

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 13 May, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: The Honourable Member for Elmwood has 30 minutes remaining.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Madam Speaker, I see that the Opposition MLA's are in a much spicier mood than they were a few hours ago. In view of the fact that many of the MLA's weren't here when I started, I think I might just start over.

Madam Speaker, at this stage in the Twentieth Century, it is apparent that the traditional nuclear family is no longer the sole means of providing for the needs of children. For a variety of reasons, there are now more single-parent families and families where both parents are employed in full-time jobs. The result of this evolution is that there is a greater demand for child care services. Affordable high quality day care services are necessary for a variety of reasons.

First, day care may be necessary because a single parent needs a place for his or her son or daughter to go while the parent works or goes to school. Second, many families have two working parents and therefore need a place for their child or children to go while they pursue their careers. Finally, some parents recognize that day care in itself provides a valuable learning experience for their children. The interaction with groups of children of similar age is an exceptional socialization experience for the children as it stresses qualities such as cooperation and social interaction which are necessary in child development.

In the past, this government's record with respect to child care has been outstanding. Spending on child care programs has doubled since 1982. The government introduced and passed The Community Child Day Care Standards Act; one of the best pieces of legislation of its kind in the country. This government's unique day care workers training program allows day care workers to upgrade their skills while keeping their jobs in day care facilities.

Since day care facilities are better and more accessible when they are provided on a "not-for-profit" basis the government will continue its efforts by increasing funding for non-profit day care centres. Day care has become an essential service and I share the Premier's view when he stated that "Building our future together means better access to better quality child care."

Madam Speaker, most of us in this House have experienced or know of people who have experienced the frustration of being told that "we would love to hire you, but you have no experience." This situation is all too common for young people in this province. This dilemma, which generates frustration and produces a sense of hopelessness, need not persist. It has become almost a cliché to say that our young people represent the future of the province.

Rather than standing still, and simply echoing the cliché so often heard from federal politicians, this

government is prepared to act. The government has indicated that it will continue its support with for the STEP Employment Program and the Careerstart Program. These programs give young people the needed experience which increases their employability and serves to boost their levels of self-confidence.

The present level of youth unemployment cannot be allowed to continue. I urge the government to make every effort possible to ensure that young people seeking jobs have a fair chance. Also I urge young people through you, Madam Speaker, to organize and present their demands to governments, at both the federal and provincial levels. Through your collective efforts, you, the young people of Manitoba can make a difference.

Madam Speaker, the bulk of my remarks so far have dealt with the government's plan of action for the next Session. I recognize that any government is constrained, to a certain extent, by forces over which it has little control. Manitoba's government is no different in this regard. As one province within a federal system, we are constrained by the fact that the policies of the Federal Government have a great influence on us, but we have only a limited influence on them. Additionally, Canada's economy is highly influenced by actions and inactions which are part of a diverse international economy.

Having said that, however, there are a few policy areas that I would like to see more attention given to. The first area that I believe requires consideration is that of members' services.

Madam Speaker, as members of this Assembly, we have a variety of tasks and duties to attend to. We have House duties which require research and preparation whether it be for question period, committee duties or dealing with the Estimates process.

Since 1945, governments throughout Canada have expanded their duties. In a complex society, it makes sense that governments and their activities expand beyond the traditional areas once thought to be adequate. For members to be able to participate fully in the sphere of larger governments, their needs must be met. Being a member of the Assembly for most of us is indeed a full-time job, and we therefore need greater resources to meet the demands and responsibilities incumbent upon us as members.

As elected representatives, we must not forget that perhaps our first obligation is to our constituents. This means, Madam Speaker, that we must keep them informed of government activities and we must, as much as possible, involve our constituents in the political process. This means that members need an office located in their constituency where they can meet constituents and receive inquiries and disseminate information which concerns them. The present \$2,500 constituency allowance is inadequate. The constituency allowance is not even enough to pay the necessary rent for an office. Even if a member can afford an office, equipping that office with staff, even if it is of a part-time nature, and supplies necessary to carry out your duties, is impossible.

Madam Speaker, members of the Saskatchewan Legislature are provided with almost \$11,000 each for constituency office staff. Additionally, each member receives up to \$800 per month for rent for a constituency office. In Alberta, members receive almost \$15,000 per year for constituency staff and office space. I am not saying that we must adopt these particular allowances, although they seem like an excellent starting point for discussion in our province. Madam Speaker, I recommend to the government and indeed to all members of this Assembly that we establish as a goal for this present Session a plan to discuss and adopt measures to upgrade allowances for members so that we can meet the challenges and responsibilities entrusted to us as elected representatives.

Madam Speaker, the people of this province need affordable life insurance programs that are designed to meet their needs. Also, people need suitable pension programs that are set up with pensioners' interests in mind, not the interests of financial institutions. Presently, life insurance and pension services are provided by a variety of financial institutions. These institutions rather than seeking to provide services that meet the needs of their clients, provide services that are designed to maximize their profits.

It was the NDP Government in this province that led the way with respect to ensuring that automobile insurance is provided universally and at rates that all can afford. The experiment, begun in the Seventies, has proven its worth and now it's time that we move into government sponsored life insurance and pension management programs. The government should, either through the present MPIC structure or another similarly constituted body, introduce enabling legislation so that the province can compete with existing life insurance and pension companies. This competition would serve to enhance the options available to Manitobans. Such a plan would also generate revenue which the government could use in the expansion of existing social programs. The government sponsored life insurance and pension services program would serve a dual purpose: (1) it would guarantee that Manitobans have options regarding their insurance and pension needs; and (2) it provides an innovative and new source of needed revenue to pay for the provision of services.

Continuing on this insurance topic, Madam Speaker, we need to enter into a debate concerning the area of limiting liability claims. I recognize that this is a sensitive area and that only now are the necessary studies and analysis being conducted. However, we must recognize that many people are facing huge increases in the cost of liability insurance or cannot get coverage at all.

Hospitals, municipalities and other parties are presently being forced to pay ridiculously high insurance premiums. We must recognize that innovative ways of reducing these costs are required and I therefore urge the government to take the steps necessary to begin a process that would examine the whole area of increased insurance costs and recommend suitable alternatives. Without wishing to prejudice such an inquiry's finding, we must be prepared to examine the costs and benefits of limiting liability claims as well as other measures, such as the formation of insurance pools or co-ops.

Corporate concentration is becoming exacerbated in the area of the financial services sectors. The recent

takeovers and attempted takeovers underscore the need for a full review of the whole financial services sector. As a social democratic party, Madam Speaker, we should be leading the calls for a review of this sector of the economy. Studies must be initiated to review the whole range of financial services. This government should be prepared to examine the advantages of providing full competition with the private sector.

We should examine the advantages for consumers of providing mortgages, RRSPs and other services by government-sponsored banking-like structures. The NDP Government of the 1970's pursued this area by introducing measures calling for the establishment of treasury branches and we should re-examine those proposals and revise them accordingly to meet the new demands that we face in the 1980's and beyond.

The present Conservative Government in Ottawa is revising the Bank Act with a view towards allowing a greater integration within the financial services sector. This plan, if adopted, would produce one-stop shopping in the financial services industry. The Government of Manitoba must be a full and active participant in this review and must ensure that the interests of Manitobans are well represented.

Madam Speaker, one of the most important themes of our campaign was "Stand up for Manitoba." In fact, the theme was so well known throughout the province that people were humming along when the theme song was heard on the radio and the television.

Madam Speaker, we are faced with a Conservative Government in Ottawa that's so possessed with making this country more and more like the United States. They are quick to adopt the buzz words so frequently used by the Reagan administration. One such buzz word is "deregulation." The present "deregulation" path that the Federal Government is on is a dangerous one; dangerous because it puts the interests of a few corporations ahead of the public interest.

Regulation in industries, such as airlines, railroads, telephones and trucking is necessary to protect the interests of consumers, as well as the service sector. Regulation and standard settings are used to establish safety requirements and to provide protection for certain markets that would otherwise be abandoned.

American experience with deregulation is particularly enlightening. Deregulation in the telephone industry has resulted in job losses and increased telephone rates for local users. The mindless competition between huge corporations has meant poorer service for ordinary telephone customers and has expanded service for high volume users such as larger companies.

Deregulation in the airline industry has meant reduced service to smaller centres; poorer service on existing airlines; and industry-wide chaos leading to bankruptcies and unemployment. There is also mounting evidence suggesting that for companies to survive they are cutting costs in safety-related areas, such as aircraft inspection and maintenance, and now we see aircraft falling out of the sky.

If the Federal Government is allowed to continue on its present deregulation course, Manitoba could be particularly hard hit. Complete airline deregulation would undoubtedly mean that remote Northern communities would lose existing airline service or at least the cost of existing service would become prohibitively high.

Tuesday, 13 May, 1986

Manitobans enjoy some of the lowest telephone rates in Canada. Telephone deregulation would threaten this and there's a real danger that the Government of Manitoba could lose its regulatory authority over the MTS.

Deregulation in the trucking industry would be particularly devastating for Manitoba. Traditionally the trucking industry has been based on east-west flows of traffic and deregulation of the kind outlined by the Federal Transport Minister would increase north-south flows and open the Manitoba market to large American trucking firms, and this would have serious negative consequences for Manitoba truckers and may well threaten the livelihoods of many smaller independent firms.

Madam Speaker, history has demonstrated that unfettered competition simply does not work. Rather than pursuing industry-wide deregulation of the kind outlined in the Nielsen Report, governments should be working towards improving present regulatory structures. In short, we must stand up to protect the interests of all Manitobans, where these interests are threatened by federal politicians.

The present deregulation mindset that the Federal Government is in will lead to the exchange of short-term benefits for longer-term hardship. We, as members of this Assembly, must not allow this to happen.

I would like to make a few remarks about a few international issues which concern me. Manitoba is part of the global community and, although as members of this Assembly, our first priority is to the people of Manitoba, we must not forget that there are issues outside our borders that we should concern ourselves with. In a world that has enough nuclear weapons to destroy the planet many times over, we must devote as much energy to activities that promote peace as is possible.

This Assembly took positive steps last year when it passed the resolution declaring Manitoba a nuclear weapons-free zone. By doing so, we sent a message to people telling them that we actively support peace, and that we encourage other jurisdictions to adopt similar measures.

Madam Speaker, declaring our province a nuclear weapons-free zone will not, in itself, convince the nuclear powers to disarm. What such a declaration will accomplish, however, is that it sends a message to others telling them that, no matter how big or small their community is, they could make a difference. If other provinces and countries throughout the world adopt similar measures, a strong message can be sent to the nuclear powers. That message is that we do not support the present nuclear weapons buildup, and that we urge the nuclear powers to make every effort possible to stop this buildup.

In another matter related to the nuclear issue, I believe that we should call for a moratorium on construction of new nuclear power plants in view of the disaster at Three Mile Island and the recent accident at Chernobyl.

Madam Speaker, Canadians are indeed fortunate in that we live in a relatively free and prosperous society. For the most part, we have been allowed to develop our institutions and governments without external interference. There are many countries in many regions throughout the world where this is not the case. In countries such as Chile, El Salvador and Nicaragua,

people must fight to maintain their sovereignty and right to self-determination. All too often external forces, be they military or corporate, extend an unwelcome hand into the internal affairs of these countries. These intrusions, motivated by greed or misguided notions of manifest destiny, are destabilizing and serve to inhibit liberation efforts. We cannot condone these unwelcome intrusions, and we must speak loudly against them when they occur.

Madam Speaker, we are well aware of the present turmoil in South Africa. The South African Government with its suppressive policy of apartheid must be condemned publicly, and I'm sure that the Opposition agree with me on that. Its form of government which systematically denies rights to the majority of its people is unjust. We must lend our support to the people presently fighting for liberation.

Madam Speaker, as I indicated earlier, we have been fortunate in Canada that we have been relatively free from external influence and harm. However, we in Manitoba are presently confronted by a plan that could have a serious negative effect on us. I'm referring, of course, to the plans outlined by the American government to store nuclear waste in Minnesota.

Manitoba and Minnesota share part of the same environment — the Red River basin. If nuclear waste is stored in Minnesota and if these storage sites were to leak, the pollution would travel into Manitoba. The potential for long-term environmental damage caused by such a leak is great. Our governments, in co-operation with the Government of Minnesota, is taking steps to prevent this from happening by arguing against the use of the Red River basin as a site for the storage of nuclear waste. We must continue this opposition and take all necessary steps to protect our environment.

Madam Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by stating that the record of the NDP Government of Manitoba is one that demonstrates the success of an activist approach. By working with various groups in our society, the NDP Government has accomplished a great deal. According to almost all economic indicators, this province will lead the way in terms of economic growth and prosperity in the near future. While other governments argue in favour of restraint . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

I rise with much the same humility that I did back in 1966 when I first participated in the Throne Speech, and it has indeed been a privilege that I have been able to do so over these many years. I suppose one always remembers the class with whom one got elected. I find it a little nostalgic that the Class of '66 is no longer represented by anybody in this Chamber, other than myself. I remind all of you that you will remember the Class of '86. There are a lot of new members here, and you will always remember them.

I should point out that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has some additional years of service on me. However, he of course firstly arrived here as a Liberal, as my colleague, the Honourable Member for Pembina, points out, and then he did have that misfortune of being defeated in 1973. So he had a little

recess in-between. Not for too long, but he had a bit of a recess. But I say that simply because the business of this House has never been jaded for me. I take it as seriously today as I did when I first came into this Chamber.

I was pleased to note that the member who just spoke, the Member for Elmwood, who defeated one of the last members of the Class of '66, Mr. Russell Doern, made reference to it in his speech. He acknowledged that, while we have different political opinions, he expressed some appreciation of the fact that our democratic system allowed that we come together in this manner, and that we can represent those people who elect us in a manner that we have chosen to do so from the different political perspectives. I remind him that is becoming regrettably a minority position in this world, when one considers that so many nations of this world have opted for different forms of government, notably all of those who have fallen under the influence of the USSR, the Eastern European nations, countries like Cuba, more recently Nicaragua, who will never have elected members like we have in this Chamber. The people of Chile can be thankful that General Pinochet came along and made it possible for them to once again, and they will, have free elections in Chile long before they have them in Cuba just as history has proven that to be the case in Argentina which had a vicious, a dictatorial and authoritarian military junta governing it, but they got overthrown, thank goodness, in time. The public will prevail even under those kinds of harsh dictatorships but it doesn't happen where Marxist totalitarianism prevails. — (Interjection) — Well, is somebody arguing history with me? Least of all the Member for Dinkster, or the Member for Inkster, pardon me.

Name me the country. Name me the Marxist country that has been able to freely elect members that the Member for Elmwood felt moved to speak about just a few moments ago. Well, Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the Member for Elmwood at least acknowledges that there is some value to the forum that we have chosen for ourselves to conduct our public affairs.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate all new members; I congratulate all new Cabinet Ministers. I have some thoughts for a particular new Cabinet Minister. Madam Speaker, I don't wish them to appear particularly harsh although they may sound harsh. I find it just simply incredible that the Member for Rupertsland, who has been designated by this Premier and by this government, acting as Minister without portfolio, but having been designated as having particular responsibility for Native people in this province. Madam Speaker, let me be the first to congratulate this government in having the opportunity of having an elected member of the people that he represents and the people he comes from, the race that he comes from, in this Chamber to have that choice to bring him into the Manitoba Cabinet.

But then, Madam Speaker, let's examine what this government has done in the position that this government has put this new Minister without portfolio responsible for Native affairs in. Madam Speaker, when it was important to gather votes in sensitive areas important to the NDP, then it was very important to make sure that preferential hiring practices were in place at the hydro site in Limestone. My colleague, the

Member for Niakwa, was roundly criticized when he voiced an understandable concern that if massive amounts of public money are to be spent on a public project then all Manitobans should have a chance at those jobs. He was called a racist, Madam Speaker, for voicing those kinds of concerns.

Now look, Madam Speaker, at what this government has done. Having won their support, the election is over, they now throw away that preferential hiring policy. I say to the Honourable Minister without portfolio, the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, he will be recorded in the Journals of this House as being the first person of Indian ancestry to be a Minister of the Crown. I would hope that he will not be remembered as an "Uncle Tom" Minister of his people.

Madam Speaker, a new Session, the first Session after an election always gives one the opportunity of casting some reflections on the election just passed. Election '86 indeed was a hard fought election. Allow me, Madam Speaker, although it's not my practice to spend a great deal talking about my own constituency, but I would certainly be remiss if I didn't express my appreciation to the voters of Lakeside to have once again returned me to this Chamber; that, Madam Speaker, despite the fact that none other than the Premier himself on two or three occasions in travelling through that great constituency expressed dire warnings of the imminent defeat of one Harry J. Enns, that Lakeside was becoming a swing seat. Well, Madam Speaker, that of course didn't happen. What did happen, and I take some measure of satisfaction, is that I was able to, despite a very vigorous campaign on the part of the NDP - one where it was certainly evident that for the first time public funds were available to assist in that campaign - I was able to reduce the overall NDP vote in Lakeside.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. ENNS: And that, of course, is a measure of satisfaction in a personal sense to me, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, pundits have criticized the campaign that we led in '86, on March 18 in '86. I want to make it abundantly clear that I was very proud of the campaign that the Progressive Conservative Party carried on in this election. I am very proud of my leader; I am very proud of the programs that we put forward, Madam Speaker. It was, in my judgment, a responsible campaign. It was, in my judgment, a campaign that was realistic and one that was attainable in terms of promises made. But, Madam Speaker, I have to acknowledge what the Honourable Member for Thompson reminded us of in his contribution yesterday, when he reminded us all that the NDP had managed to form government 12 out of the last 16 years.

Madam Speaker, I just want to review, in passing, my few beliefs and comments about how that has come about and why that has come about. It's because the NDP have managed to, and have done successfully, glom on to the kind of populist ideas of the day, distorted them, campaigned on fear and intimidation, and have done this throughout their history of becoming government. Madam Speaker, I think there is some responsibility on the part of myself to, particularly when we have a House with 19 new members and even other

members who don't remember some of the history, some members who probably weren't even citizens of our country at that time, much less know too much of the affairs that moved politics in those years, but in 1969, when I say that the New Democratic Party has been particularly successful at embracing a populist idea, milking it for its politics and then, of course, abandoning it after they have their reins of office and responsibility of government in their hands, but they've done it successfully for far too often.

In 1969, among other reasons — but surely one of them was because I remember I was then the Minister of Natural Resources — I was then particularly under the hot seat. We had intentions of flooding South Indian Lake because you see, Madam Speaker, it's important that this generation of Manitobans understand that it was not the New Democrats that thought about power and hydro development in the North. It was, of course, the Conservative administration that thought about that and had the courage and the vision to do that.

We had the approach and we knew that those kind of developments had its costs. We knew that there were social costs involved, that there was disruption of communities. When you flood land you do some damage, but the then NDP viciously attacked that program and, Madam Speaker, made a promise to the people of Manitoba that if elected they would not flood South Indian Lake; that's what Mr. Schreyer said; that's what Mr. Gonick said; that's what the New Democrats said. Of course, Madam Speaker, that among other reasons they got elected and then they flooded South Indian Lake a few years later; but only after finding the most expensive way of doing it.

The Tritschler Committee Report says it probably cost us an additional \$500 million by the time we fiddled around at Jenpeg with inefficient Russian turbines that we purchased without tender, that we flooded to less than optimum level the South Indian Lake, that we had Lake Winnipeg control structures all going on at the same time. We built, we built and we built and the result of course, Madam Speaker, was that people paid. In four short years our hydro rates increased by 140 percent because the New Democrats put building dams, for dam's sake, ahead of using your head about when to build them, Madam Speaker.

Of course, while they were doing this we came along to another election in '73. Well, by this time, the socialists were really in command and we were doing all kinds of things, Madam Speaker. You once were, if you were in the province at that time — and I believe you were, Madam Speaker — the proud owner, shareholder of a Chinese food manufacturing plant, but then it got better. Then the NDP got higher visions. Then we were going to build airplanes in Gimli. Remember that? Somewhere in the Department of Industry and Commerce are, in fact, a bunch of very nice uniforms for three stewardesses. There are thousands of matches with the Saunders Airplane logo on it. We spent \$48-50 million of your money.

What is happening right now in Gimli? What is happening to those uniforms that are gathering dust? What lasting social benefit have the people of Manitoba got for that \$50 million spent? Is there a single job in Gimli as a result of \$50 million? No.

But, Madam Speaker, in '73 we were facing another election and we couldn't make any hard and

controversial decisions — that by the way is the hallmark of New Democratic governments — don't make any hard and controversial decisions within 18 months of an election.

Well, Madam Speaker, by '77 things do finally catch up even with New Democrats and by that time — well perhaps they were getting to be old democrats by that time — by that time, Madam Speaker, the people of Manitoba were ready for a breath of fresh air and they elected a responsible Conservative administration. Madam Speaker, what that administration managed to do despite what I will tell you in a few moments, despite the rather successful attempts of this torsion and exaggeration and campaigns of fear, during those four years provided responsible government, Madam Speaker.

I don't care, Madam Speaker. Allow the record to speak. The years of that so-called restraint-minded government built more personal care home beds than this government did in the last four years, provided more day care places than this government did, provided more hospital beds than this government did, provided shelter programs like SAFER than this government did and increased highway spending, restored the highways program to what it needs to be in this office. Generally speaking, Madam Speaker, and never imposed, never once imposed on the people of Manitoba the kind of restraint that this Minister of Health has imposed on the hospitals today, that the Minister of Education has imposed on our schools, 2 percent, 3 percent increases, 1 percent increases. We did all that, Madam Speaker, with no increase in taxes.

We are going to come to a comparing of the notes in a little while. But nonetheless, I was reminding honourable members, Madam Speaker, that this government has been in debt in being able to bamboozle the people at election time; not with facts but with intimidation and with fear and they have been successful at it.

Madam Speaker, again the Member for Thompson the other evening or yesterday afternoon, in pointing out the fact that the New Democrats have governed Manitoba 12 of the last 16 years, wanted to leave the impression that the people of Manitoba should be grateful for that fact.

Madam Speaker, let's again do a little bit of comparison of Conservative Governments and New Democratic Party Governments in terms of what they have provided for the people of Manitoba in terms of lasting programs and benefits that stand the test of time, that truly serve the people of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, the most horrific comparison that one has to make immediately, because everything else flows from that — the Minister of Finance is not here. The former Minister of Finance is here. To use a phrase often put on the record by a former NDP Premier, Premier Schreyer, it's so mind-boggling that's it really hard to grasp. It should have been the most important issue in this election but, because the numbers are so big, it's hard for people to understand.

Let me try it with you, Madam Speaker. You see, Madam Speaker, I'm going to make a special effort for you and I to reach some kind of rapport during this Session. I am prepared to reach out to you. Madam Speaker, I do not wish to cast any reflections on the Chair. I just want to say, for me, I'm prepared to make

it a one-way street. I'll go the extra mile whether you meet me or not. So I want you to try to understand.

Madam Speaker, 88 years of governments of all description, plus 15 years of Conservative Governments, from 1958-69 and 1977-81, in those 103 years managed to put the Province of Manitoba into debt to the tune of \$1.2 billion. One hundred and three years of government imposed a \$1.2 billion debt on the people of Manitoba.

This government, led by this Premier, in four and one-half short years has added \$1.8 billion to the debt of the people of Manitoba — in four years! Can you really understand that? That means, the high-spending years of Duff Roblin, and he was considered a high spender. That means all the years of D.L. Campbell. He wasn't spending too much money, but he at least was governing this province. That means that the governments that were responsible for taking us through the depression, the hard years, the governments that were responsible for the formation of this province from 1870 on. From 1870 to 1981, our collective debt was \$1.2 billion. Then in the next four years, this group of irresponsible administrators added \$1.8 billion of new debt to the province.

Madam Speaker, that has to be kept foremost, uppermost in mind when we then try to ask the question, as the Member for Thompson said. And what have the people of Manitoba received for it? What have we got to show for that? You'll forgive me, but it's again part of the history lesson that I feel called upon to provide for the newer members, like the Member for Ellice, the young fellows in this House, the Member for Kildonan, the Member for Elmwood, Concordia, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, and he will remember. You see, it's important that I repeat this. It's important that I repeat it for our own members, because we have a bunch of new members here of which we can all be very proud.

A propagandist — I'll leave him nameless — proved to the world that, if you repeat something even if it's not the truth often enough, people begin to believe it. If there is one thing the Conservative Party has to chastise itself for is that we have allowed others to repeat untruths long enough that too many people in Manitoba believe it. They want to have you believe that the Conservative Party never cares for people, never cares for social programs, never cares for doing those things that all of us want seen done in this province. So, Madam Speaker, let me remind you — and again I would ask you, remember while we are doing these things the debt load that we were imposing on our people. We were doing this virtually on a balanced budget.

Madam Speaker, we brought the entire educational system into the 20th Century through school consolidation. You know what that meant, a massive undertaking, a massive building program, massive modernization of the entire education system. Madam Speaker, I myself was a permanent teacher at a time in the early mid-Fifties when there were 600 — I would call them just kids out of high school with six-week courses — that were asked to go and teach, because that was the kind of educational system that we had.

We modernized that whole system through progressive Ministers of Education like Stuart McLean, like George Johnson and, along with it of course, the massive structural improvements that had to be made.

All those yellow buses that transport our 100,000 rural children to school didn't come from nowhere. The program had to be put in place; the money had to be put in place; the roads had to be built. And a Progressive Conservative Government did that, Madam Speaker.

On the matter of health — let it be once again put on the record — it was a Progressive Conservative administration that brought Medicare to Manitoba, not the New Democrats, and let you remember that. All the New Democrats did was shift the taxes. That was easy. It was again, Madam Speaker, one of those easy populist ideas to glom onto. Nobody, none of them, not a single member of the New Democrats will say that, by taking away the premiums and putting it on general taxation, somehow Medicare was cheaper. Nobody is that foolish. But it was more politically popular, so they did that. It was a Conservative administration that brought Medicare into Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, it is so apropos that we should concern ourselves with the whole problem of agriculture. Agriculture is in deep trouble these days. Thank God that there was a Conservative administration in place to put in the basic structure, support structure that today still serves the Manitoba farmers. It was a Conservative administration that brought in crop insurance. It was a Conservative administration that brought in the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. It was a Conservative administration that provided so much of the needed drainage works throughout the Province of Manitoba: the Grassmere; the Sturgeon; the Long Lake drain; the Tobacco Creek. You name them, they were all built by Conservative administrations.

We now have this government faced with one problem, an overhill drain problem in the constituency of Portage and they have problems — they say they may have to study the matter. They may have to study the problem, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, this service, not just the agricultural community but for all citizens of Manitoba, it was a Progressive Conservative administration that brought the road system of Manitoba into the Twentieth Century, that developed the PTH highways that are still today — and there have been precious few added — oh, I've got a hardtop added here — very little during their term of office.

It was a Progressive Conservative government, Madam Speaker, that negotiated with the municipalities that took over thousands of miles of roads that were previously the responsibility of the municipalities and created the provincial road system. The Honourable Walter Weir did that when he was Minister of Highways. The Member for Lac du Bonnet, who might have been in Cabinet or in municipal politics in those days, would remember that.

Madam Speaker, other major public works undertakings such as securing this city from the danger, from the tragedy, from the millions of dollars in cost of threat of flooding, was done by a Progressive Conservative administration, a \$64 million floodway built around this community. A \$19 million Portage diversion built to divert the flood waters of the Assiniboine. Madam Speaker, part of the reason why I keep getting re-elected to this House is because there are still people that remind me in every election, people living in St. Eustache, Elie, on the north side, St. Francois-Xavier,

Poplar Point, all the way up between here and Portage la Prairie, that all too often, three out of six years got flooded out, they remind me and thank me for the fact that the Assiniboine River has been tamed in that stretch and is no longer a danger and threat.

That's a benefit that a Conservative Minister that I had the privilege to succeed put into place. It will serve the people of Manitoba long after I am gone; it will serve people as long as we have an operating economy in the Province of Manitoba. Those are the kinds of lasting benefits that were provided, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, it wasn't just in all these fields. The point I am trying to point out is that Conservative administrations have encompassed all interests. It was a Conservative administration that recognized the peculiar and special needs of a large urban centre like the City of Winnipeg and introduced the first metropolitan form of government. Madam Speaker, there are some that still say that it might have been better to have allowed it to evolve on its own, rather than to have had a New Democrat government impose a unification on them. I'm not that well versed in municipal or urban politics but, nonetheless, let it not be said that a Conservative administration didn't have the concern, didn't have the vision, didn't understand the problems of large urban centres.

We are often accused, Madam Speaker, of being a party, of being a government with a majority of rural members that don't have the kind of understanding or concerns necessary for urban societies. That simply is not true and the record shows that, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I am listing some of the accomplishments that are there today for people to see. Manitobans are using them, the institutions that were set up and established by Conservative administrations in the widest possible range of public services that you could think imaginable, a government that could, even in those restraint years of 1977, 1978, respond immediately to disasters whether they be flood or drought.

We now have a government that has difficulty responding to a request totalling maybe three to five hundred thousand to build a badly needed drainage ditch in the Portage area because, we understand, having squandered the money, having placed their priorities elsewhere into hiring former defeated candidates, etc., etc., that they don't have monies for these kind of programs but the people of Manitoba and the people affected by these programs will remember.

Madam Speaker, I started off by saying let's do a bit of a comparison. Certainly in the 12 years — granted, that may be 14 or 15 years that we are talking about for comparative reasons — the New Democrats have accomplished some things as well. The most important thing that they have accomplished, and I want to repeat that once more, have put just a horrendous debt on the people of Manitoba. You know, it's just so hard to believe, when you think that it took 103 years of governments of all kinds of description, Liberal, Coalition, Farmer Progressive, what it took those governments 103 years to do in terms of public debt, this administration in four short years has surpassed by unimaginable limits.

This government has committed itself, again because of that populist idea — sure, everybody would like to

see construction, everybody wants to see dams being built — well, maybe our Indian friends in the north won't be so happy now that they no longer have preferential job treatment somewhere. But, nonetheless, it was popular; it got them through another election. But who are we building the dams for and under what conditions are we building the dams? You know, Madam Speaker, it is so ironic to hear the anti-American venom that so naturally spews out of their mouths — we just heard it from the last speaker — that we in Manitoba, this very government, is committing vast resources to building dams for who, for Manitobans? No. For Canadians? No. But for the nebulous idea that they may be able to get some bucks and, Madam Speaker, I will tell this government one thing. They don't get up early enough in the morning to beat an American trader.

They are afraid of free trade with the Americans. Why are we trading with them on this? We have tied our sale price of Hydro to American coal, which is going nothing but down. Our hydro rates will double; our hydro rates will triple as a result of this government's decision. But that doesn't bother these people. It should bother the Honourable Member for Ellice because it's the very people that he represents that can least afford those kind of costs.

Madam Speaker, this is not just rhetoric on my part. The last time an NDP administration went on a dam building binge for the sake of gathering votes, the hydro rates did go up 140 percent; that's record. Check the records, for those of you that keep them.

So I stand here and say that our hydro bills will go up another 150 percent as a result of your hydro rates. I have a track record to go on. But those bills aren't going to come in for a while and in the meantime there are elections to be won and you've won them.

Then the consummate gall of putting it in the Throne Speech, talking, you know, glomming on to another populist idea, the Peter Loughheed Heritage Fund that my colleague, the Member for Kirkfield, referred to. Sure, it's a good political idea. Just think about it. No money changes hands until 1993. There's no money coming in until 1993 and they are already putting it in 1986 in the Throne Speech, talking about a Heritage Fund. How foolish do you think people are?

Madam Speaker, people in Manitoba will inherit something all right. They'll inherit a massive debt load that is going to cripple the economy of this province and make it so much harder for succeeding governments to do those things that governments ought to be doing for their people. That's the heritage that they are leaving, Madam Speaker.

What else have they done in their years? Let me go through what has happened to property taxes in the City of Winnipeg to your average \$7,000 assessed home. That home in 1977 paid \$686 in taxes; in 1978, \$752; in 1979, \$804; in 1980, \$799 — can you believe it, a reduction? — in 1981, \$764, another reduction. Two reductions. Then we come to 1982, the NDP years. In 1981 that same home was taxed for \$764; one year later, one year of NDP Government, \$944.00. The next year, \$1,002; the next year, \$1,067; the next year, \$1,114; today in 1986 that home, \$1,235 — virtually a doubling of taxation.

A MEMBER: Looking after the little guy.

MR. H. ENNS: You're looking after the little guy. Madam Speaker, this is all happening while this government is spending \$1,800 million more, are imposing new taxes. They are taking in \$116 million on a brand new payroll tax. They increased the sales tax. And yet, property taxes have just about doubled from \$764 in 1981 to \$1,235 in 1986. That is doing something for the average resident in the City of Winnipeg, the ordinary persons they like to speak of.

A MEMBER: That's standing up for Manitoba.

MR. H. ENNS: That's standing up for Manitoba. Madam Speaker, the tragedy is that what we have left as a legacy of 12, 13 years of NDP Government is money that, firstly, is simply unaccountable for anymore. Madam Speaker, we are not a big community; we're not a big province, so these figures are important — \$50 million — that some of us were in this House as we saw it being approved, sail through this House. We reached into the people's pockets; took it out of their pockets and kissed it goodbye. To do what? To try to build airplanes. We saw over \$100 million go through this House. We kissed it goodbye. To do what? To try to build buses.

I maintain, although I'll qualify it because Judge Trites didn't come out in the firm kind of way that perhaps I, from a prejudiced point of view would have liked. But it certainly alluded, made enough suggestions, and from my own information, upwards of \$500 million was ill-advisedly wasted and misspent in Hydro construction during those dam building years of 1970-77.

Madam Speaker, when you add these sums together and you look at our debt and all that you have to show for it — oh, Madam Speaker, I should be fair. They did create the Ombudsman's Office even though, believe it or not, I was in this Chamber in the last Conservative administration of Walter Weir that was going to move on it. If you recall it was an aborted session and it was 1970. It was the New Democrats that created the Ombudsman's Office.

They did create the Human Rights Commission and they created other conditions. They did create Autopac, Madam Speaker, but it's a monopoly corporation. There's no chance of competition and it is working. I suspect, and I still recommend to them, that they should be careful about allowing too much revenue to flow in that corporation unless unattached, because before this administration is over with, we'll see a 20-storey highrise office tower being built, as they were about to do in 1976-77, and the head knocks of Autopac will have finer and plushier offices, hardly necessary for providing the service they were set up to do.

So, Madam Speaker, I acknowledge that the New Democrats have indeed done some worthwhile things in their 12 years of government. But, Madam Speaker, I just want to say to you that any member — and I especially say that to our new Conservative members — can be extremely proud of having joined a team that has put on the record, has done so much for the people of Manitoba, done so much that will last not just their lifetime but their children's lifetime. It's there to be used for the people of Manitoba; it's there to be a benefit for the people of Manitoba.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. I would like to draw attention of members of the House to an error that I made in calculation of the time that I allotted for the Member for Elmwood in speaking. I only allowed him 20 minutes since we returned at 8:00 and he should have had 30 minutes. I would like to ask leave of the House to help me rectify this situation and not infringe on the new member's rights. I am reaching out to you, as it were.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

The Member for Lakeside has delivered a spellbinding speech and I'm told it's the same one he uses every year. I suggest he put it on VHS and Beta and we could . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MALOWAY: It sounds like he's running for the leadership. He's been around a long time. He's lost the leadership before but this time, who knows? You know he should have given that speech in 1971; he might have won. I see that the president of Success Angus Business College has placed all the leadership aspirants, Harry, Clayton, Charlie, Jerry, all in the front row where he can keep an eye on them, but he forgot . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Recognizing that the Member for Elmwood is new to the Chamber, it is very important that we adhere to the rule that people are not referred to by their first names — only their constituencies please.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker, but he forgot one. He forgot the Member for Charleswood, however, I think that he will probably hear the Member for Charleswood sneaking up on him with his crutches and all.

Madam Speaker, we in Manitoba are presently confronted by a plan that could have serious negative effects on us and I'm referring, of course, to the plans outlined by the American government and that is to store nuclear waste in Minnesota. Manitoba and Minnesota share part of the same environment, the Red River Basin. If nuclear waste is stored in Minnesota and if these storage sites were to leak, then the pollution this would cause will travel into Manitoba. The potential for long-term environmental damage caused by such a leak is great. Our government, in cooperation with the government of Minnesota, is taking steps to prevent this from happening by arguing against the use of the Red River basin as a site for the storage of nuclear waste. We must continue this opposition and take all steps necessary to protect our environment.

Madam Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by stating that the record of the NDP Government of Manitoba is one that demonstrates the success of an activist approach. By working with various groups in our society the NDP Government has accomplished a great deal. According to almost all economic indicators this province will lead the way in terms of economic

growth and prosperity in the near future. While other governments argue in favour of restraint and cutbacks to social programs, this government is making a clear choice in favour of activism and leadership. Even though the economic picture has improved a great deal since the early '80s there is a great deal yet to be done.

Unemployment is still too high and there are still too many people who live below the poverty line. Although the measures outlined in the Throne Speech will not eliminate these ills overnight, they do serve as a plan for action. We must continue to work so that all Manitobans can share in the wealth this province has to offer.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the people of Elmwood for their support. I can assure them that I look forward to participating in this House and in representing their views to the government. I will not confine myself to speaking just on a single issue, but will work in several areas such as helping to ensure that the people of Elmwood are able to share in the benefits of programs such as the Core Area Initiative, housing programs, small business and the employment programs, to name just a few. I will be active not only in the Assembly but in the constituency itself.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is a pleasure to rise to take part in this Throne Speech debate. I, like my colleague, have been taking part in the Throne Speech debate since 1969 and unfortunately my colleague is the only one left from the group of '66, but I believe - in fact I know I am the only one of the '69 group left on our side of the House but there are two or three left on the other side of the House at the present time.

I congratulate the new members in the House and those of the government who have been placed in positions of authority and responsibility. Unfortunately, I have to say to the member who just spoke that he had been doing fairly well. His philosophy is completely different to the rest of us. It is unfortunate that you did give him the extra 10 minutes, Madam Speaker, because I say that he just made himself a reputation in this House that will probably live with him for a lot of years that he will be very sorry for because he tried to be a smart aleck, to put down somebody that he couldn't carry the shoes of and his accomplishments will never be the same in this House. Then he went to the old NDP philosophy of who is going to stab who in the back and who is going to be leader, etc.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please.

I would hope that the honourable member was not reflecting on a decision of the House.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think that I said anything that did reflect on the decision of the House. I said it was unfortunate that you gave him the opportunity to continue because he made a complete fool of himself.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

I would hope that the honourable member is not reflecting on a decision of the Chair.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I believe I explained that I wasn't making any reflection on the decision of the Chair. If you feel that I have, I apologize, but I don't feel I did.

You know it is very strange, it took us quite a while to get used to the House again and get ourselves oriented. It has been so long since we've been here. This government really believes sincerely and truly that they should rule this province from behind Cabinet doors, which by the way we're not allowed to ask questions on or they don't think that we can ask questions on, if you discuss something in Cabinet. Apparently this government doesn't believe that we should be able to have any discussion on it even though it is public knowledge and has been discussed in the papers.

This government believes in changing all the traditions and everything that has gone on in this House for many years and I quote from the Throne Speech of 1969: "My Ministers believe that at this time in our history we need to abandon old ideas, dogmas and traditions that have outlived their relevance and usefulness." You see the socialists believe that they should try to do everything to make everybody forget whatever happened before. My colleague tonight explained very clearly what had happened before in this province by a Progressive Conservative Government which brought this province into the 20th Century. But you have a government that likes to change things, even the clapping in the House.

You know, I have never seen anything more childish in my life in all of the 17 years that I have been in the Legislature. As I say to the little children and my grandchildren when they come to the house and they are playing and I say, "clap a hand these children", and that is basically what you look like. You really tried to change a tradition and you've sat around in your caucus meeting saying, let's clap our hands instead of the traditionally tapping of the table that has been done in legislatures, parliaments and democracies throughout the world. But they don't believe in the traditions.

This is a government that takes the insignia of the buffalo of the Province of Manitoba and creates a buffalo whose legs aren't attached. This is really something. You take the tradition of the province completely and you throw it out the window. But they laugh at it. You see, they laugh at those types of things because they really have absolutely no regard for tradition, no regard for this democracy in this House whatsoever and they have proved it. They have proven it by the fact that they go out and they pass all kinds of large sums of money behind closed doors, etc.

I can remember the time when they were changing the insignia. They were questioned in the House about it continually. The Premier continually, as he always does, doesn't ever admit it, he said nothing was going to change, but gradually they changed the insignias of this province without asking the people and they sneak up on them continually.

Mr. Speaker or Madam Speaker, and I apologize, Madam Speaker, when I say Mr. Speaker. It is a habit that I will have to correct. Then we have a situation

where we have 21 Cabinet Ministers. Is there anything more ridiculous than that situation in the Manitoba Legislature?

My goodness, Madam Speaker! Then we have also six legislative assistants. Mind you, there are only eight or nine members left. They've got six legislative assistants. They have four appointments to boards, the boards being the Manitoba Hydro, Autopac, MTS and the Water Commission Board. They've got more boards and commissions for members than they have members left at the present time, Madam Speaker.

I note by looking at an Order-in-Council just the other day that the Member for Wolseley previously held two positions, as a legislative assistant and on the MTS Board. I wonder how many members on the other side are going to be holding down two positions because they have more legislative jobs, more boards than they have backbenchers at the present time.

I guess we will have to ask the First Minister how many boards and commissions all of these members have been on. Every member of the NDP Legislature is either a Cabinet Minister, legislative assistant or been placed on the boards of the Crown corporations, every single one of you. Then you have the House Leader. Of course, the House Leader doesn't get any extra, but he's a Minister. Then you have your Whip. This government has decided that everybody has to be paid off, absolutely no question about it.

Madam Speaker, we have the situation of the previous Member for Springfield where he's being paid \$55,000 a year to do a specific job. It's rather amazing to me that one of the members opposite is not supervising that job.

We have the Member for Lac du Bonnet, a distinguished farmer, a master farmer. We have him as a reeve of a municipality. We have him on the executive of the Municipal Association of the province, somebody who knows this province probably backwards compared to the previous Member for Springfield. He could sit and supervise as a legislative assistant, and I know two or three of the people that have more experience than Mr. Anstett has at the present time that he could supervise and do the job excellently. They wouldn't have to hire anybody at the present time, and that job could be done. But the First Minister chooses to overlook the experience within his own elected members for somebody who should probably leave this province, rather than stay in it.

Isn't it strange that the First Minister says the fact that we don't care and that we want to defeat the government is harassment? Since when was it harassment for the Opposition to defeat the government? You see, the reason why we have to defeat this government as soon as possible is, you're here under false pretenses.

As far as I know and all that I can remember when I had the privilege of being in Cabinet, the Minister of Finance at any time could almost press his button on the phone or his intercom and the deputy would come in and he would say, what is the financial position of the province at the present time? If we didn't have it within hours, certainly minutes it should be, we would be in a terrible situation. But now we have a Minister of Finance who can't get out the Third Quarterly Report on time. The Second Quarterly Report was put out without any estimate of deficit in it. It comes out after

the election, and nobody can tell me that the Minister of Finance did not know the financial position of this province during the election.

I challenged the Member for St. James on a platform, Madam Speaker. I said, why don't you stand up right now before March 18 — you're a Cabinet Minister — and tell us the financial position of this province? Why don't you tell us what the Estimates are? Because, if anybody thinks they're kidding anybody on this side of the House that the Estimates weren't ready, you're not kidding anybody because the Estimates were started almost last September, maybe even last June. They've been worked on steadily until the time you present them. Do you mean to tell me that the Minister of Health did not know that, in his Estimates, he was going to cut down the benefits of Pharmacare to senior citizens? You mean that wasn't in his Estimates and been worked on before the 18th of March? Who's kidding who, Madam Speaker?

Then we have announcements come out continually of people that are going to be relieved of their jobs, etc. Madam Speaker, during the Estimates process, there will be things coming out that this government will be doing which are not of benefit to the people of Manitoba, and nobody can tell us that they didn't know about it during the election. When I say, elected on false pretenses, all of you go home tonight and say to yourself, I was elected on the basis that we hid the financial statements of this province from the people of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker would challenge me and have me thrown out of this House if I misled this House. This Premier and this government misled the greatest authority in this province, and that's the people, and they don't give a hoot about it. They did it in 1981.

When my colleague suggests and makes the statement that they come through and they talk about things during elections and they don't produce and they forget about them after, we talked about this for four years, "A Clear Choice for Manitoba." For four years, we talked about it and there are items in here, most of the items in here have never been touched, never been done. In this document here, it talks about reducing the taxes in the City of Winnipeg, and you just had the City of Winnipeg taxes read to you of how they increased during your four years of office. You go out and you practically tell the people anything you like. You don't have any hesitation to just say anything at any time when you're discussing things with the people.

The Member for Thompson yesterday, he got up and he talked about what this government has done for young people. Well I challenge him as a young person himself to take and be the representative for the young people within his government and do something. Convince the First Minister and the Ministers on this bench — in fact, you probably should be in the Cabinet — (Interjection) — I think he should. I would certainly trade him for the Minister of Industry and Commerce because certainly his record as Minister of Finance is such that he shouldn't be in the Cabinet.

I ask this young man, what influence do you have in this government to take the debt load off your children and your grandchildren and the young people that are coming up in this province?

A MEMBER: He doesn't care.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: What work are you going to do to take the burden of taxes and debt load off the young people now and the young people coming up in this province, young people such as yourself? What are you going to do about that?

You talk about having a mandate. If you have any mandate at all, it's to do some representation for young people in this province and you should probably start doing it. You only have a mandate with this government at the present time because your mandate is given to you on false pretences. I challenge the Member for Thompson to do something that isn't false and hold down the spending for the benefit of our future generations, for people of his age and younger.

The receiving of a mandate on literature such as this in '81 and the promises that the First Minister went through during the election campaign that were basically proven to be hollow, every one of them, when people got the chance to analyze and find out what they actually were.

My colleague mentioned Flyer. I guess, especially the now Minister of Finance, would wonder that I would even bring it up because I was the member, Madam Speaker, who said in committee last year that we'd probably be better off to pay somebody to take it. And you know, they took me at my word. They did pay somebody to take it.

They actually went out like they would, with development officers, and they offered a great big premium to a company to come here and operate Flyer Industries, just as if they were going out offering great big bonuses for companies to come here, and this government has done it. Mind you, they sue people; they have had lawsuits against people in this province because of arrangements that were made with the previous government; lawsuits that the Minister of Industry now says weren't such a bad idea. Also, they have done the same thing, exactly the same thing, in the last two years. They did the same thing with Flyer. They went out, they got somebody to pay \$1 million but they gave them \$3 million plus all of the grants for training, etc., and the only big problem is that this government is completely exposed.

You have no guarantees of jobs. You have no guarantees that if things don't go well that they can't walk out of here any time they want.

My colleague also mentioned the great situation of Saunders Aircraft where we kept pouring money into it. And he talked about Sky West and the matches. There is a package! That's the \$45 million package of matches that my colleague was talking about. On the back of the package of matches it has the route here, the offices, Winnipeg, Dauphin, Brandon, Yorkton. We did have the pilots' uniforms; we did have the stewardess' uniforms; we had hundreds of boxes, big boxes of matches. They're going to be a collector's item some day.

That was all done, you see — the Member for Brandon East was going to use Saunders Aircraft to go into the airline business to have a great big airline in the Province of Manitoba — and \$45 million to \$50 million later, all we've got is a bunch of old, used uniforms and a bunch of old matches. The matches, at least, still work. The government is certainly out of position on that one.

Let's just talk about the Throne Speech. The Throne Speech is absolutely nothing. As my leader has said,

it's a repeat of many old promises, but you've got some little new ones in there like bonds for small business. The bonds for small business are nothing more than structuring government money to make loans to small business. It's the same as the Enterprise Manitoba Program for this reason, because the government is going to have to guarantee those bonds. I don't think there are any honourable members opposite that would buy any of those bonds, because the government is going to take that money and they're going to lend it. They don't know what interest rate it's going to be and they don't know whether they're going to get their money back. So, Madam Speaker, the government is going to have to guarantee the bonds and the interest on the bonds. My goodness, now you say that this is the government that is going to make the loans. All you have done is come up with a program that we had in this province through 1977 to '81 and that was done by the Progressive Conservative Government and it was the most successful program for small business that was ever held in this province.

Then we have the situation of the Ministers who have gone on these quick flip situations. But what really bothers me about this is that, first and foremost, we have a Premier who has had Ministers with problems throughout his government. He's had them demonstrating in front of consulates. We've had the problem with the Minister of Highways that was never solved. We've had the Minister of Labour who turns around, and on television while he's Minister of Labour, supposedly trying to be the mediator between labour and management or business, rips up his credit card on television, of a company that he doesn't quite see is doing the right thing because he's taking the side of labour.

I might say to the Member for St. James, because all of the members in this House — Sturgeon Creek, Kirkfield, Assiniboia — as a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, all of St. James voted in the majority for the Progressive Conservative Party. The Member for St. James lost where he used to be an alderman, by 405 votes, from Polo Park West. That's where he was an alderman and he even lost the poll he was born and raised in, Poll 47.

A MEMBER: They knew him better, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yeah, that's right. It only goes to show that the people that know him don't vote for him; the people that don't know him, do. That's fact. He lost St. James. It's a very simple fact.

The small businesses don't need any more loans anyway, as my leader mentioned. Small business in this province is in the same situation as our agriculture industry is today. They need breaks on their costs; they need to have somebody get rid of the regulations that were put forward and they've got on their backs. They've got to get rid of the taxes that have been placed on them, the small businessmen.

There are nothing but disincentives for them to hire, that this government has put in. We put forward a program that was an incentive for them to hire, was an incentive for them to expand their business. Small business doesn't need more loans of any kind and if anybody knows that, the previous Minister of Small

Tuesday, 13 May, 1986

Business and Tourism, who had a group of people go around this province listening to the regulations, asking them to come and talk about the regulations — and you know the strange part of it was when nobody showed up here in the building to come to them, the statement by the Chairman of that committee was, "I guess everybody is satisfied." Well, I can tell you that they're not satisfied. They didn't come because they've had hearings forever with this government and nothing has ever been done with all of the regulations that have been put forward.

Bankruptcies are up higher than they've ever been before in agriculture, in business. They talk about the investment in this province. No matter how proud they are of investment, your investment is nearly all public money. That's where your big investment figures come from. You have never in your life been able to produce in the time you've been in government in the last four years, a list of investment in this province that was done under the Progressive Conservative Government. You have never been able to produce that type of a list, but you sure can show us a lot of other bankruptcy lists, etc.

You know we went through 1977 and the First Minister likes to get up and do a lot of talking about the fact that while we were in government, we had the worst record in economic development, etc., in growth. Let me tell you — the Member for Brandon East will remember this report because this is addressed to him and I've read it before. It was from his Deputy at the time, Don Vernon, who explained and the report is there that explained that from 1974 through 1975, 1976, most of 1977, the job formation and investment in this province just dropped down drastically to be darn near the lowest in Canada and when we had it, we were not moving up as fast as the national average, but we were at least moving up, not down and those are facts.

These are the things that many of you new members better start thinking about because you get mixing with the older members over there and they just fill your head full of absolute misleading statements continually. I don't know how, but I'd say that most of you will have to start to think for yourselves and the facts have been presented to you by my colleague and facts have been presented to you tonight.

Let me get back to what I was going to say about the situation of the flips. A First Minister that has absolutely no control or afraid or even backs off being any type of a disciplinarian with his Cabinet. That's weakness. In 1984, the Progressive Conservative Party came into power in Canada. Within weeks they cancelled that program. The statements of the Minister of Finance at that time - the Canadian Minister of Finance, federal - was that this was costing the Government of Canada and the provinces a tremendous amount of money. Mr. Wilson cancelled it and the facts were very well known.

A MEMBER: Were you going to say something?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: In 1984 was when he cancelled it.

A MEMBER: 1985 . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, that was explained because it was one that got its application in a little before the

cutoff and that's all been explained. — (Interjection) — But just a minute, Madam Speaker, would the Minister of Finance, by any chance, in one of his better days when he was thinking, ever have said to Cabinet that this is being cancelled by the federal Minister of Finance because it's costing us a lot of money? Did you mention to the Treasury Board that it was costing the province a lot of money?

A MEMBER: He improved it for them. He took away the capital gains for it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Did you mention that the program was costing the Province of Manitoba a lot of money? Well, I'll tell you, I'll bet you did mention it was costing a lot of money to your Cabinet, to your Cabinet colleagues, and one of them rushed out and bought it.

A MEMBER: Two.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: As a matter of fact, two of them rushed out and bought it, knowing full well what this was going to cost the Province of Manitoba. The provincial Minister is sitting there saying that this is legalized theft, costing us a lot of money and two of the Treasury Board walk out and buy it.

The Member for River Heights does not seem to think that's important in this House, but I tell the Member for River Heights and the members opposite, it's very important to this House, especially since the program was criticized continually and it's not the philosophy of the government and it was discussed in Cabinet that this was costing the province a lot of money and worse still one of them does it the year after, fully well aware of what this is costing, after the Minister of Finance of this province has called it names and the First Minister has had discussions with other provincial First Ministers, saying that this is not a very good tax structure and it should be changed. My goodness, Madam Speaker, and that's integrity?

Do you really believe that any of you can sit in your chairs and say that was right when two members of Cabinet, after discussions on what it was costing the province, ran out and bought it? Those are the type of things this government gets. Those are the type of things that this government doesn't let the people know, but what do they let the people know? They let the people know that the program is terrible; they let the people know that the NDP wants tax reform; they let the people know that they're going to be for tax reform, called legalized theft. They talk about all that. You all talk about it with your heads high that that's what you want done and you have two colleagues who are in the confidence of Cabinet that knows what it costs the government, walk out and buy it. That's what you've got, think about it, think about it. I really can't understand why that would be something that the First Minister says he's not too concerned about. Well, he's weak and he's proven that. He's weak and he can't handle his Ministers.

Madam Speaker, in this province at the present time, we have a situation that's getting very serious regarding law and order. There was a mention of setting up some sort of a board or commission or something and that's

not going to solve the problem of the law and order situation, in many cases critical situations in this province. I'm very sorry about the fact that my wife or daughters will not get off the bus at the corner of our street and walk up the street anymore. I really think that's rather a disgusting situation and those of you who have city seats and the member is nodding his head, because he knows he has it in his constituency and all of the city constituencies have it at the present time.

I am rather disappointed when I say to my daughter, why don't you let Jay, our grandson, out to play; send him over to the playground to play by himself. She said I wouldn't dare. I am also very disappointed about the fact that ladies are lining up at supermarkets to have their children fingerprinted for fear if they are kidnapped or stolen there will be a record of that child. Would you have believed that that was going to happen in this province?

We have a situation where law and order in the Province of Manitoba is higher than other provinces. Do you really believe that a person, a man who rapes — which is dastardly enough, but bodily harms and slashes at the same time — shouldn't be taken to prison and lashed? Because if you don't believe that you don't have much respect for the women of this province. Do you really believe that your wife and daughters and your friends should be afraid to walk up your streets at night, and your children and your grandchildren or parents won't let them out to play on the streets? And the Minister of Finance, or previous Finance, he laughs.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's a great joke, I'll tell you, because he had the privilege when he was a little boy of going out and playing and nobody worried. They wouldn't worry about him anyway, but nobody worried. In this day and age we have that situation in the Province of Manitoba and it's time this government took a serious look at it.

It's time they backed up their police departments; it's time they insisted that their judges were stronger and then maybe we will have something done about it because all of this business of let's look at the cause, let's really look at the cause, we have been looking at the cause long enough and we have been having people harmed in this province and we are in a bad situation, so let's do something about it. Let's have this government do something about the protection of the people of this province.

The First Minister — he is now trying to line up with the Premier of Ontario on free trade. You know he came back from the Western Ministers' Conference and said he was all for it, he'd had a long talk with those fellows and they are all for it, the best thing that could happen for Western Canada, providing we protected the businesses and the jobs in this province. Now, because of the reasons that my leader has mentioned, he has found an ally in the Premier of the Province of Ontario and he is now trying to swing around.

Well, let me tell you, if he does decide that he doesn't believe that we should be discussing freer trade in the Province of Manitoba, he is going to be very wrong because this government doesn't really want that much business. They don't want freer trade for that as a

matter of fact. They really aren't business oriented. They don't really care from that point of view because they would rather control the businesses and do it themselves. But I tell you, Manitoba has a million people and it's a manufacturing province and it always was. We are losing it now.

In Western Canada we have a market of five million people. In Canada we have a market of 22 million people; we never do get the chance to ship east. But if we get into freer trade, we will have a market of 230 million people and we should have the ability to go after that business. That's what we should be looking at if we want to create jobs for Manitobans because your plants are now getting automated. They can produce in Eastern Canada enough products to supply Western Canada in a month and we have to take a look at the freer trade situation.

The river banks — all of a sudden we are interested in the river banks. We could gradually be doing that over a period of time at a quarter of the money that the First Minister is talking about, and I don't think the Estimates show more than about \$3 million for river banks at the present time. Check it out. You'll probably find that it was done long before you were there. I don't know where he has got this \$10 million a year, but there could have been a planned program with the city on the river banks, working or following through with the ARC program, etc. But no, we get an announcement of \$10 million a year for 10 years for the river banks when we've got problems in this province with our No. 1 industry at the present time and you as a government aren't even worried about it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's an honour for me again to engage in the debate on the Speech from the Throne and in doing so at the start of this new Session I would, first of all, like to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of this Assembly. I know that you have the full confidence of all members on this side of the House and I know from the experience that I have had with you in our caucus and, more particularly, when you worked alongside me as legislative assistant during the last five years, that you will do well in the difficult job of Speaker and will bring even further honour to this Assembly in your new role, and I certainly congratulate you and wish you well.

I also would like to congratulate the Mover and Seconded of the Throne Speech for their moving and seconding and their points that they made in debate. Both members are new members to this House and I would like to welcome all new members to the House, those on this side of the House. Two of the new members happen to be neighbours of mine on two of my bordering constituencies — the Member for Old Kildonan and the Member for St. Johns. I also welcome the members on the opposite side of this House and certainly welcome you to this House and look forward to your involvement.

A MEMBER: Reluctantly.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, not reluctantly. I am pleased to see them here, though there are a few other people

I would rather have seen here, but I am certainly pleased to see them here and I hope that . . .

A MEMBER: That's only the new ones he's talking about.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: . . . the new members on the Opposition benches will add something to this House because, as we have heard to date in the speeches regarding the Speech from the Throne, we have heard just a rehash of all that's been said in previous Sessions. I would like to spend some time in a few moments to talk about that. It's the old song, you know: we didn't lose the election, you stole it. I mean, that is the same song that's been sung and now they sing it with a bit of a different tune. They're saying, well, you only got 41 percent of the popular vote so you don't deserve to govern. That's what you are saying.

I was interested listening to the Member for Lakeside, the Class of 1966. Unfortunately, I shouldn't say he's not here, Madam Speaker, because you should not reflect on someone who is not here, so I won't say that. But this whole notion of theirs that somehow the New Democrats aren't fit to govern and they opposite have the divine right to govern and somehow we've stolen the elections, that we've won elections on false pretenses over the last number of years and we don't have the confidence of the people of Manitoba with 41 percent of the vote. Well, I think you have to just look back in history a bit and again even go back to 1966. But as the Member for Thompson pointed out, Manitobans have chosen the New Democratic Party four out of the last five elections. Now that's not a bad record. Four out of five times, Manitobans have chosen the New Democratic Party. That means that four times we've stolen the election and only one time they won the election, Madam Speaker.

If you even go back a little further, and if you look at the percentage of popular vote, you will find that there is only one time in the last 20 years that the Progressive Conservative Party has had a higher percentage vote than what exists with the New Democratic Party right now. If you go back to the years that you formed government and if you go back to 1966, you were government with 39 percent of the popular vote — 39 percent of the popular vote, lower than what exists at the present time. You can even go back further when you formed minority governments, albeit in 1957 when there was even a lower percentage vote.

So if you look over the 20 year history of elections in this province, you will find out that more times than not, people have supported the New Democratic Party in government and, in terms of popular vote, the popular vote has been higher for the New Democratic Party over that period of time except for one aberration, one point in 1977. That is the only point in time when the popular vote for the Conservative Party exceeded that over that same period, over that 20 year period that people supported the New Democratic Party.

So I believe, Madam Speaker, that the people were right, that the people have been right over those few years, and that the people have indicated that they believe that the New Democratic Party offers the kind of policies, the kind of programs that are filling their needs in this province.

So when we hear these same speeches as we did just shortly after the election in 1981 that somehow we won the election under false pretenses, somehow we stole the election, I think one has to just spend a little time to review the voting records of people in this province to show that that kind of position is pure nonsense.

So I hope the new members opposite will add something to the debate and not merely rehash the old speeches of our first Session back in government just after 1981, where the position of members opposite was that somehow they should have won that election and that we won it under false pretenses because the people of Manitoba have proven them wrong.

The other point that I take, I guess, some particular satisfaction in is just recalling the debate in this Chamber as you will recall sitting in a different spot of two to three Sessions ago where members opposite said there is no way that this government would be re-elected, that there is no way that the New Democratic Party would be re-elected in this province again. There were people outside of this Chamber who believed that and there was some public research, public polling information that gave some credence to that. But I think in the end, even after those accusations, those positions that were taken by members opposite, that the people of the province proved them wrong.

I would like to just spend a moment or two to talk a bit about my constituency and with respect to what has taken place over the past five years in the Seven Oaks constituency, and I am certainly proud again to represent the constituents of the Seven Oaks constituency. I'm proud that they have continued their long term support of the NDP and our predecessor party, the CCF. I'm proud that they are continuing to support and find the policies and programs of this government to be in keeping with the needs of our part of the City of Winnipeg.

You know, if I looked at what has taken place over the past five years in my constituency, an area of the City of Winnipeg that is commonly referred to as an older neighbourhood or an aging neighbourhood, there has been more activity, coordinated activity, with significant provincial involvement either directly or indirectly through cost-shared programs. There has been more activity in the Seven Oaks constituency than there has ever been in the last number of years.

In fact, if you look at an area like senior citizen housing, in the past five years there have been two senior citizen housing developments opened in my constituency and they were both projects that were developed by community groups with provincial government support by ethnic organizations within the Seven Oaks constituency, one German and one Jewish. But there were two significant senior citizen projects that were built and opened in the last five years in the Seven Oaks constituency. If you contrast that, Madam Speaker, with the years of 1977 to 1981 when there was no senior citizen construction, no senior citizen units at all developed or built in the Seven Oaks constituency, you could see why the people of my area believe strongly in the kind of programs that this party in government have been putting in place, particularly for senior citizens.

The same is true when you look at day care facilities in my area. Again, there was a serious neglect of that

Tuesday, 13 May, 1986

area during the period of the Conservative Government, but over the last five years, there have been a number of new day care centres opened, expanded centres, centres that previously were housed in dingy church basements and other less than ideal centres that have been developed and expanded, new centres like the one that is going into the North YMCA as part of the North Y's redevelopment project which is not only dealing with the traditional areas that the North Y has been involved in for close to 30 years in the north end of Winnipeg but have expanded into a day care program for children have expanded into a senior citizens' development. There is also a new day care centre that I had the privilege of opening, along with some of my other provincial and municipal colleagues, on Salter Avenue; another facility that was housed in a church basement in less than ideal circumstances for the early childhood development of our constituency's children that has now moved into an above-ground facility that was supported by significant Provincial Government resources and the resources of the Core Area Initiative which, as you are aware, is a tri-level government initiative. So we have seen a lot of progress within the Seven Oaks constituency over the past five years, in areas of senior citizen housing construction and in areas related to early childhood development through day care facilities.

I could go on, Madam Speaker, to talk about areas such as other community facilities, such as recreation facilities and cultural facilities that have been developed in our area. We're seeing finally a turnaround in the decay that was starting to take place in my corner of the city. We are seeing a turnaround whereby younger

people are moving back into an area of the city that was losing young people and having a deterioration of housing stock and community facilities.

I'm certainly proud to again represent the people of the Seven Oaks area, and I pledge to them that I will continue to work with them in the Manitoba Legislature to meet their needs and to ensure that our area does not again get neglected like it did for a number of years during the period of 1977-81.

I would like to speak on some other issues with respect to the Throne Speech. I know members opposite are just sitting at the end of their chairs, waiting for some of those comments to come. I can assure members, particularly the Member for Pembina, that he will not be disappointed. I plan to deal with some of the other important issues that are of concern to Manitobans, issues that I notice the members opposite have not been speaking on, issues related to the economy and to jobs, Madam Speaker.

As in all things, sometimes you have to leave some of the better things for another day. You can't have everything put on the table or debated at one point. I think at this point, I will just say we should maybe call it 10 o'clock, Madam Speaker, because I think it is just about 10 o'clock.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 10 o'clock, I'm interrupting this House in accordance with the rules. When this matter is before the House again, the Honourable Minister will have 26 minutes remaining.

The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).