly good increase in income, but when you analyze the income factor we find, Madam Speaker, that 72.259 million has come from the feds. You know, those real bad guys down east sent us about three-quarters of the increase in income that we have achieved in the first three quarters of this year.

The Minister of Finance and members opposite kept on saying they are cutting the money coming to Manitoba, they are cutting the flow of money. Madam Speaker, 72 million does not seem to me like a very large cut. I would say it was a very large increase, but they try to blame the feds for everything they've done, that is happening, while they do nothing themselves. They're an absolute do-nothing - I call it mentally constipated - I don't know, does Beauchesne frown on that word? -(Interjection)- Well, I'm just asking if it's okay, I'll use it, because that really epitomizes what is

MADAM SPEAKER: For the information of the honourable member, I haven't heard any objections.

MR. E. CONNERY: Okay. Well, I guess they accept the fact that that's what's going on.

So, Madam Speaker, I think when we look at some of our debt comparisons - and I think we have to be very cognizant of what's been happening in the last while and what various governments have done - looking at the list of the debt over the last years going back to 1968, the province was in debt for \$1 billion. Madam Speaker, during the tenure of Sterling Lyon, when we came in, the debt had risen to \$3.5 billion. So, the Schreyer years, they added \$2.5 billion to the debt.

During the Sterling Lyon years, the four years that he tried to put in some fiscal restraints, the deficit went up 1 billion, but in the next five years of sorry NDP Government, our total indebtedness rose \$4 billion to where we are now, almost \$8.5 billion in debt. I think that is a pretty sad commentary on a province that has so much to give and such a poor government with which to work with the assets this province has.

We can look at the percentages of expenditures in excess of revenues; 1979, 5.4 percent; 1980 - who was

in power in 1980 - not bad, it was 2.4 percent; 1981, 4.5; and then 1982, 11.5; then 18 percent; then 15.3; 16.4; and 16.95 last year, Madam Speaker. This is a government that is showing fiscal responsibility. They just don't understand what makes a province run, how to get the machine going that's going to provide the income that we need to do the services that we want to give our people.

Madam Speaker, the deficits also for the past few years, and we'll go through them just to kind of indicate what this current government has done: '78-79, 84 million; '79-80, 44; then 89. All of a sudden we changed the government; 251 million, 434 million, 428 million, 482 million, and \$554 million deficit last year, Madam Speaker. All we have to do is look at the collision course that this government is taking us on, and we won't have very much to offer in the future.

I guess, maybe, Madam Speaker, you and I are at that stage of life that we don't need that much for many more years, but I know that you have a young daughter - well maybe you do want a little more, I don't know - but I think we have to be cognizant that you have a daughter, and I think she's only 16 years old, and hopefully she will get married and have a family. What about those young children? I think that's what you have to address is that those children have very bleak futures.

But, Madam Speaker, I thought I would try to take a look at where we are in debt. We look at the provincial debt, and I didn't take the maximum, I took the other figure of \$6,932, but then we have to add another \$400 on to that - that's per capita debt - because under the Manitoba Properties Incorporated, the amount that we owe doesn't show on the books, a nice little way of hiding debt - this is the sneakiness, the underhandedness that this government has done - that brings it up to \$7,332.00. I haven't got an absolute, but it is in the very round figures of \$9,000 per capita debt. We add those two figures together, Madam Speaker, and we have over \$16,000.00.

But then we have to take a look at it, that's fine, \$16,000 per capita debt, but how many people pay income tax in this country? The figures that I got are around the 40 percent mark, so when you take 16,000, but only 40 percent of the people are paying taxes, they are the people who are going to have to pay this debt off that this government is now incurring, and that comes, Madam Speaker, when you two-and-a-half times it, \$40,000 per taxpayer is the debt we have incurred here. You add that to your city tax, your R.M. tax, and you find that you are really, really deeply in debt.

I look at our farm and the number of children I have and daughters-in-law on the farm, our farm has a debt of a quarter-of-a-million dollars of provincial and federal debt, way over what we have as a farming debt, but still we are going to be obligated unless we pass it on down to our grandchildren, then we won't have to pay it. But, I can see the legacy that they're going to say, thank you very much.

But when you look back over the figures that I gave you, it shows you that the Schreyer Government made deficits permissive. The Pawley Government has made deficits and deficit financing absolutely mandatory. And once again, if the Member for Inkster is listening, he should be somewhat concerned about his little child.

How did this debt occur, Madam Speaker? Federally, we had 15 years of Liberal rule; 15 years of excess

spending, irresponsible spending, getting us deeper in debt each year the same as this Provincial Government is doing to us right now. When the PC Government came into power a couple of years ago, they decided they would do some things to try to reduce the deficit. They accepted fiscal responsibility. They knew it wasn't vote-getting, but they started to attack what they knew had to be attacked, and that was excess spending. Also Crown corporations, which we see in this province, and we'll talk about them a little later, as being one of the great money losers that governments can have. So they have started to dispose of Crown corporations which, in the long run, will save the taxpayers of Canada an awful lot of money.

All we have to do, Madam Speaker, is to read the Nielsen Report and see the overlap in programs and chaos that's there to know that a lot of new direction has to be taken federally and provincially.

Madam Speaker, we wonder why we are in deficit, and it's already been mentioned - Flyer, in 1980 or '81, my information was we could have maybe realized \$10 million out of Flyer because it wasn't sold until just this last year - that Flyer Industry has cost the taxpayers of Manitoba well in excess of \$100 million, Madam Speaker. We say we sold it to the Dutch firm den Oudsten but, Madam Speaker, we don't know yet how much money is going to cost us to have them take it off our hands. Is it going to be 3 million, 5 million, 8 million? This we won't know until all these buses have been refitted and all our obligations for Flyer have been settled. But this could be an awfully, awfully - (Interjection)- was he the Minister at one time? He's the economist. Oh, I see.- (Interjection)-

Madam Speaker, \$100 million would have gone an awful long way. I would estimate that probably Flyer with the loss - it's going to be well over 125 million - would have gone an awful long way to paying some of the costs that the farmers are incurring. For two years we could have written off all school taxes off all farm lands, but no, no, this incompetent government chooses to carry on with something that has no hope and costs the taxpayers of Manitoba \$125 million.

Madam Speaker, we go into Manfor. When the NDP Government took over Manfor, I'm told there was something like \$14 million spent on it. What is the indebtedness we have in Manfor now? It's not indebtedness, they say it's shares. This province has put in \$252 million into Manfor and they are asking for an additional \$13.5 million for this year which shows you the increase. What could this do for the people of Manitoba in services? What would it do for the farmers? Madam Speaker, the taxes that we propose to take off farm land last year, would have been more than covered by that \$13.5 million.

They talk about the debt for 1984-85, Madam Speaker, and this is where I really get upset because this government is very deceitful. They say it's \$30 million but they do not include a \$5 million write-off that took place this year. In any business that \$5 million is a loss, but they did not put it in the books in the same way and the accountant that went over the books said that it was not the proper way to do accounting. So now we're up to 35 million, Madam Speaker, but we have no return on the share capital that we've put into Manfor. If we take that money at 10 percent we're looking at another \$25 million and now we're up to

\$60 million - \$60 million, Madam Speaker, per capita, \$60 times two-and-a-half - we're looking at a lot of money, Madam Speaker, that the people in Manitoba owe and it's not really achieving any results. Everything that the Minister for Manfor forecast goes right down the tube, it just doesn't wash.

But what can you expect from the Member for Flin Flon? He was the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. We've looked at what the Auditor said about the Department of Business Development and Tourism, along with the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, two of the worst run departments in the government. It's right there in the Auditor's report.

Now these are the people who are supposed to be running businesses - government businesses - helping the private sector and, Madam Speaker, they can't even run their own departments. That shows you just how shallow we are. That same Minister was the Minister of Tourism also and he led the groundwork, he made the bed for our Tourism this year; and I'll tell you, there's a lot of holes in the springs 'cause we're going right through the bottom.

We look at what is happening in Saskatchewan. Tourism is up. The traffic by car is up 5 percent. The non-car vehicle auto is up 15 percent but we're down 22 and 13 percent. The State of Minnesota - and I just had an article given to me today showing the huge increases in Tourism in the State of Minnesota. But they also showed that they increased their budget from \$1.9 million to \$5 million in effective - effective - advertising, Madam Speaker, and I think that's what the current Minister of Tourism and Business Development needs to take some account of.

It's pretty sad when we were asking questions in the House and of course the Minister knew that, because of MTS, I wasn't able to get my question on Tourism in question period; but she was sitting there with this list and she had gone over all of the results of Tourism for that month and she found one sector that had something that was good, 16 percent increase going east to west. Well naturally they're going, right straight through to Saskatchewan, but at Saskatchewan they stopped; they didn't bypass Saskatchewan, Madam Speaker; they stopped in Saskatchewan. What did we do to stop those tourists here in Manitoba? Madam Speaker, we did very little and we talked about, what are you doing about signs and so forth? Well, we're working on it; after the tourists have gone through. You know, that's like closing the barn door after the cows got out and boy, are they good.- (Interjection)-

Well, she knows what I'm talking about. It's bafflegab and you know, hope that you can get something on, and hope that the Speaker cuts me off before I get my second question in. So you've lucked out two days in a row now, you know it's not always going to happen.

We can take a look at MPIC and see what's happened there, and they've had to fire the manager of MPIC for some illegal doings. But you know, when you have a problem in a department, don't just look at the guys who are doing the things wrong, you have to go straight to the top, because any time there's problems in a company it's often situated right at the top, and that starts at the Premier, going down through the Cabinet Ministers and I think that lack of knowledge, lack of understanding has led to a lot of the things that we have seen happen.

Workers Compensation, Madam Speaker, a department that's operating illegally. It's in the book. They're operating illegally. We are not allowed to run a deficit but yet we're going to run a deficit because we don't want to charge the employers because they're going to be all upset; but we've got a social program that we want to give for the people of Manitoba on the backs of the employers and they're doing things - Madam Speaker, when they took over Workers Compensation, there was a \$36 million surplus.- (Interjection)- Now, we're \$36 million surplus in the thing, now I'm not sure what it exactly is today but it is close to 30 again in total. So there we have somewhere like \$60 million, in five years, that incompetent government and incompetent Minister have frittered away. But I guess if you're too busy smacking mosquitoes you haven't got time to concentrate.

We can look at the Manitoba Properties Incorporated, Madam Speaker, and I mentioned it already before where they've hidden a lot of money; \$400 million is what we owe on the provincial buildings.- (Interjection)- The Minister says that they're not sold. Technically, he's right. But to fully own them again it's going to cost us \$400 million. Madam Speaker, that's like you having a house paid for and then selling it and renting it back for yourself . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I'm having great difficulty hearing the honourable member. If other members want to have a conversation they can indulge in it elsewhere.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, what we've done with our government buildings is tantamount to selling your home, taking the money and buying a cottage at the lake, having a holiday, buying a boat, and then having to pay interest on your own home for the rest of your life. That is exactly what we've done, Madam Speaker, and anybody who's done that in their own private life knows the duress and the financial stress that you have after that. That's exactly what we've done.

ManOil, \$10 million we've invested in ManOil. The interest, depending on the rate that we assess to it - 8, 9, or 10 percent - is costing us somewhere between the area of \$2,000 and \$2,700 per day for ManOil. We produce a total or around 100 barrels a day. In simple arithmetic the interest on a barrel of oil alone is \$20 to \$27; but in Estimates the Minister told us that it cost him about 13-something to produce it; and they were selling it for 16-something. But, Madam Speaker, the interest alone, they don't include the investment in a business and when you don't do that, then you're not showing the books as being fair, and this is what this government does. They hide all the facts from the people of Manitoba and this is how they got elected and this is how they're striving to be re-elected by hiding the facts from the people.

MTS-MTX, well, three incompetent Ministers - I call them the three blind mice - how could three Ministers have been so blind for so long that they didn't see anything that was going on? So, there's an old saying you know, the little monkey that hear no evil, see no evil, they for sure are very reminiscent of half the monkey, at least, because they see no evil and they hear no evil.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Dauphin was in through a whole period at this time. He sits very quiet while the MTS discussions are on, Madam Speaker, because he knows darned well that he is largely responsible for the mess that's there. The new Minister has inherited a mess, and isn't competent enough to get out of it, but the other two - and the Minister for Brandon East sitting very quiet now when we speak about MTS. He is very much responsible 'cause he was one of the Ministers also through this whole MTX mess.

What did they do? You know, he was the Minister in charge of McKenzie Seeds, Madam Speaker, when McKenzie Seeds went broke; a good friend of the manager of McKenzie Seeds, and he didn't have the insight to know that guy was dragging us down the tubes. Now how can you be a close friend with somebody? First of all you've got a pretty poor choice of friends if that guy's going to stick you in the back, but that's exactly what happened. He was a good friend of Bill Moore, who is now serving two-and-a-half years in Stony for what McKenzie Seeds - along with two others - who went to jail.

Madam Speaker, this just shows you that if you don't have the knowledge and the competence, then everything goes down around with you. Usually what happens under a company reflects what's on top of the company.

You know, Madam Speaker, the Member for Dauphin who sits in the chair, like I said, during MTS he's pretty quiet. Well, he's a very ineffective Minister; he's got no power in Cabinet. We can see the way his budget was cut. Anybody with power in Cabinet would not have a cut budget, Madam Speaker, but they say, Mr. Minister, the Minister of Highways, this is what you're going to do and you're just going to have to take a cut.

But also he's a very arrogant person, Madam Speaker. When somebody refused to shake his hand in Dauphin in the election, I don't know if he had her fired or moved over or something, but something happened. Madam Speaker, he solicited for money from the road contractors during the election. I saw a copy of one of those letters of request for money. Madam Speaker, how do you have any honesty and morality when you are soliciting money from the people who are going to be doing business with the government later on?

It is also the fact that he's politicized road building

MADAM SPEAKER: I do hope the honourable member is not reflecting on the honesty of another member of the Chamber.

MR. E. CONNERY: No, no, we're just saying that morally you shouldn't be soliciting money from somebody you're going to be doing business with. If I said something wrong, I withdraw it, Madam Speaker, I'm not trying to impute anything. - (Interjection)- No, no.

Madam Speaker, we have the third blind mouse, the Member for St. James who is the current Minister of MTS. Madam Speaker, he wasn't competent enough to be a Minister when the government first came in. He's had to sit on the backbenches, and then they finally give him a real dandy when they give him the MTS and MTX affair. Madam Speaker, hasn't it been

a pitiful sight in this House to see him stand up there? Madam Speaker, he's stonewalled. There's been what I consider cover-ups. There's been misinformation to this House, to the committee that we've been in, and he still refuses to allow for an inquiry, an inquiry that would bring out all of the facts so that the people of Manitoba would know exactly where they stood with MTS and MTX.

Madam Speaker, before I leave, I must say that in your role as an MLA before becoming Speaker, you were, I think, the acting chairman of MTS, and I think vice-chairman of MTS, the board. Madam Speaker, I know these are political appointments - and it's done by all parties - so that members can get a little more income, but I do think when the person is sitting there that there is some responsibility to at least attempt to do a job, so I have to lay blame really on all the members of the Board of MTS along with the three blind mice, or Ministers, because nobody was asking questions; nobody was delving into it. You mean to tell me that you have a company and the Minister does not take a look at the financial statements or the board does not look at the financial statements? Now, they can't find a financial statement for MTX. Madam Speaker, that's unbelievable in the business world that something like this would happen. Well, I guess it's unfortunate, but I guess most of them have never run a business and they don't understand.

Madam Speaker, before I came into this House I thought I recognized how pathetic and how poor a government this NDP Government really is. It's just, Madam Speaker, I can't believe that it's that much worse than I had any comprehension of it being.

Madam Speaker, the current Minister of Finance and the previous Minister of Finance are devoid of any courage or grasp of what this province needs from a Finance Minister. Madam Speaker, since the NDP Government took over in '81, we've seen three credit rating reductions. What does this mean to the people of Manitoba? Madam Speaker, it costs us more money for interest, and so we see a higher cost because we are not handling our funds prudently. We've seen huge losses, Madam Speaker, and I think if I remember the Member for Emerson said it was something like \$200 million on foreign exchange, and the Minister of Finance gets up and bafflebags and tries to allay that didn't really happen. Well, Madam Speaker, I can't buy that.

We see that the Finance Department itself can't forecast what's happening when they go \$20 million over in three months. That department is the one that should be able to handle its finances better but, as I pointed out, he was also the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, and we know what the Auditor said about his department.

Madam Speaker, I've heard several members say that the Minister of Finance has been an honest person, but since I've come into this House, I can't say that the Minister has been straightforward in the answers that he gives us. First of all, they hid the fourth quarter until after the election, and I guess we know why; because if that fourth quarter report had come out before the election, everybody in this House knows that the NDP would not be in power and they would not have a very large opposition. The populace would have been stunned, but this open-and-honest government that the First Minister tells us that they

have just doesn't come through in my mind as being very straightforward.

Take a look at the Jobs Fund, Madam Speaker. We see that - what - is there \$70-75 million in the Jobs Fund this year? We tried to find out where the Jobs Fund money is going to be spent. We don't know; we're not told. There's no plan as to where this \$75-plus million is going to be spent, Madam Speaker.

We even go into Estimates, and it's not even in the Estimates, the sector where they spent the money. If we hadn't have asked the Minister of that particular Estimate how much money in the Jobs Fund was spent, we would not know what was spent.

Madam Speaker, the NDP says that we are a one-issue party, but where were they then when we were going through all of the Estimates? We went through Estimates, I would say pretty thoroughly, and if we look at the Department of Agriculture, we went through probably as thoroughly as that department has ever gone through. I think the members on this side, and I think the new members on this side have worked hard, a little bit not knowledgeable, but have worked to grasp their areas, and along with the seasoned veterans and the very capable seasoned veterans, Madam Speaker, that we are fortunate to have on this side of the House, I think the Estimates had a pretty good grilling. All one has to do, if they say we're a one-issue party, is to read Hansard. Hansard will tell you what happened.

Madam Speaker, they blame the feds for everything; they blame it for agricultural problems. We see Saskatchewan and Alberta putting in huge sums of money to shore up their agricultural industry. They blame the feds for their education policy; they blame them for their health problems; they blame them for everything.

Madam Speaker, we also see that just this week - (Interjection)- Well, the guy who wants to hard ball talks, but, you know, the Member for Thompson better first learn how to throw a ball and to get into business. I would still say that -(Interjection)- but, Madam Speaker, also this government says they're an open and honest government. Madam Speaker, the freedom of information bill has been passed, but it hasn't been proclaimed. Madam Speaker, I can understand why they don't want to proclaim the free of information bill, because then we would have another year or so - or all this winter - to go through all of the goodies that they've got hidden, and it would be an astounding revelation to the people of Manitoba just to find out how terrible this government is.

Madam Speaker, I was really offended this week - I guess it was last week - when we see the now again Minister of Energy and Mines when he has been vindicated of conflict of interest. It's one thing to be convicted of conflict of interest in a court of law, but there are other things to the morality and the justification of what you do in business.

Madam Speaker, they rode him in here on a beautiful white steed, but my estimation is that it should have been a very dark grey plough horse, because I don't think the Minister of Energy and Mines is just as clear and clean as what he would like us to think he is, and this government and the First Minister trying to save his hide for the next election is sure trying to shore up. They grieved and they went on and on. Madam

Speaker, did they know that that Minister had used the tax scam, the tax scam that the then Finance Minister said was legalized theft?

Finally, one came out, Madam Speaker, one came out. That's what had happened. Well, you know, yes, he shouldn't have done it. But, Madam Speaker, convenient - the memory doesn't work very good.

We've got another one with a poor memory when it comes to tax scams, the mosquito man. But, Madam Speaker, there was a second tax scam, and you know that in March he couldn't remember what had taken place in January or late December. Madam Speaker, that's a very convenient memory. When you tell me that anybody with that kind of a memory should be riding a white steed, then I am concerned.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of the Environment on a point of order.

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, I just heard the Member for Portage refer to myself as the mosquito man who couldn't remember his transactions in regard to R and D, when, first of all, a letter was provided to the press which contradicts what he is saying. This letter was obtained for all members of this House, which they distinctly got . . . -(Interjection)-

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . and secondly, Madam Speaker, I don't think it is the appropriate procedure in this House to call members by other than their actual name in this House. I would ask the Member for Portage to withdraw his remarks, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage knows that members should only be referred to by their title in this House, their constituency or their title.

In terms of the Minister's following comments, a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, if that offends the Minister of Environment, who won't kill mosquitoes, then I'll withdraw that statement, he's not a mosquito man. So if that makes him happy, I'm quite willing to accommodate, there's no problem there at all. But I'm sure that all the mosquitoes in the next election will be voting for him.

Madam Speaker, how much time have I got left?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has six minutes remaining.

MR. E. CONNERY: Okay, Madam Speaker, I think to be able to maintain the programs - and I'd better point out how incompetent this government is and why we're in the trouble that we're in - but if we want to maintain the programs that we feel are necessary and, as the Member for Rossmere said yesterday, that Education and Health are the two biggest, and do we want to cut from there? And no, we don't want to cut from there, Madam Speaker. But if we don't want to cut programs and have to reduce the deficit, then we have

to do it from the economic side and that's where industry, Madam Speaker, will provide the boost that we need.

It's in Ontario if we take the lesson. We can see Ontario and they're budgeting not to cut programs, but they all are budgeting to cut the deficit. Why? Because their industry, their economy is growing, and they're generating wealth and therefore they can cut the deficit without cutting the programs that we all want. Madam Speaker, this is exactly what this province needs, but it's exactly what the members opposite haven't got an inkling as to how to go about doing it.

Madam Speaker, we see the number of people who are in government services and we need government services. I'm not against government services; we all need government services, but people in government services do not generate new wealth. Madam Speaker, they just spend money within the province. If we are to increase the wealth of this province it's going to be by what we export or what we get from those bad guys called the feds. That's the only way we're going to increase the net wealth of our province. So the Federal Government is continuing to increase the grants to us, but maybe not as fast as what they were increasing before.

Madam Speaker, it's through manufacturing, but manufacturing is down in this province. In spite of all the activity that Limestone has generated, private investment in manufacturing is down. Processing is where we need to get additional money and we see some going on in Manitoba. We have some of the best potatoes in North America, and we see the companies responding by expanding.

We see the needle trades industry where we can export a lot of goods out of Manitoba, but what do we see? A government come in with ridiculous legislation, and where do they go? A part of one company takes part of their operation to Thunder Bay where they're dealing with a reasonable government. You can't tell these people that some of this labour legislation is bad for people, for the workers of the province. They put it in and then find that they drove the industry out, but it looked good initially, it was a vote-getter. But, Madam Speaker, it was a job-coster. In the net terms, the workers of this province suffered.

Madam Speaker, if we are to improve our financial situation, we have to export more than what we import and along with the federal contribution. If it wasn't for provinces like Ontario and Alberta who are contributing to our wealth - and you know, if I was one of those other provinces doing a good job I would be somewhat annoyed having to pay those other provinces that are doing a poor job - and Manitoba up to now, is not doing a very good job.

Madam Speaker, the problem, as I pointed out earlier, starts at the top. Honesty, sincerity, ethics, hard work, imagination, compassion, those are all things that have to emanate down from the top. But, Madam Speaker, we don't see much of that coming from the other side. They talk about compassion, Madam Speaker, but it's a compassion to get votes. We see the First Minister smile so prettily and then he gets into one of his tirades about how the poor people of Manitoba go. That is his compassion and he epitomizes that old saying: "Of all my wife's relatives, I like me best." Madam Speaker, that sits with that side of the House; they like them best.

Madam Speaker, we have to put a lid on the deficit. There is no question. If we don't put a lid on the deficit, this province is going to be in trouble. I was speaking to the Minister of Natural Resources, and I think he's an intelligent person. Madam Speaker, unless we have an all-party agreement to have a maximum per capita debt that all parties have to live with, we will always be in a vote-buying position where we are looking for votes by promising, promising, promising. For the sake of future - (Interjection)- We will make our priorities; we will set our priorities.

Maybe the Overhill Drain might have to be cut, but we've got to put our expenses in order, and we don't need all the highways in Dauphin. We could take one highway out of Dauphin and put the Overhill Drain in, in Portage, Madam Speaker. But I think, unless we have an all-party agreement, where we have an agreement entrenched like you went through the French issue - except we shouldn't have to fight about it - Madam Speaker, the priorities of the Government of the Day would be, if they want to increase services, they're going have to increase the revenue, which means taxes, so they're going to be caught. And if the people who are paying yell too much, then they're going to pull back on the services and hold the taxes down. Madam Speaker, that's the only way I can see that we can stop this province and this country by going bankrupt is by putting on an agreement what we know that we can handle, otherwise we're going to destroy future generations, and anybody who is not concerned, then should not be a member of this House.

Madam Speaker, when I was on a trip down to the United States, I was watching American cable TV, I saw a program and this company put it on. It was a program of the child having his father on trial and saying, "Father, why did you do this to me?"

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, my comments today are addressed as much to honourable members opposite, Manitobans and members on this side, just as much as they are to young Robyn Lindsay Scott born to a member of this Legislature and his wife a week ago or so. I think young Robyn will have to face a number of unpleasant realities as she grows a little older. I certainly congratulate the Scott family on the arrival of Robyn and I trust that all went well for the family at the time of the birth. I wish the family all the very best in terms of happiness, prosperity, and security in the future.

But someday when Robyn is old enough to read and understand, Madam Speaker, I hope her father will have the courage to pull out an old dusty Hansard and show young Robyn a copy of my speech because I feel very strongly about some of the things that I'm going to say.

My remarks could equally be directed to other young Manitobans and your family, Madam Speaker, and my family, and right across this province. Young Manitobans have reason to be concerned about the events of this particular Session and the events that surely will follow in the next - who knows how long before another

election comes and we have the opportunity perhaps to right some of the wrongs and perhaps to make changes that will ensure a better future for Robyn and her contemporaries in this decade and in the remainder of this century.

A little while ago, Madam Speaker, from his seat, the Premier of this province made some comments to me, shortly after a brief discussion he appeared to have with the Honourable Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security, something to the effect that Dr. Paton in the City of Brandon is calling for me to make an apology for having asked questions in this House. Madam Speaker, I'll tell you just a little bit more about that in a moment, but let me begin by saying that I make no apologies to anyone for anything I say in this House, where I am doing my best to represent the interests of the people I represent. I make no apology for speaking and standing in my place in this House and asking questions of this government that require answers.

As far as Dr. Paton is concerned, who knows very well the situation referred to by the Honourable First Minister a little while ago, I find it surprising that he should be demanding apologies from me, and I believe from the Minister of Education; however, if an apology is forthcoming, perhaps it should be coming from the Minister of Education.

Madam Speaker, some time ago in this House I asked the Minister of Education if about \$1,200 worth of legal fees had been paid by Brandon University on behalf of Dr. Paton and another gentleman, having to do with a threatened lawsuit. The answer given by the Minister of Education on August 6 in this House was the following, Madam Speaker: "I can indicate to the honourable member that yes, in fact the \$1,200 referenced in a question the member gave to me somewhat earlier, was in fact paid by Brandon University, Board of Governors."

Now, Madam Speaker, the only reason I raise this is because of the unfair spurious allegation shown across the floor by the First Minister of this province. Madam Speaker, if "spurious" is not a proper word, I will withdraw it without having to be asked - incorrect allegation - I shall say.

If the First Minister took the time, Madam Speaker, to inform himself or even to spend a few minutes with his own Minister of Education, I'm sure the Minister of Education would clear the matter up very quickly for the First Minister. Does he have no confidence in the Minister of Education?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no!

A MEMBER: No, would you?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Sometimes I have confidence in the Minister of Education and some days I don't.

In point of fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as it turns out, the legal fees referenced in my question were not paid by Brandon University and I'm happy to be able to report that to the House. I wish the Minister had done that instead of me. It would have been good, I think, for the Minister to correct his statement.

I don't blame him for the inaccuracy of this statement, but here again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do have to comment that the people at Brandon University who advised the Minister have not been doing a very good job of advising him. They've been misleading him and I'm saying the Minister shouldn't be putting up with that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have another Minister who doesn't mind being misled. I say that is not a very good sign of leadership for our province and for the people of this province, that Ministers will allow themselves to be misled, and then relay that incorrect information to honourable members in this House. I think that's a disservice to our province and I hope it will stop.

In the case of the Minister of Education, I have reason to believe that it will stop; but in the case of the Minister of Labour, I don't have that same kind of confidence.

My friends on this side say I shouldn't be so charitable to the Honourable Minister of Education. Well, perhaps their judgment is better than mine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I will not do so on a regular basis but when the Minister of Education deserves to be singled out for some credit, then I will, like I said earlier in the Session, I'll be the first in this House to do that. But perhaps my colleagues are correct that I'm being far too kind to the Minister of Education and I'll watch myself in the future, so I apologize for that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another thing that really bothered me a lot in the last little while, on July 14 the Western Report Magazine put out an article entitled, "Here comes the left." Well honourable members opposite will be quick to clap their hands and to support even the Communist party if it means getting rid of the Tories - they'd rather have the Communists than the Tories - (Interjection)- but honourable members opposite say that's not true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other night the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek brandished an ad, which I take it was used in the last election campaign, put out by the Communist Party of Manitoba, and at no time have I heard honourable members opposite publicly repudiate or disassociate themselves from that ad, so let them not say, "Oh, no," today, when I tell them that they'd rather have the Communist Party running this province than the Tories.- (Interjection)-

Mr. Deputy Speaker, honourable members opposite say that's a low comment for me to make and perhaps it's beneath me. Let them stand in their places when they get the opportunity and repudiate that ad. It hasn't happened yet. Did they have to wait for me to tell them to do it? Why is it taking them so long, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

As I said, it was of some concern to me that we hear in July, here comes the left in the Western Report. It was a report about some of the new members in the Alberta Legislature, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of the new NDP members. The story on that issue was that the picture of politics in Alberta is changing. The story was never that the Conservative Party of Alberta won another astonishing landslide victory. The story was that the NDP got oh, 14, 16 seats, whatever it was - the ND Party, as the Western Report calls it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to quote something said by a New Democrat member of the Alberta Legislature by the name of Marie Laing: "When I heard about the value placed on the family, I reflect upon the fact that

the most dangerous place in this society for women and children is in the family." That was said by the new NDP MLA in Alberta, Marie Laing.

HON. J. STORIE: What does it mean, Jim?

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, the Minister of Education asks me what the Member for Alberta meant. I suggest if this matter concerns the Minister of Education, which it should, that he get on the telephone right away and find out just what that meant. If this is the kind of philosophy that honourable members opposite support, let them get to the bottom of it.

To be fair to the Minister of Education who is shaking his head in obvious disgust and dismay, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will go on and I will get out of the actual quoted material because there is no more here, but it does say that the Leader of the NDP in Alberta, Mr. Raymond Martin, were quick to deny that their party is anti-family, as the remark clearly suggests. Well, how can you have it both ways? How can you say something like that and then say that you're not anti-family?

Now this member in Alberta, Mr. Deputy Speaker, surely was talking about being anti-violence. That is something that we're all against, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but it betrays a certain philosophy when words like, "... the most dangerous place in this society for women and children is in the family." It does betray a certain disrespect for some family traditions in this country and I must say I don't share it. I'm on my feet to repudiate such statements. I would have nothing to do with it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I hope it doesn't represent government policy in this province or any other province in this country. Her solution of this New Democrat from Alberta is more social workers, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Alberta New Democratic Party also has, as a few of its planks, of its platform: "abortion on demand; equal pay for work of equal value", and I stress here in the public sector. Even the Alberta New Democrats won't go so far as to take pay equity into the private sector. More platforms, Mr. Deputy Speaker: "universal day care; greater intervention by social workers in troubled families"; and, of course, "homosexual rights", Mr. Deputy Speaker.

These things trouble me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we head into the 21st Century, and as I think of the young children of this province I think, what are they looking to? The programs that I mentioned here, as being part of the platform of the New Democratic Party of Alberta, are expensive programs whether we think they're right or wrong, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're expensive, they're costly. The New Democrats would like to have those programs in Alberta now, when we can't afford them in Alberta, we can't afford them in Manitoba. These things have to be brought in as and when our finances permit it. This is something that has failed to attract the attention of honourable members opposite in the last five years, that the problem with these honourable members is that it doesn't matter where the money comes from. They can always borrow it. Well, I believe - whether they'll admit it now or not, Mr. Deputy Speaker - our Minister of Finance understands the problem that he has been given and I don't think he has any illusions about him being the Minister who is able to solve those

problems, considering a continuing increased pressure on him by his colleagues for some of these programs that I've mentioned. But I hope in whatever small way he can, that he will moderate the demands of his colleagues to bring them into line with reason and with what can be afforded in this province.

But during this Session, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I as the Member for Brandon West have raised several issues and brought them to the attention of the government in the hope that some of them would be addressed in a real way and in a way that would prove to be fair for all the people concerned. I raised, for example, with the Minister of Education the situation for the Shilo school children and, perhaps privately, perhaps by letter, the Minister can be in touch with me on what progress he has made in his discussions with the Federal Department of National Defence so that the Province of Manitoba can pay its fair share for the education of those children in Shilo so that they don't have to be based on a regular basis to the City of Brandon for their education.

I believe the Minister took that matter under advisement, told me that it was a matter of concern to him and that he would be working on the matter. I hope he has indeed been doing that and I hope very soon that he can report that he has done the best that he could to convince the Department of National Defence, the federal bureaucracy, that perhaps those children would be better served being educated in their own community and that this province is prepared to pay its fair share, not a year from now, not two years from now, but now, so that those children do not have to be displaced.

I raised with the Minister of Education the matter of school funding in this province, I and the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell. The Minister has to his credit taken that matter seriously. He has had meetings with various school trustees in the province. I've seen a copy of his response to some of their concerns. I can't say today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I've had an opportunity to review that response in detail; but the covering letter seems to indicate - and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong - but seems to indicate that he's relatively satisfied but willing to continue to monitor and evaluate the support for education program on a regular basis and to see that any unfairness which develops in the system is addressed and corrected.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've been listening to a lot of Ministers throughout this Session, especially during the Estimates process, tell me that this concern or that concern that we on this side have raised is being monitored and that those concerns are continually being evaluated. Well, the people of Manitoba want to see things done; they don't want to hear that things are being evaluated until the cows come home and that things are being monitored. If there's a problem, let's identify the problem, let's do something about it.

Let's not use this as a - how shall I put it - as a buzz word. It's a word I've used before and been punished for it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but let's not use "monitoring" and "evaluating" as a way to escape our responsibilities to the taxpayers of this province.

I raised with the Minister at the time of the announcement of Brandon University's funding for this year, I raised with the Minister the matter and told him and I was backed up by the president of the university

and also, I believe, by the board of governors, although they don't speak quite so loudly on matters when it would come to a criticism of this government, the board of governors doesn't speak so loudly. But I believe even members of the board of governors would agree with me that Brandon University is getting the short end of the stick when it comes to funding this year. The Minister will no doubt disagree with me, but tell that to the President of the Brandon University, is what I would say to the Minister, and the students at the university who are facing increases in their tuition fees.

You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't really have a problem with raising tuition fees and perhaps cutting back on budgets, if that is what is called for and if there's a good reason for it, I don't have a problem with that. But when some five months ago honourable members opposite went around this province, Brandon included, telling people that they need not fear, a vote for the New Democratic Party is a vote for the enhancement and the preservation of the programs and the institutions that we have in this province and that they should trust New Democrats to protect those institutions and those programs in this province.

The thing that really bothers me is that within a few months later, within a few months of saying those words, we hear from presidents of universities that the funding is inadequate for programs that we have; when we hear from hospitals that the funding is inadequate and then the next thing is we have an announcement that 31 beds in my community, in the riding of the Honourable Minister who represents Brandon East, that there are 31 beds being cut there; and then when we hear a few days later that four people had to spend a whole night sleeping in a corridor; these things concern me because what we have is hypocrisy. What we have is broken promises and broken promises to people in Brandon is very serious business.

The Minister who represents Brandon East nods, he understands, he knows that this is serious business in our community. You don't fool around with an institution like Brandon General Hospital in the way we have seen in recent weeks, not with impunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Honourable Member for Brandon East is going to have to do some explaining and there are some explanations. No one's denying that there are good explanations for some of the things that have to be done, but what brought them on is where the real explanation is, the bottom line. Why did it happen? Why was it allowed to develop?

For the last four or five years, while the Honourable Member for Brandon East has told Brandonites how well they were served by having him for a Minister and him for a member and how he's done so much for Brandon East, that was fine; that was all on borrowed money. The Member for Brandon East has to recognize that and admit that, and he's going to have to tell the people of Brandon East and Brandon generally that the services we've been enjoying are because successive Ministers' of Finance have been willing to go along with the Member for Brandon East and borrow money.

I think it's bad advice. I think you should try to raise the money before you spend it. That's the way I was brought up. Maybe that's just a little too old fashioned for honourable members opposite, but I think there are a number of them on that side who were brought

up that way too. Don't spend more money than you earn.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "You can never stay out of trouble by spending more money than you earn." Honourable members opposite would do well to heed that advice. It's very old; I've been accused of pulling out advice given by 19th Century politicians before. Well, I'll stand by that advice; I think it's good advice in the 1980's. I think it's good advice to lead us into the 21st Century. The Honourable Minister who represents Brandon East would do well to remember that when he's facing the people there in the coming months and years, but he is going to have to explain how it came to be that that very difficult decision had to be taken at Brandon General Hospital, why 31 beds had to be closed.

Now, surely the Minister representing Brandon East will do as the Minister of Health has done and throw it back in the faces of those people who operate the Brandon General Hospital and say, clean up your act - as the Minister of Health has done - which is quite an insult considering the people who do operate our fine hospital facility in Brandon.

The Minister for Brandon East will have to explain his colleague's comment too. He is the Minister representing Brandon East. He's going to have to answer those tough questions. Maybe he got away with that before, maybe he got away with having to make these detailed explanations.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a member who also represents Brandon and he does not sit on the benches with the Member for Brandon East, and that member's going to be asking those questions; and the Member for Brandon East is going to have to answer them. I think his answers will be found inadequate and the people of Brandon will find them inadequate, and for all the personality the Honourable Minister has and all the good things he's tried to do for the people of Brandon, it's now, the chickens are coming home to roost for this government and for the Honourable Minister and his options are running out. He's not going to be able to explain any more because the questions are going to be a little tougher from here on.

I don't think it's unfair or I don't think there's anything wrong with saying that a member has tried to serve his community. I don't see anything wrong with that and I don't see why I should be ridiculed for trying to speak well of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East has done his best under very difficult circumstances at times, but when they look at the colleagues that he has, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the people he has to deal with on a regular basis, I would say it makes it pretty tough. The Member for Brandon East has lost his clout. They don't want him around any more. They're tired of having him around. He's an expensive Minister; the Minister of Finance knows that; he's an expensive Minister. He's expensive not just for our community, but for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Education is carrying on his usual speech from his seat. His thought processes are obviously disturbed as he sits there. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find it hard sometimes to retain my train of thought when the Minister of Education cackles as he does opposite.

All I'm saying is that good intentions are not good enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have to face some

realities. The Member for Brandon East has had this joy ride long enough. The Minister of Finance has made it clear that the gravy days are over and it's time for the Minister representing Brandon East to face that and to start telling the people in his own community the facts of life as they really are.

The Minister representing Brandon East is going to have to explain that closure of 31 beds, and it's not going to be good enough to blame it on the people who operate our hospitals, and it's not going to be good enough to make that explanation when you're trying to explain a 900 person waiting list, a waiting list that is growing.

During this Session, I've asked questions of the Minister of Finance respective his motive fuel tax which he levied in his Budget. He's thrown that back in my face and in the collective face of the Opposition by saying that we are the ones who are concerned about the deficit and so, therefore, we shouldn't say a word of his levy of the motive fuel tax. Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are pretty cheap words. I just ask the Minister of Finance to go back in the history of this province and look at how previous governments have managed - I mean previous to the government of his friend Ed Schreyer - and look at the budget figures that you'll find for those governments and you'll see that somehow governments in the past have managed to pay the bills and to keep Manitobans out of debt trouble. This government has not been able to do that, and the reason for that obviously is mixed up priorities, and also a rather dismaying lack of responsibility when it comes to the spending of taxpayers' dollars. When you have that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the thing that flows from that is a lack of respect for the principle of accountability for people's money.

Now honourable members opposite should remember and stop laughing about the fact that the money they are spending is other peoples. It is not their money; they are the trustees of the money of the taxpayers of this province and they've shown a shocking disregard for the principle of accountability when it comes to the spending of that money.

Then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had the Brandon University fiasco. Well, there's not a whole lot more to be said about that. The faculty is now up in arms over what has happened. Through sheer incompetence and hatred, honourable members opposite and their friends have seen to it that one Dr. Perkins was removed from office; they've seen to it that the doors to his office were locked so that he couldn't get in; they've seen to it that he was removed from office, and now the bill has to be paid for that incompetence by the taxpayers of this province. Like I say, little more needs to be said about that, but the Minister of Education knows very well what I'm speaking of. I'm sure appropriate action will be taken.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the member continues, may I inquire if the House has any inclination to waive Private Members' Hour?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe there is agreement between the House Leaders that Private Members' Hour be waived.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: The Minister of Education, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe now has a much better understanding of the events which have taken place over the last three or four years at the Brandon University. It may not be as thorough as it should be yet, but it is a lot better than it was a few months ago. I believe, and here perhaps I'm naive, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this point, but I believe the Minister of Education now is concerned about what is happening at Brandon University and I believe that he will take steps, as much as he is able to, to rectify situations there and make improvements.

In the next months and years there will be a very serious problem in the City of Brandon brought on by the Clean Environment Commission. The City of Brandon has been ordered to increase the capability of its sewage treatment facilities and the cost will be about \$20 million, which is about twice what the City of Brandon thought it would be facing. The City of Brandon is looking to the Department of the Environment for assistance in this regard in terms of giving the city the proper amount of time so that the facilities can be constructed. The city will also be looking for financial assistance, after all, it wasn't the city that imposed these very stringent standards on itself. The standards are a matter of an issue, and whether the city should have to live up to such stringent standards is a matter which will have to be discussed. I ask the Minister of the Environment to take that matter very seriously and deal with the City of Brandon in a fair way, realizing that there are only so many dollars to go around, realizing also that because of the way that the people of the City of Brandon are taxed, the money is just not there. So much money is spent to pay for the education of their children, an amount which I maintain is not fair to our city and I wish the Minister of the Environment would keep that in mind, too, when dealing with that matter.

The matter of the mismanagement of the Land Titles Office has become a concern, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the last little while. Senior personnel from the Brandon Land Titles Office are being seconded to the Winnipeg Land Titles Office to clean up the backlog there. Well, in doing so, my concern is that a backlog will develop in the City of Brandon. Did the Attorney-General take that into account when the decision was made to remove people from the Land Titles Office in Brandon? Now I realize these people are on loan and that they'll be back; I hope it's soon. I hope the backlog in Winnipeg is cleared up very soon so that the people in the City of Brandon don't have to suffer because of the mismanagement of the Land Titles Office here in Winnipeg.

I'm very concerned also about grants that are made by this government. I discussed some of them with the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation during her Estimates. The Minister has said that, oh, she didn't really mean to discriminate blatantly against Girl Guides, for instance, being the Minister responsible for the Status of Women. I think it should be some slight embarrassment, if not rather a large embarrassment, that the Boy Scouts are treated so much better by this government. I hope the Minister will keep her word and look into that situation and make it right and fair very

quickly because I would think, for a government which is supposed to be interested in equal rights for women, and I take it in that young women and young girls, too, certainly the Honourable Member for Thompson should be very interested . . . Did I say Thompson? I mean Inkster.

A MEMBER: And Thompson, too.

MR. J. McCRAE: And Thompson. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Inkster should be very interested in this; his daughter, Robyn, may very well want to get into the Girl Guide movement. If my entreaties on the Minister of Culture don't work, I hope the Member for Inkster will get involved and have that looked into. It certainly seems strange to me that the Manitoba Horseshoe Association should get twice as much money in a year as the Girl Guide movement in this province. It doesn't make any sense to me at all and it reflects rather badly, I must say, on the priorities of this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, political leaders like to think that some kind of monument should be left after they're through so that people will remember them. Certainly in the case of Sir John A. MacDonald, we have quite a monument that stretches right across this country, the CPR. It's an achievement of that government of that day of which Canadians have been, are, and will be proud. It's certainly very instrumental in the building of our country.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

The recent Prime Minister Trudeau left mountains of debt in this country. He brought home the Constitution. Now there was an achievement, but the only way he would bring home the Constitution was to include in it a Charter of Rights and Freedoms for Canadians. That matter has been the subject of some debate ever since. I don't think anyone disagreed with bringing our Constitution home. Nonetheless that Charter of Rights and Freedoms is Mr. Trudeau's monument. Mr. Reagan in the United States really leaves several legacies. I was listening to a CBC program this morning about Mr. Reagan who, after six years in office, enjoys 64 percent approval rate among the people of the United States of America. I am sure our First Minister in this province would envy that kind of record.

Honourable members opposite are very quick, of course, to criticize people like Mr. Reagan, but there are 237 million Americans and 64 percent of them don't see things the same way as honourable members opposite. But, Mr. Reagan has his monuments, and that monument is that during the very worst recession he was able to pull his country through in pretty good shape; granted his government has amassed a rather large deficit in its term of office, but at least, I think, there is something that we could say that can be shown for that deficit.

The most important thing that Mr. Reagan has done, and his most important monument will be the pride that Americans have had restored to the fact that they are American. Patriotism I don't think ever disappeared from the United States of America, but now Americans feel good about being Americans, and I believe that 64 percent approval rating is evidence of the way Americans feel about their country. I suggest that if a

poll were taken tomorrow about the approval rating for this First Minister in this province we might see something altogether different, and Manitobans would find it very hard to feel proud to be a Manitoban. Madam Speaker, I am still exceedingly proud to be a Manitoban, but I am not proud of my First Minister.

Mr. Drapeau brought Expo to this country in 1967, and he brought the Olympics in 1976; Douglas Campbell brought rural electrification to this province; Mr. Schreyer brought Autopac - the kind of monument that one is remains to be seen, but it is a monument nonetheless; Mr. Roblin brought us the Red River Floodway - and really that was the Premier who brought us into the 20th Century; and then we have our First Minister, and what did he bring us? Well, the Minister of Education told us a minute ago that what he brought us was Limestone, and that's his monument. Well, apart from the fact, Madam Speaker, that there are a number of monuments just like that in our province, and that other Premiers can claim that those other projects are their monuments, I ask, will the energy heritage fund, will that be the monument that our Premier has constructed for himself? And, if it is, what's in it, and how long will it be before there is anything in it, and if there is going to be something in it 10 years from now, or 20 years from now, or ever, why is he constructing, why is he putting the fund in place now? If this is his monument, well whatever pleasure he can take from that, let him have it.

Manitobavik, that will be our First Minister's monument, Manitobavik, the program of the First Minister to replace Katimavik, that'll be his monument I'm sure, in spite of the comments we hear from people who had been involved in the Katimavik Program, about how there were many negative aspects to that program; and in spite of the fact that the Federal Government saw fit to find better ways to spend its job creation dollars, this First Minister will have that monument, and I am wondering if he is going to call it Manitobavik, or what it is going to be. Maybe it will be Pawleyvik.

The greatest legacy that this First Minister will have left, and his Finance Minister, indeed all his colleagues, will be debt. They are taking away from successive generations of Manitobans the right to decide how their money will be spent. That, to me, is contrary to the democratic system when we have \$500 million deficits annually, that adds up, Madam Speaker, and the children of today will not be singing the praises of this First Minister some years from now.

Now, my colleagues have talked about the MTX fiasco - and I see my light is flashing, Madam Speaker, so I am not going to have time to deal with that in any detail. I will say though that honourable members opposite accuse the Honourable Member for Pembina of having some part in the beginnings of MTX, and they take great pride in telling us that. But I tell honourable members opposite, never did the Honourable Member for Pembina wish for discrimination against women; never did he wish for discrimination against Jews; never did he plan for kickbacks; never did he support corruption; never did he support floggings and cover-ups. I think what we have is a pathetic spectacle, Madam Speaker, of a Minister who is clinging in this House to an untenable position which no one, almost no one, in this province supports.

I remind honourable members opposite of the writing on the wall. I'm saying that just by our Budget figures, and just because we have some of the bills that the members are bringing forward, there is writing on the wall for honourable members opposite, and it's the same kind of writing on the wall that we find in the Fifth Chapter of Daniel. Perhaps, Madam Speaker, you will recall reading that chapter, and in that chapter you will have found that King Belshazzar saw the writing on the wall and he didn't know what it meant and he asked Daniel what it meant. The writing was mene mene tekel upharsin, but basically it meant, "God hath numbered Thy Kingdom, and finished it;" and it also means "Thou art weighed in the balance and art found wanting." Madam Speaker, the writing is on the wall for this government.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I hadn't intended to participate in the debate. Thank you, Member for Minnedosa.- (Interjection)- The Minister of Education says, never mind the Bible, remember the headlines from March 18, "Tories Lose Election."

I hadn't intended to really participate in the debate, but having listened to the Member for Brandon West, the Member for Portage la Prairie, and some other members opposite, all afternoon, the Member for Minnedosa, I decided that it was called for that I make a few remarks in rebuttal to the various comments. Well, I've been sitting here listening since the end of the question period, well that's close to two hours I've sat here and listened to various speeches, some of them rather interesting; some items were rather interesting.- (Interjection)- Well, my problem is this, that I listened to some members . . .

MR. G. FILMON: That's not your only problem.

HON. L. EVANS: We may have many problems; the Leader of the Opposition may have a lot of problems as well.- (Interjection)- Well, we'll see, we'll see in November. The Member for Portage la Prairie, regrettably was very loose with his observations and his facts. He's a very nice guy, the Member for Portage is a very nice guy, but really he is sloppy with his facts. Frankly, I would like to, as a friend, warn him that if he were making statements that he made in this House outside in the corridors or on the streets of this province, or this country, he might very well have himself as an object or subject of a lawsuit, the Member for Portage.

Some of the words, some of the phrases, some of the expressions he used do reflect on members, and he's a nice guy. Frankly, he's a little loose with his description and I would say the Member for Brandon West complained about spurious and incorrect allegations, and I would agree with him. There is no room for spurious and incorrect allegations from either side, but I have heard a number this afternoon and I would like to correct one or two, but I don't have time to go through all of them.

I get particularly upset when the Member for Portage la Prairie refers to McKenzie Seeds and myself, and

so on, and how he twists the words and how he uses those phrases; I become very, very upset. But, you know, in some ways you've got to forgive the Member for Portage because he is new - he may not have all the facts - and he wants to blame the McKenzie Seeds episode, lump them in with everything else and say this is all part of bad administration. But he doesn't know and I would invite him to read the Auditor's report; I would invite him to read the evidence in the court where it's very clear that the fraudulent actions that occurred . . .

A MEMBER: If you fly with the crows, you get shot with the crows.

HON. L. EVANS: . . . they did occur, they began when the honourable members opposite were in government. Under the Lyon Government, fraudulent actions occurred.- (Interjection)- Well, go and speak to the RCMP, read the Auditor's report, read the testimony in the court and you'll see that. So when you want to talk about that as an example of poor management of Crown corporations, my honourable friends across the way have to take responsibility as well. You have to take responsibility as well. I would invite the Member for Emerson to indeed look at the Auditor's report and to read the transcript from the court case.

But what I really find objectionable is the continual personal attacks that occur in the House, and too often people are prone to attacking people on a personal basis.- (Interjection)- Well, I've listened to many members opposite, regrettably. I've listened to attacks, and again this afternoon, the Member for Portage, I really think he was unfair in many of his remarks.

I again say that honourable members should spend more time looking at the policies, looking at the programs and analyzing them and debating those, rather than making unfair and often untrue remarks about the members of this House.

The Member for Portage did say that we have to put a lid on the deficit and I think we could all agree. We would all like to control deficits.

A MEMBER: That's not true.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, it's not true. You know, on some occasions, deficits are a good thing. The Member for Morris agrees with me because he studies economics and he knows that the national, and to some extent provincial governments have the ability to offset business cycles by utilizing the fiscal capacity of those governments and to spend when the economy is in a slump, and hopefully when the economy is doing better, to have surpluses to pay off the deficits that they had.

The point I want to make, Madam Speaker, is you cannot say that deficits are always bad and there is no room for deficit spending, because I think it's quite clear. As a matter of fact, the Member for Brandon West, who is very praiseworthy of the Reagan administration in the United States, among other reasons why Mr. Reagan may be as popular as he was, was because the United States has had a lot of prosperity the last couple of years, and a large part of that is based on the deficit spending of the American administration. Regrettably most of it is geared towards

military spending, but nevertheless the Reagan administration has gone into debt like no one else I think in American history, except for perhaps World War II when the Americans and Canadians went into a great deal of debt in order to finance the war.-(Interjection)- Well, they may be, but nevertheless in a very short period of time Reagan took the American economy, the American Government, into a massive amount of debt. But the positive side of that, Madam Speaker, was that it did stimulate the American economy, created jobs and so on. There are other negative impacts, I'm not going to dispute that there are some negative impacts.-(Interjection)- I beg your pardon?-(Interjection)- Thank you. But regardless, the fact is that we have to - everybody seems to agree with me - that the deficit spending can have that stimulative effect.

Members opposite regret then the amount of our deficit and the debt that has been accumulated, and then they come up with quick answers, say, well, you know, if you didn't have all these losses at Manfor and if we didn't have to spend so much on Flyer, we'd have all this money to do all the things that we want to do. Well, the fact is, I suppose if you didn't have to spend money on Manfor and if we didn't lose some money on Flyer, we would have some more money, but I ask them, I invite them to do a little bit of arithmetic because you just can't add up sufficiently through three or four Crown corporations in their losses in expenditures to do all the things that members opposite would like us to do, and at the same time eliminate the deficit. It just doesn't add up.

I wanted to ask the Member for Portage, when he was criticizing us for Manfor and Flyer, if he objected to us selling Flyer at that price, why didn't his party, when they were in government in 1977 to 1981, take the opportunity to sell the Flyer Industries Limited?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. EVANS: But, Madam Speaker, whether we were critical in Opposition or not is beside the point.-(Interjection)- No, it isn't, because the point is that the Lyon administration had a majority government and had the ability to do what it would do. It sold off one or two other companies, what was this outfit? - Morden Fine Foods, you sold that, and so on. You had the ability to do it. You tried to sell McKenzie Seeds and so on. But the fact is you didn't sell Manfor and you didn't sell Flyer, and I don't accept the criticism that because we objected to it in the Opposition you couldn't do it. That just doesn't wash, Madam Speaker, that simply will not wash.

So really what we get is a lot of easy answers from members opposite as to what they would do to eliminate the deficit. We have not really had any substantive suggestions, any fundamental suggestions made by members opposite as to how to resolve the deficit. How would they go about reducing the debt of the Province of Manitoba? We don't hear that. We don't have the options; we don't have the policy options offered to us.

I don't hear anything in the way of tax increases because you can eliminate the deficit by increasing taxes obviously, or you can reduce spending, and of

course you always say you can be more efficient in government.

I would like to submit, Madam Speaker, that our government is a lean government. It's run very efficiently. The number of civil servants per 1,000 population is the lowest ratio, I believe, or the second lowest of any government in Canada. I think Alberta has the highest ratio of Civil Service to population and I'm not criticizing anybody. I'm just saying it's fairly lean and I don't know where you go to find savings, and even if we could agree on some areas with regard to the corporations and the Crown corporation losses - nobody likes to see the losses at Manfor - but even putting all that aside - that does not answer the question fully. That does not give us enough money. Where would you get the money? What taxes would you increase? Would you increase sales taxes, do you want increase income taxes, what do you want to do? I haven't heard any suggestion on that side because if you are going to take a hard look at eliminating deficits of the size that we have, then you have to take a look at that. I hear no suggestions.

On the other side I don't hear any suggestions about any major program cuts that members opposite are suggesting. In fact, it's just the reverse. We're being asked every day, why don't we spend money here or why don't we spend money there? I was asked by the Honourable Member for Gladstone the other day, why don't we do what the City of Winnipeg does, and that is allow families who are on provincial social welfare or provincial social assistance to keep the CRISP money without deducting it from their welfare cheques. Well, to do that, as worthy as that may be, there's an argument to how equitable it would be because there are other people on welfare who might object to favourable treatment of that particular group. Regardless, you're looking at another \$5 million, \$6 million, \$7 million, \$8 million. I don't have the numbers with me but you're looking at a lot of money, year after year after year. I only use that as one example.

So we are getting suggestions to increase spending on agriculture, in social services and in many ways. The Member for Portage wants us to spend more money on the Manitoba Developmental Centre, the School for Retarded people at Portage la Prairie and so on, but they don't come forward and say where they want to cut programs. We don't get any suggestions in that regard whatsoever.

I'm reminded though of what happened when the Conservative Party was in office between 1977 and 1981 under Sterling Lyon about the major cuts that did occur, some of the major cuts that did occur. In fact, one of the reasons we did so well in the 1981 election was because of the reaction of the public of Manitoba to the Lyon Government.

I wish the Member for Brandon West, I guess I'm not supposed to refer to him, but I wish he could hear me -(Interjection)- okay, that's great. He didn't live in Brandon at that time. The Member for Brandon West, I think, was living in Ottawa at that time, but maybe he doesn't know. But you know, he's concerned about what we're going to do in the future in Brandon; how difficult a time it will be for me as a member of the government side to explain to the people of Brandon, the good people of Brandon about not going forward with different programs.

Well, I'm going to get to that in a moment, but I'd like to tell the Member for Brandon West, the members of this House, that when the Conservative Government was in office in Manitoba, we didn't have one stick of senior citizens' apartments put in place anywhere in the City of Brandon, never mind Brandon East, the whole City of Brandon; not one stick was put in place of senior citizens' accommodation; not one brick was put in place to develop Brandon University.

There was a cry, need, to develop the music school back in the Seventies and we committed in 1977 to expand the School of Music at Brandon University. When the Lyon Government came in, those plans were cancelled. They brought forward a scheme that they would help finance, but it may be in the year 2050; maybe the university might collect enough money from the community to do something. But really, there was no funding of any expansion of Brandon University as has happened in the last couple of years. - (Interjection)- I'll talk about Perkins in a minute if you like, because, Dr. Perkins, I'll remind you, was hired by the board that we appointed in the 1970's and that's why I reject anybody's criticism that this is purely a political problem, because it isn't. It's more complicated. I'm not responsible, I cannot be responsible for the writings of citizens of this country or this province as to their observations and the way they see things. - (Interjection)- I have lots more to say here, but maybe other people want to speak.

The Brandon University, I wanted to tell the Member for Brandon West, as well, that the Brandon University under the Lyon Government had less money in real terms to spend at the end of the Lyon administration than when the Lyon Government took office in 1977. There was less money. In other words, the rate of increase was less than the increase in inflation, so that in real dollars Brandon University had fewer dollars to work with in 1981 than it had in 1977. - (Interjection)- I kid you not. I'm saying we had four years of experience with the Conservative Government and the people of Brandon know what cutbacks mean. I think they have some concern that if Conservatives ever get back in that this might happen again, that it'll become cut-back city again.

I want to remind the Member for Brandon West and other members of the House that a lot of great things are happening in Brandon, are happening right now. The Brandon Music Building was just completed, but a student union building is going up; architectural work is being done on a library. We have approved a nursing education program so that you've got a Bachelor of Nursing Program in for the first time. In terms of developing nursing homes, there is nearly an \$18 to 20 million program under way. It's still under way. We've built the new Dinsdale Home; Fairview is undergoing a \$10 million expansion. The Rideau Park Nursing Home is now under construction, a massive \$5 to \$6 million project. The Member for Brandon West, I believe, knows that, but I'd like to tell other members of the House and make them realize that this, by using that city in my riding and that area as an example, it's an example of the positive things that are happening under this government.

With regard to social housing, we've developed all kinds of - there wasn't one stick of social housing for families put in place when the Conservatives were in government, not one board.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that we've had three, four major housing projects developed in the last few years and there's another one that's going to start, a \$3 million housing project for families that's to start within a matter of a month or two, southeast of the Brandon General Hospital. It's needed and it will be put in place. There are various Manitoba community asset program grants. We've helped the City of Brandon by providing money to expand their police station.

There is a gymnastic group in Brandon that badly needs a new building. We are going to help make that possible. We've committed \$50,000.00. I've got support from the Member for Brandon West - \$50,000 to help make that happen, and I'm sure they wouldn't have started without it.

We've given large grants to the Chamber of Commerce for them to develop their headquarters on Rosser Avenue, and I can go on and on about major commitments that are now being fulfilled and will be fulfilled in the future.

I believe there may be some other members opposite who want to speak, so I'm going to conclude my remarks on just one or two major points.

The Member for Brandon West brought up the Brandon General Hospital and I have to comment about that, because we both share a concern to ensure that Brandon General develops as a fine regional hospital which it is. There had been no cutbacks in funding at Brandon General, year after year, and we've got the statistics showing an increase in funding.

We've picked up the deficits in the last two years and, in addition to that, there have been millions of dollars - I'm not going to take the time, as I would if I had more time - of monies, millions of dollars provided for major capital improvements to the hospital; everything from an emergency observation unit that has put in place, a not-for-admission surgery unit that's put in place, a hemodialysis unit for people with kidney disease put in place, ultrasound, radiology equipment put in place and now, right now, today, under construction at the hospital, they are providing for space for the CT CAT scanner at a cost of \$1.7 million, an annual operating cost of \$600,000.00. The plans for a new expanded laundry is going forward at a cost of \$2.6 million and a long-range plan of between \$50 and \$60 million of capital development is under way.

I want to - (Interjection)- well, why cut 30 beds? The fact is the Member for Brandon West is causing my speech to be longer than it would be otherwise. I've got to answer this. The fact is - and I don't understand this, but maybe the members can help me - the Manitoba Health Services Commission have statistics of the people utilizing the hospital and they say at the Brandon General, the patient days per thousand people corrected for age and sex differences is 44 percent higher than those people using the Winnipeg hospitals, and the rate at which Brandon residents and Westman residents are hospitalized in Brandon General is at a rate which is 74 percent higher than in Winnipeg. Now why? I don't think the people in Brandon are that much sicker than the people in Winnipeg that they have to go there at a 74 percent higher rate. But, at any rate, what we are doing is referring this to a third-party review.

I believe the hospital and the Manitoba Health Services Commission together will have a study done of this so that we'll see whether those utilization rates

stand up or not. If they don't, then the money will be forthcoming. But that is the reason the government would not provide those extra funds and the member then talks about the 30 beds.- (Interjection)- Well, there are no layoffs there, and I believe all the hospitals can continue to function doing its job.

As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, the question is: quality of where? Not just putting more and more and more people in hospital beds. We've got to do more in terms of prevention, more in terms of public health and more in terms of quality for that hospital.

So, Madam Speaker, I've gone a couple of minutes more than I would have and maybe I'll have an opportunity at some other time to share some of my thoughts on financing and supply with members of this House at a future time.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

Interim Supply - what does Interim Supply really mean? What was the original intent of the bill that we have been discussing for the last couple of days? Interim Supply, Madam Speaker, was to accommodate the true democratic concept about what this Chamber's all about is, that no public money is spent unless it gets the approval of the elected representative of the people; but because we are practical people, we realized even in days of yore - if I want to speak of my time when I first came in, Madam Speaker - that sometimes the fiscal year-end of the province is March 31, that it could not always be possible to have the Estimates approved, although I would venture to say that in most instances in the lifetime of the governments of this province, that was not the case. When Sessions were held in January and concluded in early May, the Estimates usually were approved prior to the fiscal year-end coming to its conclusion.

But because it didn't always fit that pattern in the marvellous way that democracies can work, they invented the concept of Interim Supply, which meant that even though the Legislature had not approved the Minister of Highway's budget or the Minister of Education's budget, but certainly were not going to be callous and bring everything to a stop - employees have to be paid, teachers have to be paid, roads have to be maintained, so we will grant the Government of the Day those necessary dollars so that we could continue debating the Estimates and the issues of the day in this Chamber, but still keeping intact the original concept that I mentioned when I first rose, that public monies are not spent until they have the approval of the Legislature.

Madam Speaker, that's a very fundamental fact. How far have we come from that concept and for what reason, by this government and the New Democratic Party's general attitude, cavalier attitude towards this House and towards these concepts and principles of democracy and parliamentary democracy, based on the British model? So they don't particularly worry if it suits their time schedule to delay the opening of this Chamber, to facilitate the proper study of Estimates before they are being spent. If it suits their timetable

to call an election, at whenever, their last concern is for the principle workings of this Legislature.

So we had the Legislature opening in May and we find ourselves now in September when April, May, June, July, August - we're into the seventh month of government spending by the departments. We have yet to approve the Estimates of the Department of Education. On principle, there should be no school operating in this province, there should be no university operating in this province, there should be no hospitals operating in this province, there should be nothing done in this province.

A MEMBER: It's not our fault, by the way.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, of course that is ridiculous, but I just want to point out for members opposite who perhaps do not understand what the purport of Interim Supply was all about. The purport of Interim Supply was, on the part of a responsible Opposition, to accommodate the Government of the Day to facilitate the smooth operations of any government; that's what Interim Supply is all about. But, Madam Speaker, we are now debating an Interim Supply Bill, Bill 56, where we are now talking about approving 70 percent to 75 percent of the total government expenditures in an interim way, without us having had the opportunity to pass the final judgment as to the spending requirements of this government.

Madam Speaker, that may not be very important to many people, but for those few scholars who wish to have some understanding of what the different terms really mean, now what does Interim Supply mean - I know some of our new members would ask me, what does Interim Supply mean? What is the purpose of an Interim Supply Bill? It's worthwhile to put on the record that that was the purpose. As a rule, certainly in recent history, if you want to call it the modern times in Manitoba, governments rarely asked the Legislature to approve more than 20 percent, 25 percent, perhaps 30 percent at the maximum of total government expenditures in Interim Supply Bills. That was the norm, Madam Speaker, during the more recent years of the Legislative Assembly.

Madam Speaker, this group has shown its disdain for that tradition and for that important principle, in my judgment, by introducing an Interim Supply Bill. We are debating it in September, the seventh month of the life of the government in this fiscal year, which will approve when this bill is passed, upwards to 70 percent, 75 percent of the total government expenditures.

Madam Speaker, I was moved to open with those few comments because this government and this party that is responsible for the present government has, in a most fundamental way, altered many, many things that Manitobans, I believe, still hold very dear and hold as being very important to what we would like to call the good life in this province.

Talking a bit about history, Madam Speaker, members opposite, not just in this debate, but in other debates, often like to taunt us about the fact that they have won four out of the last five elections. Well, I suppose one ought to be at least a little fair about this. I mean, when do you start counting? I suppose, from a totally

objective point of view, it would be fair to say, well let's start counting from the time - and I'll even be fair - their predecessors first formed, as a political party, the CCF; but because I'm a charitable person I won't do that, recognizing that a new party takes some time to gain its support. But then at least I'm sure members opposite would be at least fair enough to say, because they have often referred, Madam Speaker, to the fact where the election of Premier Duff Roblin and the Progressive Conservatives in the late Fifties as being the era, the event that brought Manitoba into the 20th Century; they have referred to that administration as having brought progressive government to Manitoba, so let's start from that time.

Well, in that event, of course, the Conservatives have won five elections compared to your four elections. So, Madam Speaker, with all the times the New Democrats want to talk about, they are still playing catch-up. A Conservative administration was elected in 1958, in 1959, 1962, 1966 and 1977, compared to their elections of 1969, 1973, 1981 and 1985. That's five out of four, so let's lay that little story to rest and it is not really all that important, except that honourable members like to use that statistic in that way to prove that Manitobans have indeed made a fundamental decision that they would like to believe indicates that overwhelming approval, four out of five times, is in the favour of New Democrats. That simply again, Madam Speaker, is historically not correct.

Of course, Madam Speaker, one can never say too often what occurred in those particular years. If you take their arguments, and these gentlemen, ladies and members opposite have often, as I say, raised that discussion proudly. Manitoba has elected four New Democratic Party Governments out of the last five. I say to be more objective and fair, it can be equally said that Manitobans have elected five Conservative administrations out of the last nine administrations to the New Democrats four.

Then, Madam Speaker, if you ask yourself, what did those five Conservative administrations leave Manitobans with? What was the legacy of their governments? Madam Speaker, although they are not necessarily always supportive of the Conservative Party, but to me of course one of the greatest contributions of those five years was bringing the education system of this province into the 20th Century. The entire educational system was developed during those five, four Progressive Conservative administrations, which was a massive undertaking.

Madam Speaker, the universities that we now debate about, their finances were created during those years.

To us in rural Manitoba and to urban Manitoba, we created the modern road system that is now deteriorating under this government and that meant thousands of miles of roads, millions of dollars of commitment. Madam Speaker, in 1965 in one fell swoop, the Provincial Government took over a provincial road network from the municipalities which were then receiving spotty provincial support of over 5,600 miles in one action, by one Order-in-Council. That was vision, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we endowed the province with the hospitalization program, with the Medicare program. The Member for Brandon talks about building housing units, senior citizen housing units in Brandon. We began

and led the country, Madam Speaker, in accommodations for senior citizen housing during those years; developed the personal care home program, not to speak of such other sound corporations that helped agriculture; the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation; all of which and all whose institutions are serving Manitobans well, and that we can be proud of as Manitobans. But certainly listening to the taunts opposite, we can be proud as Conservatives as having played a role in, along with the people of Manitoba who helped fund, the creation of these institutions.

Madam Speaker, again being absolutely objective, it would be not unfair to compare the four years, the four administrations that the New Democrats liked to remind us of so often in this House. What are the basic legacies that they have left in those four administrations? It covered a period of time - and by the way I should say that all of these accomplishments that I just mentioned, under Conservative administrations, left the people of Manitoba, the Province of Manitoba with virtually, by today's standard, no debt. No debt, and we weren't passing on these responsibilities to the children who are being born this week or next week or the years to come. Of course, our credit rating was at the very top, Madam Speaker, our credit rating was at the very top.

Madam Speaker, objective analysis of the four NDP administrations will tell you very quickly that those were the years that, by and large with some exceptions, we went through a period of the highest interest rates this country has ever seen, this province has ever seen, with unemployment rates unacceptable - maybe not rivalling those of the Thirties, but certainly unacceptable in the post-War years.

Madam Speaker, I have to say this, we have seen - I can't lay it all at their doorstep, but some of it - a great deal more of family breakdown. We have seen - and I believe this to be the case - our senior educators, our universities are telling us a general lowering of the standard of education.

Now whether that is entirely all their fault, that's not necessarily the case. There was certainly a swing to different experimentation in our educational programs but, Madam Speaker, they are still bucking some of the effects of that experimentation which other jurisdictions have seen to have led to the conclusions that it did not produce and were not indeed in the best interests of our children.

Madam Speaker, on top of that massive debt - a massive debt which we have never seen before in this province - what has to be the other legacy talked about, if honourable members want to talk about the accomplishments of their four administrations, is what they have done to our Crown corporations. Crown corporations, Madam Speaker, had a proud history in this province. There was an esprit de corps with those who worked for the Crown corporations. There was integrity; they knew that they were providing a most valuable service for the people of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: You can't legislate integrity.

MR. H. ENNS: No, you certainly can't legislate integrity, but what you can do, Madam Speaker, is to be very

careful about how governments handle and treat these Crown corporations which provide this service. Once you muck around with them, by bringing in carpetbaggers for political reasons to run them, and Manitoba Hydro was the first to feel the brunt of political interference by New Democrats when Mr. Cass Beggs was brought in and all of a sudden the Hydro decisions became political, Madam Speaker. What did that lead to, Madam Speaker? It led to the fact that the president, the chief executive officer of Hydro, lied to a committee of this House and finally had to resign for that reason, Madam Speaker.

We have had just during this Session, another chief executive officer of a Crown corporation of their creation, Autopac, being fortunately removed for a wrongdoing. (Interjection)- For wrongdoing. No, no, I'm accurate. The carpetbagger means, Madam Speaker, in the case some honourable members don't understand that, the carpetbagger term comes from when people from another jurisdiction usurp authority in another jurisdiction in which they really have no business. When you take somebody out of a defeated NDP Government out of another jurisdiction and impose him on to our Crown corporation, that's called carpetbagging, Madam Speaker, and we've seen the results.

We have Autopac's chief executive officer resigning. Madam Speaker, at an institution - I can't call it a Crown corporation - that has not received, quite frankly, although we have certainly raised it often enough, but again under the leadership, under the stewardship of this government, because of the political interference they're in, one of the best organizations that we have for workers' protection, families of workers' protection, the Workers' Compensation Board virtually driven into disrespect and into financial ruin by the political tinkering and the political interference of New Democrats.

Now, Madam Speaker, we have the Manitoba Telephone System being investigated by the RCMP. Madam Speaker, every day, honourable members including the Premier, stand up as though that is something to be proud of - we have the RCMP investigating the Manitoba Telephone System.

My god, Madam Speaker, what have they allowed to happen to that corporation, that we have to turn the RCMP on them? What have they allowed to have done to that corporation, that Ministers stand up here and say that they have been misinformed by senior management people of that corporation? What is this nonsense that we have to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to get outside auditors to report on our Crown corporations? Madam Speaker, our Provincial Auditor

was always good enough to do that and we accepted those judgments, those findings, or if not that, then another auditing firm within the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, you understand what I'm saying when these honourable gentlemen opposite want to look upon that as some achievement, that they have sacked the RCMP on to what once was a proud, worthwhile, responsible Crown corporation, providing a worthwhile service that people of Manitoba required. This is what has happened. This is all what has happened under the capable leadership of a New Democratic Party administration, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, is that something to be proud of? Is that something that you want to have in the annals of history as a legacy of your administration because, Madam Speaker, that's what it is. You want to compare that to your four administrations versus our five administrations, I ask and I dare, because I know the kind of support and research staff honourable members opposite have. But I ask them to draw up a comparable list of accomplishments with respect to the five administrations that I refer to with some pride, four of which I've had the privilege of serving; compared to the four administrations that honourable members taunt us with as having provided so much mayhem, ruin and fiscal irresponsibility to the people of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, that is the story that has to be told and will be told to the people of Manitoba. That is the story that will truly bring to prophetic justice the lines read by my colleague from Brandon West about honourable members opposite whose time has surely come.

The only thing, Madam Speaker, is I am confident that somebody else making a similar speech like this 20 years from now will be able to say, and when we compare the records of which party formed the administration more frequently, that the record will be more like 16, 18 to 4, than the 4 to 5 that they now like to talk about, Madam Speaker. Because the kind of damage they are doing, Madam Speaker, is the kind of lasting damage that is breaking down the very fabric of some of the institutions that I believe most Manitobans think are most worthwhile.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. MERCIER: Should we call it 5:30, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed).

The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).