

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 12 February, 1988.

Time — 10:00 a.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 Volume 1, Financial Statements, Public Accounts, for the year ended March 31, 1987; also Volume 2 of Public Accounts, Supplementary Information, for the year ended March 31, 1987; and also the Report on the Auditor's Receipts and Disbursements of the Provincial Auditor's Office, which is required under section 19 of The Provincial Auditor's Act, and which is contained in the Report of the Provincial Auditor to the Legislative Assembly for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1987.

These reports have been previously distributed to all honourable members.

MADAM SPEAKER: I am pleased to table the following documents:

The resignation of L.L. Desjardins as the Member for the Electoral Division of St. Boniface and a copy of my correspondence to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council respecting the vacancy in the representation of the St. Boniface Electoral Division.

Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

Autopac - revenue disbursement

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Madam Speaker, motorists throughout the province are outraged at massive increases in Autopac rates that they've been slapped with as a result of this government's actions. Madam Speaker, last year Autopac raised its rates such that it added over \$30 million of additional revenue to the corporation, and at the same time it declared a loss in that operating year of \$63 million.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister responsible is: Where did that over \$90 million of revenue go in the corporation?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition makes mention of where did the \$90 million go. Madam Speaker, last year, the corporation handled 249,000 claims, the highest number in the history of the corporation, and, in fact, the cost of those claims increased substantially - bodily injury claims, windshield and auto repair claims, parts claims - to the amount that the amount of money, in terms of year over year, \$40 million in claim costs exceeded the revenues that the corporation took in, as well as the previous year. So the entire amount of money that the member speaks of was paid in benefits to motorists in the Province of Manitoba in repairing cars, in dealing with bodily injury claims, in dealing with all the costs of operating claims.

Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is it was their party who made auto insurance rates an election issue in 1986. They called their experts and said that our reserves in 1986 were too high; and in fact they pledged to Manitobans that they would reduce auto insurance rates by 10 percent because our reserves were too high, that a public company wouldn't go broke - it didn't need those kinds of reserves. Madam Speaker, we kept our rates down and worked our reserves downward to pay for the claims . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, of course we didn't know that the former Minister had cooked the books and he was covering up for losses.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Autopac - setting of rates

MR. G. FILMON: In the two years in which there was a provincial election issue, in those two years, claims in Autopac went up by 17 percent - a 17 percent increase in claims - yet this government reduced the rates of Autopac by 2 percent. Now, since the election, claims went up this past year by only 1 percent and rates are going up by 24 percent.

Is the Minister now going to admit that there was political manipulation involved on the part of his government in the setting of Autopac rates?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I don't know where the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has been over the last number of years. Madam Speaker, in '86 they said that we were overcharging Manitoba motorists, that we in fact should reduce the rates and that was when we announced that there would be no rate increase.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition pledged during an election campaign that they would reduce premiums, if they were elected, by 10 percent.

We said we would not be drawn into that political manoeuvring. Madam Speaker, motorist rates would have to have risen by 10 percent more if they were in power today.

Madam Speaker, in Ontario a \$330 million underwriting loss in 1986. Were those executives and those private companies fired as a result of having a \$300 million underwriting loss? Did they get fired, Madam Speaker? No, they raised the premiums. In fact they have come before the legislative committee asking for a 30 percent to 40 percent increase this year because of an underwriting loss in auto insurance.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

May I remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions should not be speeches.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm glad that the Minister has brought up the case of Ontario because just last month in the Ontario Legislature at a committee of the Ontario Legislature, the vice-president of Finance of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, Mr. Dribnenky, was being interrogated by the committee at the request of the NDP Opposition in Ontario.

With respect to the losses in Manitoba, he said as follows, and I hope you'll bear with me. He said - this is Mr. Dribnenky - "I think there is a combination of factors that took place; one of them being that our rate structure did not keep up with what was happening on the claims side." The chairman said, "But as you have suggested, they have been inadequate for a couple of years."

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: He said, "That is correct." "That is correct," he said.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, I do, Madam Speaker. I have just one.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please place it.

MR. G. FILMON: And the remainder of his sentence, he said, "But as I have indicated before, obviously if you're going to lose \$60,000, your revenues were not high enough. That accounts for it."

So, Madam Speaker, the vice-president of Finance was saying clearly that the rates had been politically manipulated. They had not been raised as they should have.

Madam Speaker, I ask the Minister once again: Will he now acknowledge to the people of Manitoba that they are paying with their massive increases today for his political interference and that of his predecessor?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I want to tell my honourable friend - and he's quoting the Ontario reports - that the president of the Insurance Bureau of Canada

to that same committee, a statement by John L. Lyndon - I'll quote one paragraph - where he says: "The auto-insurance industry has not been profitable in Ontario in the last several years mainly because the cost of settling claims has risen faster than premium income. Between 1982 and 1986, total premiums earned increased by more than 55 percent while losses and adjustment expenses increased by almost 68 percent. For the bodily injury side of the business under third-party liability coverage, premiums increased by roughly 63 percent while losses increased by almost 84 percent."

Madam Speaker, were the private sector companies hiding and covering up something in terms of the losses? While their premiums increased in excess of 55 percent, Madam Speaker, Manitoban motorists premiums were held. If we do a comparison, Madam Speaker, and use their report, the Burns Report, and we look over the last seven years since the Burns Report was there, our premiums have increased roughly by less than 10 percent a year. When you compare it to what the premiums earned were in the private sector, they were going over 11 percent to 12 percent a year. Madam Speaker, over that period of time, Manitoban motorists have received the best coverage in the country and have the best premium rates across the board of anywhere in the country of Canada.

MR. G. FILMON: No, Madam Speaker, I'm not saying that the Ontario companies were hiding their losses. They were declaring them; you weren't. You were the ones who were hiding your losses.

Madam Speaker, I repeat, Mr. Dribnenky, the vice-president of Finance, said that the rate structure did not keep up with what was happening on the claims side because of the decisions that this government made in setting its rates. Is he saying that Mr. Dribnenky was lying?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I really don't think the Leader of the Opposition knows what he's saying. Madam Speaker, what he is saying is that he could guess what the number of claims will be over a 12-month period ahead. Now he's looking back after we've had the claims in and says, gee, you've had more claims. Why couldn't you guess it?

Madam Speaker, it's nice to be a backseat quarterback, Madam Speaker. That's what the Leader of the Opposition really is. He's saying, now that the claims are in, how come you couldn't guess what they were 12 months ahead, Madam Speaker. An armchair quarterback, the Leader of the Opposition is, Madam Speaker. That's really what he is.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He doesn't cook the books when he has the information though.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, let the honourable member stand up and say someone cooked the books. Is he calling the Provincial Auditor a liar? Is he calling the auditors of the corporation liars? Is that who he is calling? They are the ones, Madam Speaker, who certified the accounts of that corporation and they are the ones who bring those statements here. So let the

Honourable Leader of the Opposition say that, yes, the Provincial Auditor is not telling the truth.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, his figures showed that the claims were increasing, but they didn't increase the rates.

Autopac - appearance of senior officials before committee

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I have a further question to the Premier.

The Throne Speech says in some detail that this government is interested in opening up Crown corporations to public scrutiny. It says, for the first time, all commercial Crown corporations will appear before standing committees of the House.

Madam Speaker, in the review of MPIC, we asked in this House and in committee to have Mr. Dribnenky speak to the committee. Mr. Dribnenky was denied the opportunity to speak to the committee by the NDP majority on the committee. He then went to Ontario and spoke to the Ontario legislative committee.

Will he allow Mr. Dribnenky and other senior officials to appear before a standing committee this year and not muzzle the Opposition?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the officials of the Crown corporations always are in presence at the committee hearings. The procedures of the committee are well known insofar as the custom of the committees, and the answers are responded to by the Minister or by the president of the corporation.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, that's not good enough. This Premier's word isn't worth the paper it's written on, even when it's written in the Throne Speech.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: He does not want to open up the Crown corporations. He does not want to allow senior officials to be able to be questioned.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, is the Premier going to keep his word given in the Throne Speech and allow senior officials of Crown corporations to be asked questions in committee, and really have an open government in this province?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I guess I ought not to be surprised at the Leader of the Opposition. His words speak for themselves.

Madam Speaker, the procedures that we follow are the same procedures that had been followed for years and years by different administrations, but we have gone beyond that. During the last Session of the Legislature, we introduced legislation pertaining to the

Crown corporations to provide greater accountability and, as well, what is very important, Madam Speaker, we will be providing opportunity for accountability sessions in which the officials of Crown corporations will have an opportunity to respond and the obligation to have meetings with members of the public.

Madam Speaker, this is an innovative and creative move on the part of this government. Madam Speaker, this is a move that has not been copied elsewhere to the best of my knowledge. Certainly, Madam Speaker, we don't have to take any lectures from the Leader of the Opposition, who was part of a government that we can recall very, very well when honourable members on that side of the House then tried to get some basic questions about Hydro - what became the Hydrogate affair, some very simple questions - and we were blocked day after day after day. So I'm not about to take any advice from a member of that previous administration.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with a question.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the most important court of accountability in this province is right here in this Legislature and in its committees. Is the Premier now telling the people of Manitoba that he will continue to muzzle the senior officials of Crown corporations and not allow them to appear before standing committees, despite the fact that they can go to standing committees of the Ontario Legislature and be interrogated there? Is that his idea of accountability? If so, Madam Speaker, it's a lot of crap.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I guess we've got the new buzzword for this Session.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Could I caution members to not get too close to unparliamentary . . . the Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, we are following the process and procedures of the past many, many years. We've opened it up by way of further legislation brought in by this government that I believe will be — (Interjection) — Well, Madam Speaker, I guess the honourable member doesn't want accountability sessions via Crown corporations.

The honourable member doesn't want our Crown corporations to appear before the people of the Province of Manitoba because, when the people of Manitoba have opportunity for dialogue with the Crown corporations, they might discover that so many of the allegations made by honourable members in this House during the last 16 months have been but hogwash.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Law Reform Commission - cutting of members

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Since its inception on October 1, 1970, the Law Reform Commission has been an example of excellence in this province, with 75 percent of their recommendations forming new and better law for the citizens of this province.

My question is to the Attorney-General. Why did this government fire all the independent members, thereby dimming this light in an otherwise tawdry government?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

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

Certainly, I agree with the Member for River Heights with respect to the activities of the Law Reform Commission. However, it is also a fact of life that in these days when we have to look for funding for our health care system which is so inadequately funded by the federal government which promised 50-50 funding beforehand; in these days when we are looking to find more revenue for job creation and industrial diversification in this province, all departments have to look at areas of saving money.

This was an area that was chosen in our particular department. It was a difficult choice. It was not one that we wanted to make, but members opposite also don't want us to close RCMP stations and we won't. Members opposite also don't want us to shut down more Land Titles Offices, and we hope that in the immediate future we won't. Those are tough decisions you have to make when you're in government.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: With a supplementary question to the Minister, how does he believe and how does he really intend to save large amounts of money when the total value of the honorariums to independent members amounted to \$21,000.00?

A MEMBER: Wow.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There really isn't a great deal of point in paying honorariums to members of a commission which no longer has funds. The point is that, last year, there was about \$350,000 to \$360,000 expended on the commission. A decision was taken, which we communicated publicly in December, that for next year there would be no new funds for new research. We felt that there was very little need, very little purpose in having members of a commission simply there to wind it down.

Law Reform Commission - re in vitro fertilization

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: As a final supplementary to the same Minister, Madam Speaker, who in the Attorney-General's office will now study the legal, ethical and moral questions of in-vitro fertilization and surrogate motherhood which was to be undertaken by the Law Reform Commission, but will now not take place since it has been effectively abolished?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, in the last number of years, more than 95 percent of the legislation which has come before the House and most of which

- 80 per cent or more - has been unanimously approved by all members of this House, has in fact been achieved without the input of the Law Reform Commission.

That doesn't mean they weren't doing valuable work, but we can't be doing every bit of research on every area of interest in the Western World, and this is one of the areas that probably will not be worked on as much, although there will be still be, Madam Speaker, research capacity within the Attorney-General's Department and within other departments.

Just as an example, in that particular department our law reform with respect to marital property, with respect to maintenance enforcement and those sorts of things have come, in the last number of years, not from the Law Reform Commission but from other staff people from the Attorney-General's Department.

That is not to take anything away from the Law Reform Commission. We simply don't have the available resources. We had to make choices. It is very easy when you are in Opposition, when you don't have to make choices; when you're in government, you do have to make them.

Autopac - allocation re claims costs

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

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

In the pre-Christmas announcement Mr. Silver made regarding Autopac rates, he indicated a \$23 million allocation as part of the \$63 million loss to cover unpaid claims and expense adjustments.

My question to the Minister is how much of that is included in his claims costs?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, all of that amount is included in the claims cost. Those actuarially-produced reserves, I think the breakdown will be brought out at the committee, but the bulk of it deals with claims going back a number of years in a reassessment of all the claims in light of the kinds of costs that the actuary that we employed looked at in terms of court awards, increased part costs and all those other costs, and that was part of that figure that was included in this year's loss.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, my question to the same Minister is why was that included in claims costs and not included as part of the Rate Stabilization Fund?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, those costs are related directly to claims incurred by the corporation. What occurred was that we had remaining \$52 million in reserves. Those reserves were used to offset the claims costs and the actuarially-recommended amount of reserves, and as a result the year-end figures will show a net deficit in the corporation in the vicinity of \$10 million.

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

I wonder if he would inform this House how much of that \$23 million was incurred prior to 1987.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I believe that the bulk of that amount is as a result of 1987 claims. There would be an amount for previous years. I'll have to take the specifics as notice.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, I assume that the Minister will table that information at the earliest possible time next week.

Autopac - actuarial firm which did review

MR. G. CUMMINGS: My supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

Would the Minister inform us which actuarial firm did the review for Autopac and will he give a commitment to the people of Manitoba that he will make them available to the standing committee in this House in the same manner that Coopers and Lybrand were made available during the MTX affair?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I want the honourable member of the Opposition to know that we are likely the first auto insurance company to employ an outside actuary to do an accounting of our reserves. It is a recommended procedure in the insurance industry. However, the vast majority of companies, I've been informed, do not use that practice. However, MPIC did employ, at the request of the former Minister, an actuary, and as a result, these figures and his assessment were produced as part of our annual statement.

Autopac - tabling of information re claims

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

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, if we're going to have an open and honest and accountable government, why will this Minister not agree to have that firm present to answer questions at the committee?

Madam Speaker, if we cannot get an assurance from that Minister, I would like the answers to the following questions:

What is the claims volume the past year that was involved in the \$40 million that's left over after the 23 is subtracted, Mr. Minister? How much is the bodily injury? What is the collision cost, both labour and parts? What are the comprehensive costs? What are the property costs? What are the no-fault payments and the adjustment expenses that are included in the \$40 million?

I would ask that the Minister table that information at the earliest possible date next week.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I am sure that all honourable members will want to question staff of the corporation and ask questions at the Public Utilities Committee when it is called, and all that information, as it has been in the past years, will be made available.

The name of the actuary, I believe, is Tillinghast. I don't have the exact titles. They're from Eastern Canada and they are the ones that were employed by the corporation to do the actuarial report.

All the statistics and claims numbers that the honourable member is asking, Madam Speaker, certainly will be made available when the committee meets and we will have an opportunity, as we have had in the past years, to ask the questions, all the detailed questions, on what percentage increase, when those percentage increases came in, how did it affect us as it did in other industries, what was the claims number.

I've given the claims number. I believe it's 249,000 claims last year, Madam Speaker. I know, in general terms, that the claims costs, average claims costs, increased from \$830 to something like \$1,100-plus on an average basis. That's been the increase in claims costs. But those detailed questions should be posed at committee, Madam Speaker.

Industry, Trade and Technology - committee meeting

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

If memory serves me correctly, last May, the Prime Minister and Premier of Manitoba set up a committee to service a focal point for provincial-federal relations composed of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and the Federal Minister of Health.

I am wondering if the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology could report whether that committee has met, and if so, have there been any results to date?

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

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

Yes, the committee was set up and it met a number of times. We've had some discussions with respect to a number of issues. In addition to that, Madam Speaker, we've also consulted with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, with the Winnipeg Business Development Corporation, and other organizations with respect to industrial diversification in Manitoba.

Industry, Trade and Technology - progress re health industry

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, a supplementary particularly regarding the status of the health industry development initiative which I believe falls under the aegis of this committee.

I'm wondering if the Minister could report if there has been any progress in this area.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: That is one of the areas that has not gone as well or as quickly as we had hoped. There was indication when the committee was set up, and before that, that we would actually have the

agreement in place by June and certainly signed by September of 1987.

The agreement was negotiated in a form that was satisfactory to people on both sides. We have long since signed it and we've been unable to get the Federal Government to come through with its side of it for the last several months. They've had it in their hands since December of 1987. We're becoming a bit concerned with the lengthy delay in that very important agreement which has about 20 or 30 Manitoba companies very interested in proceeding with it.

MR. M. DOLIN: A further supplementary, in light of the Minister's response.

Has the Minister received any indication from the Federal Government as to what is holding up the signing of the agreement on their part?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Madam Speaker, I don't know what the holdup is, but hopefully it'll be fixed up, as the Member for Lakeside says, fairly soon. Maybe he can give Jake a call.

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

MR. M. DOLIN: A final, final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

I'm just wondering if the Minister can advise the House what will be the effect of the continuing openness in not signing of this agreement on the companies affected.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There are a number of elements to the agreement that have been entered into, or had been tentatively agreed to, and not yet signed by the Federal Government, none of which can really go ahead without the agreement coming into effect.

The agreement obviously also requires funding on the parts of both the Federal and Provincial Governments, and without the funding in those various areas, we can't go ahead.

Inter-City Gas - cost to taxpayers

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister of Energy.

Madam Speaker, much to the frustration and growing anger of Manitoba taxpayers who continue to watch this government find new ways of wasting their tax dollars, can the Minister now tell us what did that whole exercise of attempting to acquire Inter-City Gas cost the Manitoba taxpayers? Was it several hundreds of thousands of dollars? Was it over a million dollars? What was the actual price tag for that grandiose public relations venture that this government entered into over the past year?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

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

I'm a little puzzled by the member's suggestion that this exercise was a grandiose PR exercise. Madam Speaker, if that's his interpretation of saving the taxpayers of Manitoba \$38 million, I don't think that Manitobans want that kind of approach to their affairs.

Madam Speaker, I guess the more important question is when the small business people in this province and the residential homeowners were being hosed to the tune of \$38 million that this government knew was happening back in September-October of 1986, where was the Member for River Heights? Where were the Liberals, where were the Conservatives in protecting consumers' interests, Madam Speaker? Where were they? They were nowhere.

The Member for Lakeside said not one word for more than a year while this government made every effort to rectify what was clearly an injustice on the part of Manitoba natural gas consumers, but we attempted to rectify what we saw as an inappropriate response to the federal agreement to deregulate the gas industry, Madam Speaker. They said nothing; they said nothing. If that's defending consumers, I think Manitobans are going to be interested in their perspective of how it happens.

MR. H. ENNS: Let the record clearly show that the Minister simply refuses to answer our question, which is a very straightforward question: how many hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars, if not millions, did this government spend in the attempt to acquire Inter-City Gas? The Minister chose not to answer that question.

Madam Speaker, it took no polls or no hundreds of thousands of dollars to drop the motive fuel tax that dropped the price by \$12 million. All it did was pass an Order-in-Council.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Does the honourable member . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Well, I ask the Minister once more, Madam Speaker, and I seek your assistance: how many hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent in the attempt to acquire Inter-City Gas by this government?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I want to tell you that I enjoy these questions because the Member for Lakeside is leading with his chin.

Madam Speaker, I want to say, categorically, if the Member for Lakeside believes for one minute or wants the people of Manitoba to believe for one minute that Manitobans would have experienced that \$38 million reprieve by any actions of ICG or anybody else, he is misleading the people of Manitoba.

Point No. 2, Madam Speaker, I have not at any time refused to acknowledge the fact that the effort on behalf of the Government of Manitoba to save that \$38 million costs money. — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, I can see they're a little unnerved by the fact that they haven't been protecting consumers at all. What they've been doing is political grandstanding. That's what they've been doing.

Madam Speaker, I will be delighted to give the member the exact figure, including invoices that we have not yet received, but the exact figure for the cost

of acquisition - the exercise that we went through to assure that as we proceeded we were doing so in a prudent and reasonable fashion, that we had conducted the necessary due diligence before getting involved - the figure is \$589,000 to save Manitoba taxpayers \$38 million - a bargain at anytime.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, I just want to assure the Minister that most Manitobans are heaving a massive sigh of relief that they are not looking at a similar Autopac-type situation in their energy costs . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. H. ENNS: . . . but we still would like to know precisely how many hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars, were spent by this government in attempting to acquire Inter-City Gas, and the Minister refuses to answer that question.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I would like the member to read my lips: \$589,000 to save \$38 million.

Appointment of provincial judge

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General.

He's talked about consultation in his other portfolio as Minister of Industry and Trade. I want to ask him in regard to the appointment of a provincial judge who was unanimously rejected by the Manitoba Bar Association as incompetent, yet he appointed this judge. I ask him why did he consult with the Manitoba Bar Association if he was prepared to reject their unanimous viewpoint?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

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

I consulted with the Bar Association, I consulted with my colleagues, I consulted with . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I thought he'd like that. I also consulted, Madam Speaker — (Interjection) — No, I didn't consult with Mr. Hnatyshyn or with some other people, but I did consult with the Law Society of Manitoba. The Law Society of Manitoba wrote back to me and said that all of the candidates we were proposing, every single one of them, were quite acceptable and quite appropriate to be appointed to the Bench in Manitoba.

I understand that there was a telephone call made from somebody from the Bar Association with respect to one judge - not to me and never anything in writing - suggesting that one lawyer didn't have sufficient court experience. It had nothing to do with competence. We happened to know that lawyer very well and we expect that he will be able to do quite well on the Bench. We're satisfied with respect to his ability, with respect to his

integrity and with respect to his ability to perform his duties as a judge in Manitoba, and he will do very well.

Consultation with the Bar Association or with anyone else does not mean that the people consulted are going to be the people determining who is going to be chosen as the judge.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, nine members of the Manitoba Bar Association executive unanimously rejected one of the judges who was appointed.

I ask him why he swore the Manitoba Bar Association to secrecy. Will he name the incompetent judge that was appointed and remove the cloud over the heads of the four remaining judges who were appointed at the same time?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, it appears that there's a massive hearing problem on the other side of this House - people referring to incompetent lawyers. There was no such suggestion made to me or my office by the Bar Association. There was one reference with respect to lack of court experience. That was the reference that was made by the telephone caller. The notion of swearing anyone to secrecy is poppycock.

What I asked the Bar Association and other people with whom I consulted to do is not to talk to anybody about who was on the list and what was going on until the announcement was made. I have never asked anyone to refrain from saying in public whatever they have said to me in private, and it would be foolish to do so. I did not do so and I have no difficulty with the Bar Association or anyone else saying to anyone what they told me, but the Bar Association, in fact, has said nothing to me directly.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Does the honourable member have leave to ask a supplementary? I don't see unanimous consent for varying the rules.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health to make a non-political statement.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, I'd like to make a non-political statement regarding the Olympics, if I might have leave from the House.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am speaking as the Minister of Sport in this connection. As we all know, tomorrow the Olympic Games start in Calgary. They will run from the 13th to the 28th. We, in Manitoba, I think are very proud of the fact that we will have 10 athletes from Manitoba participating in the winter games.

I think what we've had shown in Manitoba recently has been a tremendous response with respect to the whole notion of the Olympic spirit. I thought that was symbolized quite well with respect to the torch relay through Manitoba and throughout Canada.

I would like to inform members of the House and the public that there will be a telegram that is in fact being compiled, I think, at the centre court of Polo Park. I think that telegram will be available for people to sign onto it, bringing support to the Manitoba athletes until tomorrow evening, and I would encourage all people who are so inclined to do so.

I will be taking that telegram to the athletes on behalf of the people of Manitoba a week from now, and on behalf of all the province, I wish to tell all the participants in the Olympics - from other countries, from Canada, and from Manitoba - that we in this province fully endorse the ideals and the spirit of the Olympic Games.

The Olympic Games spirit basically should transcend national boundaries. I think that it is the ultimate in sportsmanship and good will and good relations to each other. While saying that, on behalf of all athletes, I think we have a warm place in our hearts for those people from Manitoba.

In conclusion, I'd like to bring greetings, best wishes, good health and good sportsmanship to all Manitobans participating in the Olympics and to all the athletes participating in the Olympics.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: On the same matter, Madam Speaker, we on this side of the House would like to join with the Minister in what will be, as we understand, the largest and most successful winter games ever held. We'd particularly like to congratulate the 10 Manitobans who will be participating in the Olympic Games. I believe this is a doubling of the representation from Manitoba.

In addition, Madam Speaker, we understand that there are some 24 Manitobans who will be assisting at the games in terms of officials and medical people, and we would congratulate those people.

We would also take special note of the former Manitoban Olympian, 91-year-old Mike Goodman, the only surviving member of the first Canadian hockey team to win a gold medal in an Olympic competition, who will be there to enjoy another Olympic game. He and his teammates, primarily Icelanders, formed the now-famous 1920 Winnipeg Falcons Hockey Team, our first Olympic hockey champions.

We would also, of course, Madam Speaker, like to congratulate the some-70 Manitobans who shared in carrying the Flame through Manitoba and representing the aspirations of many other Manitobans. I appreciate what the Minister has said, that he will be taking the best wishes of Manitobans to the athletes and participants.

I would ask him, perhaps, by leave, Madam Speaker, to second a resolution of this House which would read as follows:

THAT this Legislature forward to the OCO 1988 President, Mr. Bill Pratt, its sincerest congratulations and best wishes on the occasion of Calgary hosting the 15th Winter Olympic Games; and further,

THAT this House acknowledge the strong partnership this event has created between sports volunteers, government and business which has made these games possible; and further,

THAT this Assembly acknowledge the outstanding contribution of Manitoba athletes, officials and sports

volunteers for their dedication and desire to excel and be the best they can possibly be, providing an important Manitoba flavour to this great world-wide happening, acknowledging that we are proud and supportive of their efforts and representation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member would have to have leave of the House to submit this kind of a resolution without notice at this time. Does the Honourable Member have leave?

The Honourable Minister of Sport.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Madam Speaker, I certainly would be very pleased to second the resolution.

I'm not sure whether it's possible just to add something there about the families, because I think the families are very involved as well. I would do that as a . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 40 visitors from South Dakota State University under the direction of Mr. Bill Chase.

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

The Honourable Minister of Culture - on a non-political matter?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, I would ask leave to make a non-political statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Could I ask the Honourable Minister to repeat her remarks.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes. I'm also asking leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave?

A MEMBER: We should deal with the resolution instead of getting on to something else.

MADAM SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I misunderstood. Do you want to have a question put on this resolution at this point? Is that agreeable? Okay.

All in favour of the resolution then? Opposed? Carried and so ordered.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to make mention in this House of another important group of Manitobans going or already at the Calgary Olympics, and they are, of course, from our rich and first-rate cultural community.

At this time, Madam Speaker, on behalf of all members of the House, I would like to congratulate

four groups who have been invited to be a part of the Olympic Youth Music Showcase. They are as follows: the MacGregor Collegiate Choir, the Edward Schreyer School Senior Orchestra, the River Heights Junior High School Choir and the Harrison Junior High School Junior Choir.

Madam Speaker, I'm sure that all of these groups will be outstanding diplomats for Manitoba at the Calgary Olympics and I am sure all members join me in wishing them well in Calgary.

Let me also mention a number of other groups that have been invited to be a part of the Calgary Olympic Arts Festival. They are: the Manitoba Chamber Orchestra, Prairie Theatre Exchange, Les Danseurs de la Riviere Rouge and the Contemporary Dancers.

Madam Speaker, again, the artistic and cultural talent in Manitoba will be showcased at the Calgary Olympics for all the world to see. On behalf of all members in this House, I offer our congratulations and wish them well.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone on the same issue.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is the MacGregor Collegiate Band that has been invited to attend the Olympics in Calgary and play at a Youth Festival. I would certainly like to congratulate them at this time and wish them well on their trip.

MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, I have a motion of which you were duly notified, that the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I have a motion, seconded by the Member for Portage La Prairie, that the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss this matter of urgent public importance; namely the massive and traumatic increases in automobile insurance rates in this province caused by political interference in the setting of rates, mismanagement of the Autopac Division of MPIC, and the total inconsistency created in the application of discounts for merit driving records.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes to explain the urgency of debate for his motion.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, the people of this province have been shocked, outraged and angry by the recent dramatic, massive and traumatic increases that we have seen in the Autopac rate structures for the 1988 coverage year.

Madam Speaker, these losses that have created this increase in rates have not been explained. We already saw this morning in the House the manoeuvring of the

government to try and put the best possible face on the causes of these increases.

I appeal to the Chair, Madam Speaker, that we will go forward immediately following this statement to discuss, to debate and to publicly air on behalf of the motoring public the problems that we see, the concerns that we see, and start to deal with the crisis of confidence that we have developed in this Crown corporation.

Madam Speaker, the crisis of confidence is a crisis that's been created by the hand of the government opposite. Not only has the public of this province ceased to have confidence in MPIC and Autopac, they have ceased to have confidence in the government that controls the strings of these Crown corporations.

Madam Speaker, we have seen interference on an ad hoc basis that has now destroyed the ability of this Crown corporation, its employees to function, and of reasonable and practicable manner to deal with the ongoing situations that they are facing for the rest of this month.

Madam Speaker, I notice a look of dismay crossing the face of the Minister. It is the very fact that the disorganization and the daily interference that we are now seeing in the operation of this corporation that is leading to the problems that the motoring public is encountering as they go to renew their automobile insurance for the coming year.

There is a sudden financial impact on those people who are approaching the corporation, the monopoly corporation, a corporation from which they have no choice but which to do business. They are the sudden and traumatic financial implications, and we need to urgently discuss these costs, because increased costs and reduced coverage are an immediate reality.

The motoring public of this province has had very little time to deal in financial terms with this. They need the time and they need the consideration and the expertise of the MPIC employees; they need the expertise of the agents when they approach the corporation to buy their insurance; they need the time to consider the coverage that they are being given, to consider the cost of that coverage and to put their personal, financial orders at a preferred position so that they do not have to face any further traumatic decisions after they have to make use of their insurance coverage.

Madam Speaker, it is urgent, it is important and it is critical to the motoring public of this province that they have this time extended to them.

Madam Speaker, we need to know if this corporation will be able to make adjustments, to allow more time to encourage people to purchase their Autopac; we need to know if they are prepared to take steps to allow people to come in earlier and use post-dated cheques; we need to know if they're prepared to increase the ability of the corporation and the agents to deal with the motoring public when they come to the counter.

We're facing a situation, Madam Speaker, where people are - in certain instances - facing doubled insurance costs. These are not frivolous changes; this is not a frivolous question, Madam Speaker. It is urgent and important that this House discuss the problems that are facing this corporation so that we can start to put forward ideas, so that we can start to discuss

with the government opposite the ways and means by which this corporation can deal with the precise problem that a motoring public will be dealing with between now and the end of the month. The time space is narrow; the answers are not forthcoming. The public does not completely understand the discriminatory situation regarding the discounts.

Madam Speaker, we are discriminating against people who arrive in this province with a clean driving record. They can have nothing more than a parking ticket in 20 years, and they cannot get meritorious driving standards in this province. Why don't we encourage people to come to this province?

Madam Speaker, the time has come, and I appeal to your impartiality to grant us this opportunity . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The time has expired. The Honourable Government House Leader has five minutes to address the matter of urgency of debate.

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

I welcome the opportunity to address the remarks made by the member opposite and, as well, to speak to the matter of urgency on this particular debate because, Madam Speaker, this government has shown previous to the opening of this Session, has shown for its entire term, and will continue to show that it welcomes the opportunity to debate issues of significance and importance to Manitobans. We believe that this is just such an issue, and one that we have structured a whole number of ways to ensure that not only is that debate allowed to take place in this House in an appropriate manner, but that debate will take place outside of this House where the people of this province can come forward and address many of the questions which the member opposite put forward and many of the questions which we on this side want to have input and suggestions and constructive criticism from the public on.

But, Madam Speaker, in respect to the actual urgency of this particular debate, I would reference you to Rule No. 287. While the member opposite has appealed to your impartiality, and we all know that you are an impartial Speaker in this Chamber and we all know that those sorts of appeals are not necessary because that is a standard procedure which you have followed as a Speaker, I must appeal as well to your duty to follow the rules of this particular House and the rules as outlined in *Beauchesne*, which is our most noted source of information on the matter of public debates on matters of urgency. Rule No. 287, Madam Speaker, says: "'Urgency' within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately."

Madam Speaker, we are in the middle of a Throne Speech Debate. If the member wishes to stand in his place today after the Mover and the Seconder have made their presentations on the Reply to the Throne Speech, he has ample opportunity, as does any member of this House, to stand in their place and to put forward the types of concerns and questions and even criticisms

that they feel are necessary. We will welcome that opportunity because, as well in that Throne Speech Debate, we have the opportunity to defend what is the best public insurance corporation in the entire country, if not on the entire continent.

Not to say, Madam Speaker, that there are not problems that have to be addressed, and that is why this government is not content to debate it in this House and to defend it stridently and strongly in this House against attacks which we're not certain exactly why they are coming forward in the way in which they are. The Opposition haven't fully flushed out what it is they're really after. Are they after Autopac because, in the past, Madam Speaker, they have very clearly stated what they believe about public insurance in this province and how they are opposed to the very concept right from the very beginning? We won't let them take it away in spite of any problems. We will make the improvements that are necessary to ensure that corporation continues to protect the interests of Manitoba automobile users in this province for decades and generations to come, Madam Speaker.

We have already indicated, Madam Speaker, that we have asked for a commission to meet with the public directly, through a series of public meetings, to discuss the very issues which are so important to the continuation of a healthy Autopac system with Manitobans on a regular basis over the next number of months.

That commission has been asked to talk to Manitobans, generally - and certainly members opposite can involve themselves in that debate at that level - in respect to ways to reduce Autopac costs, in respect to ways to ensure that Autopac rates are fair and equitable, including recognition of good drivers, penalties for poor drivers, experience ratings, alternate time payment plans, replenishing reserves, a whole series of issues which must be addressed in a very serious and in a very sensitive way, Madam Speaker, if we are to improve this corporation to the extent where it continues the tradition that it has taken on for so very long.

So, Madam Speaker, it's not that we do not wish to debate. There are many opportunities for the debate. We know that you have the difficult task of upholding the rules of this House and the rules very clearly, by way of *Beauchesne*, indicate that this debate and that motion is out of order because there are so many other opportunities for the debate. Madam Speaker, over the course of the next few days, over the course of this Session, you will hear us speak out on Autopac in defense of that fine tradition in Manitoba.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: There are two conditions that must be satisfied for this matter to proceed. The first condition has been met in that I received proper notice from the honourable member of his intention to bring this motion to the House.

The second condition is that the debate on the matter is urgent and that there is no other reasonable opportunity to raise the matter. Consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, which

allows discussion on far-ranging matters, is on the Order Paper today and will be discussed today. There is, therefore, immediate and ample opportunity to debate this matter. I rule that the motion is out of order.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, we would challenge your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour, say aye; all those opposed, say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. J. McCRAE: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak (Swan River), Harapiak (The Pas), Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith (Ellice), Smith (Osborne), Storie, Uruski, Walding, Wasylycia-Leis.

NAYS

Blake, Brown, Carstairs, Connery, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Findlay, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, McCrae, Mercier, Mitchelson, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas 28; Nays 23.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried and the ruling of the Chair sustained.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. J. WALDING: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that an humble address be presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, as follows:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present Session.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. J. WALDING: Madam Speaker, may I begin my remarks this morning by making the traditional remarks towards yourself and congratulate you on appearing, once again, in the Chair as the presiding officer of the Assembly? It's good to see you looking hale and hearty and in a position of experience of some two Sessions in dealing with what looks like being a somewhat robust Session.

I should also note that members of the Assembly are looking tanned and fit and healthy and ready for the upcoming Session. I see some anxiety, as well as confidence, in the faces of members around us. I suppose it's a waste of time to ask them to debate with each other and conduct themselves in a sane, sober and logical manner in the forthcoming Session. I can see from the Session this morning that is not likely to happen. There is likely to be some vigorous debate across the House, which is fine, but I should caution members opposite that they should not use this Speaker and the position of the Speaker as a way of getting at the government. The Speaker is not a member of the government. An attack on the Speaker, as a way of attacking the government, is a demeaning thing and it is really bringing the dignity of the House and of the Opposition itself into disrepute.

I can't think of anyone else who should be congratulated around the Assembly, but I do note that we still have not brought in any new bill or new measure that would give the people of the Speaker's constituency the same right of representation in this House as the other 56 constituencies. We still look upon the Speaker as the impartial presiding officer of the House and yet, at the same time, we expect the Speaker to be partial and impartial. Clearly, it's impossible and it puts the Speaker at a disadvantage should there be, and there has occasionally been known to have been, a challenge to the Speaker at the time of the next election. The Speaker can hardly - in Manitoba - run as the Speaker seeking election. Since no political party will refrain from running a party candidate, that Speaker, wishing to continue a political career, must therefore seek the approval of one particular party. To do so would be to end a political career. It makes a mockery of what we say to our students and to the population. Yes, we agree that we have an impartial Speaker who is also partisan and a member of this political party. We really haven't addressed that, whether we will in this Session; I'm not sure, but it should be.

When I was asked just a week ago whether I would move the Throne Speech, I was somewhat surprised. It's a job which is usually given to fairly new or rookie MLA's. When I first did the job, it was back in, I think, 1972 when Pete Adam and I had been here for just a year. Other years it's been handled by other fairly newly elected members. So I wasn't sure. My first inclination was to say thank you, but I would respectfully decline.

But giving it a little bit of thought, it did seem that the Throne Speech is a major debate starting off the Session, giving everybody the opportunity to speak about anything of particular concern - whether it's personal, or constituency, provincial, or national, or just whatever - whether it's praise, criticism, suggestion, just what it happened to be - and knowing from past experience that members during the Throne Speech, and indeed the Budget Speech too, will often rise to make their remarks to an empty press gallery and a

half-empty House, where most of the members there are just filling in the time and being slightly bored at the same time, this I felt was a time when I would get the attention maybe of a goodly number of members and of the press gallery too, and it really does my political soul no end of good to see such rapt attention from the members. I'm not sure whether they're expecting to be entertained or amused or challenged or provoked, or whether it's simply a politeness that they're sitting and watching. I'd like to think it was mostly politeness because I don't think that I can entertain or amuse any of the members that might be sitting around here.

Madam Speaker, members deal with all sorts of things at a Throne Speech, and it is usual for a rookie member, when moving or seconding that Throne Speech, early on in a parliamentary career, that there is keenness and enthusiasm there by the new member who is most likely to praise what his government has done. With a view to a future career and the advancement within that career, he is most likely to want to impress those people in a position to advance his career. And so, movers and seconders of Throne Speeches have tended to be rather complimentary to the government and of what it has done.

A MEMBER: What's your motive?

MR. J. WALDING: I'll tell you what my motive is, just wait a minute.

I wanted to deal this morning with three topics, Madam Speaker. The first one came about because of the thought that I'd given this matter over the last week as to what I would deal with and in what way it would be dealt with, and that is the overall perception that Manitobans have of the administration of the province. The second one is Autopac. And I also want to deal with - if there is sufficient time - the matter of health care in this province. I believe that is one of the most important matters before us at the moment and of grave concern to the people of Manitoba.

But first, that first thing that I was talking about, and it has been referred to on a number of occasions this morning and of recent times in the last month of the protest that has welled up over Autopac and the things that have happened - the increases, the rebate issue and the policies taken to ameliorate those increases. It has been paralleled at the same time, we have found out from a couple of polls, that support for the government has fallen drastically and that the support for the Conservatives has increased again quite dramatically. Whether those two things have occurred over the same month and during the same time spell, and whether one is the result of the other and the two are linked together, I don't think so personally. It may well be. And obviously members across the way consider that the drop in government popularity is because of, and linked closely to, those matters of Autopac increase.

I happen to consider that Autopac is simply a symbol of a number of other things, that Autopac has been a lens, if you like, that has focused and brought into a position that people can enunciate more clearly the increases that we have seen as symptomatic of a number of other underlying factors.

MR. H. ENNS: I would think so, yes. They've worked hard . . .

MR. J. WALDING: Okay, I've spoken to a number of people recently, mostly New Democrats, who have said that they would never vote NDP again. A number of New Democrats have told me that they have torn up their cards, and perhaps even more quietly declined to renew their membership and to separate themselves from the party that they have supported for a long time.

This makes me curious and I always say, well why? And the first thing that is mentioned to me is Autopac, something about Autopac, the rates or the record of the last year or something. But that's always the first issue that's given to me. Fair enough. So I ask them, well is there anything else. What else is there? That is where people will tell me any one of a number of things. Sometimes if I press them, they will think a little bit and give me one or two other things, but Autopac is the focus that people have but it's only a symptom of a number of other things.

They have difficulty putting into words what exactly the problem is. A problem which cannot be defined cannot really be solved. If something is to be cured, first of all, we have to define what the problem is and we're half-way to finding a solution for it. If the problem is not defined, any solution which is stumbled on is purely coincidental and rather wild.

Let me then attempt to put into words, however imperfectly, what I think is that underlying perception that people have of the administration after six years or is it seven years of this government. Where do we stand? What is the position? I'm going to put it across as criticism, if you like, of where the government is. If the government takes it and uses it as constructive criticism, fine. Something might come out of it. If they don't, it'll simply be wasted. Anyway . . .

The average householder in this province usually knows that there are things to do around the house. Maybe the roof needs repairing a little bit and it would be nice to have a new carpet and maybe we should get a new dining room suite. The stove is on its last legs, and maybe a landscaping would add to the attractiveness of the garden. A different car would make transportation costs a little bit less. In fact, it would be nice to take Caribbean holiday for a month this year. But the householder knows that he cannot afford to do all of those things at the same time. Maybe he can afford to do some of them.

He checks his bank balance, how much money he has. He checks his income for the year and how much his expenses are, and whether he can afford to put the money in that particular area. If something has to be financed over the years to come, again that has to be given consideration because that is limited for most of us - there are not that many of us who are millionaires. The householder will prioritize the things that need to be done and he will trade off safety against convenience and preventive measures against transportation and lifestyle and things like that, and generally put in some sort of order of priorities those things that ought to be done and those things that maybe ought to be done, and maybe those things that can be put off for next year and, if he's wise, leaving a little bit of money on the side for unforeseen disasters, emergencies, which

always crop up in the lives of householders. That we all know, too.

Governments operate slightly differently, perhaps very differently. When a government comes into office, it finds that it has the responsibility for administering a large number of different programs that have been in effect, a number of different taxes, institutions, different programs, systems of health and education and other systems in every different department. They together constitute a charge on the public purse that has to be paid for and administered, and generally handled in an efficient manner for this year, next year, almost every year into the future.

At the same time as that, every government comes into office with certain things that it wants to do. So it puts into effect a program here, a program there. Perhaps every department has a couple of programs all to be put in at the same time.

This government has done that over the last six years, introduced a number of different programs. Each of those programs has a cost, not for only this year but it locks it in for next year and the year after that at an escalating rate, because it goes up. Every time the government builds a new capital facility, it's not only the cost of that new institution or that building which goes up. It locks in an operating expenditure for next year and for every year to come.

Of all the programs that the government has brought in over the last seven years, I am sure that each program taken on its merits can be justified and has been justified, has been researched, debated and agreed to and then brought into the House. This has happened on a large number of occasions, and the government then finds itself with a larger number of programs that have to be run and administered and have to be paid for as well.

But is the forest of government programs to be paid for made up of those individual programs that are put in there, or does the government approach it from the other side and say, this is the size of the forest that we have, and we have to divide our resources up into the programs that we presently have? I suspect that it's the former rather than the latter.

The government then finds itself with the problem of paying for all of this, and it turns to its trusty Minister of Finance every year, and asks him to do his very best to pay for these commitments that have been made.

A MEMBER: Pull rabbits out of a hat.

MR. J. WALDING: Pull rabbits out of the hat, yes, but rabbits really don't pay for programs. Dollars do, and they have to be found from somewhere.

So the Minister of Finance in a rather awkward position looks around to see which taxes can we increase? What new sources of revenue does the government have? What new thing can we tax? You know, there used to be an expression in the army that if it moves, salute it, and if it doesn't, paint it. I'm afraid government philosophy tends to be: if it moves, then tax it, and if it doesn't move, put a tax on it. That is the perception that people are getting out there.

When they see all of these taxes, some of them are regressive. Some of them are not as progressive as they could be, like the sales tax. You have the

employment tax which has a name that I cannot remember — (Interjection) — whatever.

But at the same time, the Minister doesn't cover all of these outgoes, and so there is a deficit. He is borrowing money, and not just to build bridges and schools and houses and other things, which can be amortized the same as the householder amortizes the cost of the house that he's buying. But the Minister is also borrowing money to operate the province on, and that's a situation that simply cannot occur. If you tell your neighbour or people that the province is borrowing money and it's like you, as the householder, being short of money to pay for groceries at the end of the year and you borrow money to pay for it, the householder knows that he has to pay that money back and so he won't do it. He knows that's the route to bankruptcy. Yet he sees his government doing that, and that is not going to inspire confidence.

At the same time that the government has its group of programs that it has brought in and is looking at bringing in more in this Session and next Session, there is the expectation by the average Manitoban out there that the government is looking after things, that somebody is looking after the store and saying, this thing is more important than that thing. We will increase the size of this pie and we will draw back a little bit over here. We will expect this to happen. We expect the province to be in a certain position in three years time, in five years time, maybe some idea of what it will be like in ten years time, but this is what we are planning. This is the way we think the province is going. But people are not sure that is happening. People are not sure who's in charge of the store or, more frighteningly, is anyone in charge of the store.

At the same time that these new things are happening and new programs are being brought in, Manitobans expect that their government will be in charge of existing programs, Crown corporations, institutions and everything else. They expect the odd mistake now and then, but Manitobans will forgive a particular foul-up in one area now and then, once every five years or so.

But the public expect that the government will have its fire extinguishers. It has a Minister in charge of putting out fires and, when a brush fire starts somewhere, they will get onto it, deal with it and, when another one breaks out somewhere else, that someone will be there to deal with it. But the public asks: Why do we lose these large numbers of millions of dollars on reinsurance? Did that happen just overnight, or has that been happening over many years in the past? If it has been allowed to happen over many years, who was looking at it? Who was in charge? Who was responsible for putting out that little brush fire? The question is raised: Did the deficits in the compensation system happen overnight and how many years has it been that the government or the Compensation Board or whoever is responsible has been running an illegal deficit for a number of years? But that didn't happen overnight. It's been happening for several years. It's been building up. It's a little brush fire that should have been snuffed out some time ago.

There is the matter of Child and Family Services which was not fully understood by the average Manitoban out there and not by many of us either, but we read in the press that there are problems, that children have died. Something should be done. Are there sufficient

resources out there to do it and, if not, why not? Shouldn't they be given the money? Who is in charge of the store? How many children have to die before something is done?

When it comes to MTX, did we lose that money one night when somebody tripped over in the desert and spilled out \$27 million under the sand? Of course not! It's been happening and developing over the years. There have been enough things said. The Auditor has made enough reference to it that somebody ought to be out there with a fire extinguisher saying, we cannot have this brush fire. It doesn't reflect well on the competence of the government. Let's deal with it, let's get on with it. There are possibly other examples too, but at the same time, people expect their government not only to be looking after today's things, not only those things that have developed in years past, but of what is coming in six months, a year, or two years.

There are things, just for example, the Member for River Heights mentioned a couple of things this morning. There's a matter of job retraining for workers who are laid off for technological reasons. There is a matter that we live in the information age and that it is the exchange of information which is the source of power in the province rather than manufacturing which has been the source of the capacity to raise taxes in the past. There is a change. Does the government have on its shelf somewhere a binder with a way of dealing with these particular problems? So when the problem develops and something needs to be done, the government can say, oh, we have all of this in a binder. We've looked at it. We have done that research, we have our plans and this is how we intend to handle it. You know people respect a government which has done that. They will say, oh, here's a government that's on top of the problem, they know what they're doing. They have competence; they can be supported in the next election because they have shown competence and capability to do all of these things.

Manitobans also see that the government has a number of - what are they called? - communicators or public relations. There are less complimentary words, I am sure, but the average worker in this province paints his fence and mows his lawn, goes to work and does his job. He doesn't need a communicator or a public relations person to tell people that yes, he's doing his job. — (Interjection) — Yes, that's what he gets paid for.

But the average Manitoban looks at the government and sees a number - quite a large number - of people in public relations whose job is, apparently, to tell people that the government is doing its job, is doing what it intends to do. If that is not bad enough, occasionally, sometimes those communicators are paid not to tell the people of Manitoba what the government is not doing properly. There is some hiding, glossing over, shunting on one side of things that the average Manitobans see.

At the same time that these are raising questions in the minds of the average Manitoban out there, does it see a government that's putting all its efforts and concentrating everything on the Manitoba store that we have here, or does it see that the government of this province is turning its eyes towards Ottawa on matters of federal-provincial relations, cost sharing, balances of payments for health system, a number of

constitutional efforts and, in particular, what seems to be taking a lot of the Provincial Government's present energies is the matter of the free trade agreement, which is undoubtedly a federal responsibility. They clearly have legal and constitutional responsibilities and duties for carrying on negotiations with other countries. The average Manitoban, I suggest, doesn't see that the Government of Manitoba really has too much point in getting involved with what are essentially international affairs.

One further thing that concerns me - the economy of this province is doing well; people have money in their pockets, they're working; the participation rate is probably as high as its ever been; we're in the midst of a mini-boom; unemployment is very low; there are a large number of new small businesses starting up, providing employment and they are a stimulus to the economy; we're doing well - but I have this nagging question as to whether we are doing well because of Limestone and because of the North of Portage money that's gone in there. That's public money that we have been borrowing to pay for these things. Our economy is good on borrowed money. People are working. The costs involved with unemployment are as low as they have ever been, while at the same time revenues, because of this buoyant economy, are flowing steadily into government coffers.

Do I have the Minister of Finance's attention? I certainly hope so.

But that mini-boom time will not continue. There will be a recession or a depression - I don't know when. It might happen this year or next year, but as sure as Manitoba's history is one of booms and bust times, there will be a recession, maybe a depression, and I hope it won't go any further than that. But when that comes, when that happens, Manitoba will have its huge debt - which requires servicing - and is the first claim on revenues from the people of Manitoba every year.

At the same time businesses will retrench, money will not be spent because of the recession that is there and people will be laid off from work. The unemployment numbers in absolute terms will go up. There will generally be a tightening of the economy. The government will find itself, at the same time, facing larger expenditures because of the unemployment, at the same time that its revenues from the economy and from income tax and from sales and that sort of thing is decreasing, and it's a vicious cycle too.

The more recession that you get, the more people draw back; the more that revenues decrease at the same time that demands from the unemployed and the costs involved with that are increasing. That's a particular concern that I have.

We've been doing well in this province, but are we doing well on borrowed money? The day of reckoning will come, whether it's next year or the year after.

These have been the things - I seem to be rapidly running out of time, and it's not likely that I would get to a couple of the other things. But what I've tried to show are a number of the concerns that the average Manitoban has.

He hasn't necessarily been able to put them into words and really has not been able to define for himself and for others just where the problem is. But I believe that there is a problem that has been reflected not only in what people have said but in the public opinion

polls which were produced about a week ago. Those, I don't think, were the cause of Autopac. Autopac was merely the reflection of the focus, the symbol if you like, of a number of underlying facts that people know. Neither one on its own would probably be enough to make them turn the government out of office, but when you get all of them together they form a cumulative objection that people have.

The government will probably turn around and say, that's nothing new, we know all about that; we've heard all of those problems before. We're dealing with them; they're in hand. We really don't need any more criticism from you. We're getting enough from the Conservatives opposite.

If they take that point of view then my remarks will have been wasted, and I might as well not have said them. But if they take them as they are meant, as a constructive assessment, if you like, of the present situation in the province, maybe the topic once defined can be addressed and maybe it can be cured.

I think that it won't be cured in the same way that the '84 crisis in government support was that the Government simply pulled back and kept its head down and did nothing for two years. Fine, it worked. Support for the Government crept up pretty steadily over two years to about what it had been before or pretty close. I cannot see that that approach will be effective at this particular time. Something is going to have to be done and should be done if the government ever hopes to increase its popularity again.

May I try to move on, Madam Speaker, to Autopac itself, and certainly I have a couple of questions to raise on that. I see that my light is flashing, Madam Speaker, and I'm probably getting very close to the end of my remarks. I wonder if members would be inclined to grant me leave to make just a few remarks on Autopac itself?

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

MR. J. WALDING: I do thank honourable members for that indulgence and I will attempt to keep my remarks as small as possible - as short as possible.

Let me say first of all that I have been very proud of Autopac. I think that it was a great system of insurance for cars. It came in back in 1970 - I believe that was a year before I was elected into this House - but I did take a part in the struggle of '70 in getting Autopac in and showing the Government of the Day that there was a good deal of support out there for a system that would concentrate on car accident claims and not spend its money in the court with one insurance company taking another insurance company to court - a system that would keep our money in this province where it would go to roads, hospitals and schools, etc., etc., and one which would pay out to motorists well over 80 percent of their premium dollar, which itself was considerably more than the private companies were.

Autopac was, I think, generally seen as the jewel in the crown of the Schreyer Government of those years; it was generally well accepted by Manitobans.

Manitobans have been, I think, pleased with Autopac over the years. I have been proud of it and, quite frankly,

I have boasted of Autopac on a number of different occasions. But I find that something has happened this year. Autopac, over one year, has lost \$40 million. How did it manage to lose \$40 million in one year and can it be only one year that has caused those losses or is it the previous year as well or the year before that?

Do we not expect that the people who are running Autopac, whomever that may be - and there may be some doubt as to who is running the store - should they not know a year ago that costs are heading up and that something should be done about it? Should they not know two years ago?

I don't know, but I know that you should expect an efficient corporation to manage these affairs on a basis that shouldn't need a \$40 million increase in one year plus the \$23 million which apparently are attributable to losses in previous years.

Let me get to a couple of specifics. A few years ago I made the inquiry of someone, a figure, who probably naively - do we have no claims bonuses on our insurance the same way that many private insurance companies do? I was told - perhaps a little condescendingly - that no, we don't do that; that's not our policy. Our policy is to give everybody the cheapest rate. But to put on surcharges for poor drivers or bad drivers, drivers with bad records, okay, I can accept that, but this was a different principle to a private company.

About a month or so ago I renewed my house insurance, which I hold with MPIC. The rate had gone up but not by a great deal, but I was told that I was eligible for a 20 per cent bonus because I'd made no claim on Autopac, on MPIC, for the last couple of years or whatever the time lapse, for a 20 percent no-claims bonus.

So I have to raise the question: Why is Autopac giving a no-claims bonus on houses and presumably on households, other things, but it doesn't do the same over this side when it comes to car insurance? Do the two different divisions of Autopac not talk to each other? Doesn't the left hand know what the right hand is doing? How can Autopac or how can MPIC hold these two conflicting principles that on the one hand there is no no-claims bonus; on the hand, yes, there is a no-claims bonus? Perhaps the Minister will tell us some time. If that wasn't bad enough - and yes, they are two different divisions and I suppose it's possible for each division of MPIC to have a different policy. Fair enough.

I read in the newspaper, in the Free Press, not a month ago that there is to be some change in the rebate system for commercial carrier fleets and that the amount of rebate, and by not having a claim or having a reduced claim - it wasn't called a no-claims bonus, it was called a rebate or something, but the principle is the same thing - that some reduction is given because of a reduced payout on the part of Autopac. But this was not the General Division; this is Autopac. What it was doing was giving a form of rebate, a no-claims bonus to those carrier owners, registrants, who kept their payouts under a certain amount.

So what we find out is that there is no claims bonus for you and I, the average motorist, but there has been for carriers. Again, that is two different principles within the same division. Yet, at the same time, there was the announcement in the Press, referring to this, stated - was to the effect - that this particular rebate was to be discontinued.

Now I phoned Autopac about it to query whether the facts were right and they told me yes, that as of this year it was a bit too complicated or for some reason it was being discontinued, but it had been in effect for many, many years in Autopac. But someone was getting a no-claims bonus, but I wasn't getting a no-claims bonus.

We see as of a month ago that there was an announcement of some fairly sharp increases in the Manitoba rates, probably justified on strictly business reasons, that to run the corporation efficiently this is what should be done. And then there was an announcement at a fairly late date that something was to be done about it and members who had merit points were to get some sort of a no-claims bonus. Maybe it wasn't called that, but they would get it.

Whether that was properly thought out and whether sufficient thought was given to that, I rather doubt. I would guess that the Minister had probably planned to do something for next year, but because of the present conditions, had been persuaded or persuaded himself that it should be done this year. That brought up problems of itself and I happen to approve of giving drivers with good records or merit points some break in the amount of insurance that they are paying.

Now it so happens that Manitoban drivers who are bad drivers outside of this province and get some violation or accident or something like that will find that that bad driving record somehow finds its way back to Manitoba and they will find on their driver's licence that they have a number of demerit points for it, which is fair enough. We don't expect there to be two standards of driving, good in this province and bad when you cross our border. Okay, those demerit points mean that there is an additional charge on their insurance for those Manitobans who obtain their demerits outside.

But the reverse also happens that people move into this province from other provinces and I have had a number of calls from people who have moved here from New Brunswick, as far west as Alberta and as far north as the Northwest Territories, and they have told me that yes, they were good drivers, that they had no accidents or violations in their own particular province that they came from, and that had they driven in Manitoba in the same way that they would be eligible for merits on their driving licence, but they don't get them. We say if you're a bad driver outside, if you're a Manitoban and you get some demerits, that's tough, you're going to pay more; but if you're a good driver and you move here, then surely equity would demand that both merits and demerits were recognized.

Now surely the Minister could rise beyond this discriminatory aspect of it and perhaps make himself very popular, at least, in this Chamber and amongst those constituents of mine who have phoned me, by recognizing that some people have come to Manitoba and that they are not necessarily bad drivers. They have brought here their good record with them. Do we not recognize them? Can we not be big enough to say, yes, we will recognize you in the same manner that we will recognize Manitobans who have lived here for so long?

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank members of the House for giving me the indulgence of a few extra minutes and I do not wish to stand and take any more

of the time. Let me sit down and defer to the Honourable Member for Burrows who is to be the next speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina with a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, since we were so generous to grant leave of the House, I wonder if the House might grant leave for a question to the Honourable Member for St. Vital?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member can choose whether he cares to answer a question or not, I believe, although his time has expired.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. J. WALDING: Madam Speaker, I don't wish to take from the time of the Honourable Member for Burrows, but if the Member for Pembina can keep his question short, I will try to give a short answer.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, given the abysmal record that the Member for St. Vital has alluded to in the last six-and-a-half years of NDP Government under Premier Pawley, can we assume from his remarks on the Throne Speech Debate that he will be voting against this Throne Speech Debate and triggering an election in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. J. WALDING: Madam Speaker, that facetious question is really not worthy of reply.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

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

Initially, I wish to congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor for his Speech from the Throne, focusing on the most important and up-to-date issues of public policy in this province.

The Speech from the Throne centred around important issues, among which includes the anticipated adverse Implications of the U.S.-Canada instant trade deal on the sector of agriculture in this province; the issue of job creation, promotion, and diversification of our provincial economy through such initiatives like the Jobs Fund, the Careerstart Program, the Job Training Program, the Youth Business Start Program and the Community Assets Program; in taking up the challenges facing Manitobans in the area of health care with emphasis on health prevention rather than curing the disease afterwards, and encouraging healthier lifestyles among our people; in the initiative to balance the traditional in-patient institutional care with a more expanded program of community health centre delivery system; in regulating, for example, the habit of smoking in public places and expanding the educational program on AIDS for the enlightenment of the population; and, finally, in affording needed protection in the marketplace to consumers and protection to the workers in their workplaces.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital deserves some recognition for his continuing commitment to the cause

of social democracy in this province. The Honourable Member for St. Vital has devoted lengthy years of his life, faithfully serving this province and this Legislative Assembly since he was elected in 1971, and has been re-elected at least five times. I admire him and salute him for his courage of conviction to express his views which are not necessarily identical with the official party position.

I also wish to extend my gratitude to the electorate of the Burrows constituency for their continuing opportunity that they afforded me, that I may be able to represent them in this Legislative Assembly, and their personal code of political beliefs, among which I subscribe to are the following:

- (1) that a public office is a position of public trust;
- (2) that government exists for the benefit of the governed;
- (3) that citizens have a right to know the basis and reasons for public decisions that affect them.

I also wish to thank the people of my constituency of Burrows in acknowledging the monumental achievements of the social democratic government in this province since 1969. Sometimes, in the heat of the moment, we tend to forget those important advances in our social institutions. We have helped in instituting universal Medicare with no premium, with no user fees. We have initiated a program of Pharmacare for our senior citizens. We have initiated a system of non-profit government subsidized day-care centres for children of working mothers.

Also, I want to thank the members, the people of the constituency of Burrows, for also reminding this government not to take them for granted as well, and for reminding this government of the policy mistakes of sometimes sacrificing basic human needs, social needs for the sake of fiscal restraints.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital had asked some questions: Who is tending the store? Who is in charge? Those questions simply inspire me, as an academic, to ask more basic philosophical and political questions. But these are important questions. How come some people govern over other people? How come some people have more power, and influence the lives and destiny of other people? In other words, how does government emerge in our society? I also want to ask, given that government has come about and emerged in our society, what institutions of government are actually governing in our western democratic society. — (Interjection) — Yes. And when they govern, I ask who is really in charge? Who is really governing?

Finally, if I can identify those who are really doing the governing, how can that system of government, that set of institutions in government, how can it be made, how can it be transformed into a service-oriented and service-fulfilling instrument that they may truly become government of the people, by the people and for the people?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. C. SANTOS: So I ask my first question: How come some people can rule over other people? How do governments in general arise in our society? What is the explanation?

In every society, there is always a scarcity of resources. The resources are both material like assets and property and money, or non-material like knowledge, respect, influence.

It is generally the case that individuals in their individual capacity and groups of individuals in their collective capacity as groups are vying against one another for some control of these resources that they may promote their respective interests. So there are individual interests and group interests that are vying to take hold of these resources, limited today in society.

So inevitably there will be conflicts between individuals, among individuals. There will be conflicts between groups and among groups. If there is no means of peacefully resolving such conflict in society, every individual and every group will resort to self-help, and that will be the end of civilized society.

Therefore, society has evolved as a result of the wisdom of the ages of our forefathers. Society has evolved certain normative rules for the resolution of conflicts peacefully, and also certain mechanisms for the enforcement of these rules in order that the resolution may be enforced peacefully. These rules and mechanisms, throughout the experience of humankind, have been institutionalized into a unified structure of power and authority which is now recognized and personified as the state in that society.

The state, compared to any other entity and any other institution, is unique in the sense that it has a successful claim to the exclusive use of coercion to enforce its will, and it can do so in a legitimate manner. Only the state can sequester an individual's property. Only the state can imprison an individual against his will. No other entity, no other institution in society has this right. There are many other sub-governing institutions in society, but none of them exercise or has successfully made a claim to the legitimate use of coercion in enforcing its will. That is the unique distinction of the state.

Now, in the olden days, someone said he is acting in the name of the state, and when the people ask by what right are you ruling over us, and the king will say by the divine right of kings. Vox dei vox. The voice of the king is the voice of God. That is the justification. Now when the king becomes so arrogant and says I am above the law - just like King Louis of France who said I am the law, I am the state - then the king violated a higher law which says whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased and whoever shall humble himself shall be exalted. That was an eternal law, a higher law which the king on the secular war had violated and King Louis lost his head in the guillotine, because all the powers, all institutions - I believe - in the universe and in this society were ultimately established by the eternal power of the Almighty.

Where there is no power but of God, the powers that would be are ordained of God. I believe that elementary institutions in a democratic society are ordained so that there be order, stability and peaceful resolution of conflicts and peaceful transition of power in society.

Knowing that institutions of government are really ordained and established to have peace, stability, order, peaceful resolution of conflicts in society, the next question I ask is who really runs those institutions in our society, those institutions of government?

In terms of the Member for St. Vital, who are in charge? If we look at our western societies, we can

imagine a triangle - three sides, three corners, but only one triangle - it's like the Trinity. At the top of the triangle is the Legislative Assembly - Parliament. It has the power to legislate; it lays down the law.

On the other corner was the established administrative bureaucracy. It implements and carries out the law, a jump to the administrative establishment or the public service or some other independent administrative agencies. And on the other last corner there are the courts. They interpret the law. I call this three core institutions in our society that are ordained so that there would be order in society. This is the secular trinity of political sovereignty. Power passes ubiquitously between and along those three corners and power is being exercised sometimes in competition, sometimes in cooperation among these three core institutions in our society. The claim of parliament of the Legislature is that they are the only ones that are really elected by the people, and so, the doctrine of legislative supremacy. It must have the last say in case there is a difference of opinion among the three core institutions in society. That's only right because they are the only ones who are accountable to the people.

The third question I ask is if two of these corners are exercising the powers of sovereignty without being accountable, should they really have the last say in any social issue? That is just a question. If that is so, how can we make these three core institutions exercise their political power over persons' lives, freedom and

property in a service-oriented and service-fulfilling manner that they may truly serve the divine purpose for the orderly and civil governance of mankind in organized society?

But the trouble with our modern society now is quite different with the old society. As I said, the old political formula was that I, as king, am the voice of the Almighty. That had been changed across the years when people refused to accept that and so we have the age of revolutions in the United States, in France, in Russia, and they changed the formula. They say the voice of the king is not the voice of God, it is the voice of the people that is the voice of God, vox populi, vox Dei.

So if the people are the sovereign and the ultimate seat of the power to rule, then we can see that the people really must govern and rule themselves. But how can they do it directly when there are so many of them? And so they have designed and devised our system of representative government, and said I am going to entrust you with this position as our representative in the Legislative Assembly and, as our trustee, you be faithful to the trust.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, I am interrupting the honourable member who will have 19 minutes remaining when this matter is again before the House.

The hour being 12:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 Monday next.