

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 10 March, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

It's my pleasure to table a number of reports: Volume I and Volume II, Public Accounts, for the year ended March 31, 1986, copies of which were provided to members prior to the opening of the current sitting of the House; and a report of the Provincial Auditor to the Legislative Assembly for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1986, which was also provided to members previously; also, a Return under Section 30 of The Public Officers' Act and The Public Trustee of Manitoba Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 1986.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to table the Annual Report of the Department of Energy and Mines for the year ending March 31, 1986.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report for Government Services for the year ending March 31, 1986.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, I'd like to draw the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 students from Grade 9 from the Alexander Ross School. The students are under the direction of Mrs. MacLean, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bilingual directory - civil servants

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

Last week, the Premier issued a directory of bilingual civil servants in the Province of Manitoba, which he called an important step forward in the Province of Manitoba, which he called an important step forward in the process of bringing French language services to Manitoba. At the same time, the head of the government's French language services secretariat indicated that the number of bilingual civil servants had not increased in the past three years.

My question to the Premier is: does this indicate that the great demand that the Premier and his government said was there for French language services some three years ago, when they embroiled this province into a bitter and acrimonious debate on French language services, that great demand is not there?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, first, I think a correction would be in order. The embroiling of this province into a bitter debate was originated with honourable members across the way, not on this side of the House. So let the record be clear in that respect.

Insofar as language services are concerned, what indeed the directory indicates is that during the last period of time, though there has not been any significant increase in the numbers overall of bilingual civil servants, there has been organization and coordination to ensure that more individual departments have the capacity in order to be able to respond to requests in French so that they can be properly answered - more coordination, more organization.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, there may be more coordination and more organization, but there aren't any more services, Madam Speaker.

My question, therefore, to the Premier is: is there any unfulfilled demand that his government sees today for language services in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, first, we're not the sources of exaggerated numbers that were suggested would be required in order to provide bilingual public services in the Province of Manitoba, nor was the Minister for Urban Affairs the originator of any exaggerated figures in that respect. If the honourable members would closely scrutinize those statements, they would find that to be the case.

You know there are clearly areas, Madam Speaker, where there is still a lack of bilingual servicing. In communities, particularly, where there is a heavy density of Francophone population, we still lack adequate bilingual service in those particular communities, and the government will attempt to continue to redress that problem.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the First Minister could indicate where those demands exist, and why his government isn't moving to fulfill the demand.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I thought that I had answered that in the previous question. I said in those areas of the province where there's a substantial number of Francophone residents, specifically those areas of 10 percent and over that are Francophone, there is still a lack of service in some areas. We are identifying that lack and we'll continue to strive to redress that problem in those areas.

Translation costs - federal contribution

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, speaking of exaggerated figures, in response to my questions in the Estimates for the Premier's area on September 9 of last year, the Premier sent me a letter on November 18, indicating and I quote: "With respect to legal translation costs themselves, the Federal Government contributed \$300,000 in the last fiscal year. While no final agreement has yet been struck for this year, we fully expect the federal contribution to be at least comparable to last year's." Yet the Annual Report of the Attorney-General's Department that was tabled in Committee of Supply August 19 indicates, and I quote: "We have received support from the Federal Government in the order of \$400,000 last year, and we anticipate a similar amount this year."

Is the figure \$300,000 in the Premier's letter correct, or \$400,000 in the Attorney-General's Annual Report correct?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, we will accept that question as notice.

Rural Manitoba - programs

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister or to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Madam Speaker, the decline in population in 60 percent of the municipalities throughout Manitoba is indeed very shocking to, not only the Opposition, but to those people who are affected. What plans or programs does the Minister of Municipal Affairs or Premier have to assure those people in rural Manitoba that they will not be called upon to bear the heavier load of taxation that has been incurred because of a loss of population under the New Democratic Party over the past five years?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, first I'm really surprised that the Member for Arthur would pose that question, he having been a member of a government during the term of a former Premier, Premier Lyon, in this province, in which there were two consecutive population losses in the Province of Manitoba, when there were absolute net declines in the Province of Manitoba.

That has not been the case during the term of this administration, since 1981 to the present time. So, Madam Speaker, I wish that honourable members would ensure that, when they ask questions, they try to base

those questions on correct premises rather than on erroneous premises.

Madam Speaker, the thrust of this government in respect to Manitoba, including rural and Northern Manitoba, I think is one that is quite, quite clear, and is one of the reasons that this province has led most other provinces by way of growth, by way of job increase, by way of investment growth. It is because there has been a clear economic strategy carefully thought out in order to . . .

POINT OF ORDER

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, we have listened in Opposition to Ministers giving answers that have no connection whatsoever to the question that's asked. Madam Speaker, Beauchesne points out that answers to the questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, which the Premier in this case was not doing. The question was very specific as to grants to municipalities with reduced populations and the effect on those municipalities.

The answer should not provoke debate, as Beauchesne says, and the First Minister is getting exactly into that area, Madam Speaker. A quick perusal of Hansard over the few days that we have been in Session will show the extended length of answers that have no relevancy to the question that is asked.

And I would ask, Madam Speaker, that whereas you have interrupted members on this side of the House who are asking questions when they add one extra sentence, that you ask the Ministers to keep their answers short, so that we can ask as many questions as possible. That is the objective of question period, to ask as many questions as possible and to get brief, short answers to them.

MADAM SPEAKER: On the point of order, the Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, to that point of order, if indeed the question was, as the Member for St. Norbert has suggested, a specific question as to grants to municipalities, then I'm prepared to acknowledge that my answer was too general. But if it is, as I recall the question to be - and, Madam Speaker, you may wish to review Hansard - a general question as to what your government intends to do in order to arrest the decrease in population in rural areas, then a general question like that deserves and I am obliged to provide a general answer to a general question. I suggest to you that, Madam Speaker, you may wish to review Hansard to ascertain whether the question was a general question or whether it was a specific question.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, Madam Speaker, I have an additional question.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: On the point of order, it's my understanding that, while we cannot determine, either the Opposition or the Speaker, the content of the answer, or the Opposition cannot raise a point of order as to whether they're satisfied with the content of the answer, certainly I have asked, on many occasions, that the Honourable Ministers who are answering questions do adhere to Citation 358.(2), which the Honourable Opposition House Leader raised, which is that "answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate."

I would like to caution all Ministers, once again, to follow that particular citation.

Rural Manitoba - population loss

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister.

In view of the fact that he has been the Premier of the Province of Manitoba when they removed the Land Titles Office from Boissevain, when they removed the RCMP from Winnipeg Beach, Reston and Deloraine, Madam Speaker, the question to the Minister is, in case he has trouble with it, will he stop the exodus of people from rural Manitoba with his government policies so they don't have to burden the extra tax load which his government is incurring upon them?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the question is argumentative, and it is one that calls for a general response. Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to provide a general response to the general question from the Honourable Member for Arthur, if indeed that is the appropriate manner to proceed.

The honourable member knows full well that, during the term of this government, there have been many programs by way of Interest Rate Relief, by way of the Beef Stabilization Program, by way of other initiatives in establishing health and educational institutions, by providing government services, municipal services, to the rural areas of this province that have improved rural life in this province.

Now, Madam Speaker, I am prepared to go on at great length to answer general questions, if that is indeed the wish of honourable members across the way.

Rural Manitoba - transfer payments to

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur, with a supplementary.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Madam Speaker.

In view of the fact that 60 percent of the municipalities of rural Manitoba have seen a decline in their population

under his term as Premier of this province, will he contact the municipalities and the people of rural Manitoba and assure them that there won't be a reduction in total dollars for support of rural Manitoba out of the Provincial Treasury? Will he give that assurance that they can look for the same amount of support which, Madam Speaker, they deserve, police protection and all those other services that the people in the City of Winnipeg expect and get?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker.

A rather interesting reaction to a newspaper article that appeared in yesterday's paper. I want to assure the Member for Arthur, my critic, that we will be reviewing this in the next month or so, the transfer payments to the municipalities. In the past, there has always been consideration taken about the potential reduction. We will be reviewing this matter and an announcement will be made at the appropriate time.

Daerwood Machine Works - incentive payment

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Business Development and a little Tourism.

On November 8, 1984, a conditional grant of \$60,000 was made to Daerwood Machine Works. The Minister says that it was not made on legal terms but on moral terms, and I maintain it was done because of compassionate and political reasons. Can the Minister tell us what the conditions of that grant were?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, I will, as always. Madam Speaker, the terms of the grant, as I recall, it's a fully secured loan. In fact, it's not a grant; it's a loan and a fully secured loan, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie with a supplementary.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, yes, the O/C states that it was a conditional grant, but the Minister now says that it was a loan. Are the payments to the loan being made?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, I will have to check on that and I will report back to the member, but I can assure him that it was not a grant and that it was a loan and that the loan was fully secured.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, I was trying to get the Minister out of the chute, but the question is to the First Minister. Was the condition of that grant that Mr. Roels not tell the people of Manitoba, and

specifically the constituency of Selkirk, prior to the election just how incompetent his government is in handling affairs?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, if we are going to abide by the rules and the procedures and the practices regarding questions in question period, and if we are going to reference Beauchesne in order to attempt to bring, in the perception of members opposite, a different type of question period into bear, then I would reference Citation 357 where it states very clearly that: "In putting a question a member must confine himself to the narrowest limits, and the purpose of a question is to obtain information and not to supply it to the House. A question oral or written must not be ironical, rhetorical, offensive or contain epithet, innuendo, satire, or ridicule. An oral question or written question must not be trivial, vague or meaningless. An oral question or written question must not multiply, with slight variations, a similar question on the same point, and a question oral or written must not repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused. A question must also not contain imputations. A question must also not be a speech, however short; nor be of unreasonable length or seek, for purposes of argument, information on matters of past history."

There are a whole number of other things that a question ought not to be, that have just been violated by the Member for Portage in the phrasing of his questions, right from the earliest preamble where he talked about Business Development and a little Tourism to the last question. In fact, if the members opposite - and I see the Assistant House Leader getting to his feet, and I welcome any suggestions or advice he might provide to us on this side again. If in fact, Madam Speaker, we are going to abide by the procedures and rules as laid out in Beauchesne, we can let them apply equally to both sides, and let members opposite frame their questions in the proper fashion.

I would suggest, Madam Speaker, on the point of order, that question is in fact out of order for all the reasons as raised here and many more, which we can go into detail on if required.

MADAM SPEAKER: On the point of order, the Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: What we see now, Madam Speaker, is the government not only wants to take as much time as possible in answering the questions so that they can limit the number of questions that are asked for this side, the Government House Leader now wants, in the few limited questions we get, to restrict those questions. The purpose of question period is to allow us to ask questions, and to get as many answers as possible, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader, with more advice.

HON. J. COWAN: On the point of order, Madam Speaker, just so the record be clear, all we want to do

is have the same rules apply to both sides of the House. If the Member for St. Norbert, the Opposition House Leader, wishes to stand up and attempt to muzzle individuals on this side of the House by suggesting that we should not be giving full and factual information in answer to questions, then let them phrase the questions in the way in which Beauchesne anticipated and in a way in which this House has said questions should be phrased in the past, so as we can answer them in a concise and factual manner. But we will not allow them to suggest that this side of the House should abide by the provisions provided for in Beauchesne, and that side of the House can do anything they damn well please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I do hope the Honourable Government House Leader would withdraw that final remark.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I think the intent was to suggest that they . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. COWAN: I think the problem's a very real problem, that members on this side, Madam Speaker, should not be forced to abide by the procedures while members on that side can do anything - and if you wish - they darn well please. But the fact is, they're doing anything they darn well please anyway.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

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

Let me, on the point of order raised by the Government House Leader, Madam Speaker, refer you to Commons Debates of February 24 of 1986, in which the then Speaker stated, in discussing the whole area of question period: "As one important principle, it should be made a part of question period that members should be given the greatest possible freedom in the putting of questions that is consistent with the other principles or practices, should seek, in the words of Mr. Speaker Jerome, to reduce to an absolute minimum the negative disqualifications that may limit or restrict the members' right to ask a question."

I would ask, Madam Speaker, that you respectfully reject the arguments of the Government House Leader, in that the right and ability of members on this side of the House to ask questions should not be unduly restricted, as the member is suggesting.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, very seldom, if at all on this side, have you seen me rise to suggest that the questions that were being asked were out of order. Very seldom, on this side, did you see any member rise to suggest that the questions should not be answered. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, it is our intent and our policy that the members opposite do be allowed the greatest possible freedoms and flexibility in posing their questions and, by practice, we

have shown that to be our policy. We have not risen to our feet to suggest that the questions were out of order or that the questions did not abide by what was called for in Beuchesne or the practices of this House.

Let the record be very clear. What is happening here today is what has been happening for far too long in this House now, and that is members opposite suggest that this side should be constrained, unduly so, in answering questions. Either they don't touch the subject which they wish them to touch, either they're too long, either they're not acceptable, either we shouldn't be asking questions on this side of the House which demand factual information for the public and for members opposite and, at the same time, suggest that they have the maximum possible freedom.

What I would like to see in this House, Madam Speaker, in the interest of good debate and in the interest of the proper functioning of this House, is for the maximum latitude to be given to both sides of this House so that questions can be those questions which members opposite and members on this side feel are important questions to the public of Manitoba and so that the answers, most of all, can be full, factual, complete, and provide the information which this government wants to provide to the people of Manitoba through this House.

SPEAKER'S RULING

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

I thank all members for their advice on this situation. As members well know, when we take time from question period to discuss points of order, we do keep track of the time that is lost and we do add it on. So I think it's very important that we determine points of order based on their merit and make sure that we do have the full adequate 40 minutes for question period.

Also in terms of the rules for both questions and answers, as all members are well aware, there are not the same rules for each. There are many, many qualifications that are put on the kinds of questions that are in order, and I do try to interpret questions to see whether they follow within those guidelines. The guidelines for answers are quite different. So it is, certainly, not possible to have the identical interpretation on questions and on answers.

The Member for Portage la Prairie's last question was certainly out of order, and I do caution all members to address Ministers with their proper titles and with the respect that all honourable members deserve in the House.

Also that we will, with the help of both sides, by following the citations in Beuchesne that are applicable to either side, have a very fruitful and productive question period according to the rules.

Automotive Trades Association - cancelled meeting

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll attempt to ask my question without conflicting with

either rule in order that Manitobans can hold this government accountable.

Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for MPIC. The negotiations between MPIC and the Automotive Trades Association continue to drag on with no resolution, and it has come to my attention that the Minister was to meet with representatives of the ATA on March 13, but it appears that he has postponed the meeting. My question is this: why did the Minister impetuously call off the meeting and thus neglect an opportunity to bring a quick end to the impasse?

MADAM SPEAKER: Could the honourable member please rephrase her question as not to imply motives? The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Yes. Why did the Minister cancel the meeting, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

As usual, the Member for River Heights does not have all the facts. As in the last question on this matter, the member had indicated that the Automotive Trades Association was asking for a 9 percent increase. In fact, the figures were between 17 and 30 percent. There is a considerable difference between \$30.45 an hour and \$35.50 an hour, and that is something like 17 percent or 20 percent.

On the matter of the meeting, the member should be aware that I had, some two weeks ago or so ago, responded to a telephone call from the consultants working for the Automotive Trades Association indicating that I might consider meeting with the representatives of the association. I subsequently received a three- or four-page letter from the association, after which I advised the consultants or members on the negotiating committee that I did not feel that it would be appropriate for me to meet with the association at this time.

That information was conveyed to the representatives of the association last Thursday or Friday, and I was somewhat surprised that the consultant or the negotiators have not been speaking to the president for the past three or four days. If there was a surprise today, it's a communication problem within the association, not from my office to the association.

Minister's disapproval of questions - re Automotive Trades Association

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I have been told by a member of the ATA that the Minister called off the meeting because he disapproved of questions being asked in this House about negotiations. How does the Minister justify this sort of behaviour whereby the Minister of a Crown refuses to meet with a group when he receives questions which he deems unfavourable?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

That question is not in order. Does the Honourable Member for River Heights wishes to rephrase her supplementary question?

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I'd like to ask a question to the Premier, Madam Speaker.

Is the Premier prepared to accept behaviour which would allow his Ministers to not meet with individuals because they don't like what is raised in this House?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, there is no case to suggest that, and the question is hypothetical.

Carman Agri Services - meeting with Minister

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Autopac and follows on the recent answer of his Premier.

Will the Minister responsible for Autopac meet with Mr. Dennis Lesage of Carman Agri to discuss the current problem that he is having with the bad situation caused by mishandling by Autopac of his claim in Saskatchewan? Will he meet with Dennis Lesage?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Madam Speaker, apparently, the Member for Pembina doesn't read the newspapers as thoroughly as I thought he did. The fact of the matter is that there is a Statement of Claim before the courts by Carman Agri against the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and it would therefore be quite inappropriate for me to meet with representatives from Carman Agri at this time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether Autopac has been served with this alleged Statement of Claim?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Madam Speaker, I understand that, as of about an hour-and-a-half ago, the claim had been filed, but it had not been served on the corporation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well then, Madam Speaker, given that the claim hasn't been served on Autopac, will the Minister undertake to meet with Mr. Dennis Lesage and discuss the mishandling of Autopac of his case in Saskatchewan?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: If it weren't such a serious matter, I would almost find it amusing, the manner in which the Member for Pembina tries to play lawyer. This is a very serious matter -(Interjection)- in which the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: This is a very serious matter, and I can appreciate the concerns that the owners of Carman Agri have about the existence of their business because of the particular court award. However, as I

indicated when the member first brought it to my attention, I think that the appropriate place to determine whether or not this matter has been handled properly is the courts. I notice the Statement of Claim is to that effect, and the courts will deal with the matter and will adjudicate on it.

MADAM SPEAKER: A final supplementary?

Carman Agri Services - Letter of Credit

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the First Minister.

Madam Speaker, given that Friday, outside of this Chamber, the Minister responsible for Autopac admitted that there was now a policy in place whereby people being sued would be notified, indicating an error on Autopac's part;

given, No. 2, that outside of the House, the Minister responsible for MPIC indicated that Autopac was served in Saskatchewan and failed to serve Carman Agri;

given, No. 3, Mr. Premier, that there is no precedent in this case because Autopac is not similarly defending any other Manitoban;

given, No. 4, that you, Sir, on moral grounds have defended a business in your constituency and provided, on moral grounds, financial support to that business; and,

No. 5, given that the Minister again outside this House said that he would provide relief to Carman Agri if they were sued by the Saskatchewan lawyer;

would the First Minister simply accede to the request I made to him in my letter to him of March 6 and provide a Letter of Credit to take Carman Agri out of the bounds of going bankrupt because of incompetent actions by this Minister and his staff and Autopac?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, let me assure you that I won't be asking for equal time in my answer as to which the Honourable Member for Pembina gave in his question, and I won't need it either.

Madam Speaker, there is a court action which is taking place in the Province of Saskatchewan involving Mr. Rieger and affecting Carman Agri, involving the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. We've also received notice that there is another action under way vis-a-vis Carman Agri and the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, apparently a suit just filed in the courts a short period of time ago.

Usually in matters such as this, it is in the public interest, as well as the interest of all parties including Carman Agri, to allow the courts to make their determination of equity and justice and have sufficient confidence in them rather than attempt to distort the process in the Legislative Chambers.

MPIC - policy re Autopac

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier.

Is the Premier now telling Manitobans who have not been properly represented by Autopac, by Crown

corporations, by bureaucrats, that his policy now changes, wherein two years ago he supported Daerwood Machine Works Limited in his constituency from wrongful action of bureaucrats? Is that policy now changed in that the First Minister will no longer support and defend businesses in Manitoba who are wrongfully represented by bureaucrats of Crown corporations?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the very court action that is presently being dealt with is one that is attempting to determine whether or not Carman Agri was well represented, was well served by way of the legal processes by Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation in the case that was held in Saskatchewan. That is the very essence, the very substance.

If the Honourable Member for Pembina is already making up his mind prior to the court case having made a determination, then I don't know why his constituent has launched a court action or why indeed is Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation appealing the action in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Carman Agri Services - bankruptcy

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary to the Premier.

Is the Premier then telling Carman Agri that they can go bankrupt because of wrongful action by MPIC and their defence in Saskatchewan; that pending the appeal, he is going to allow them to go bankrupt?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Madam Speaker, I would

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina asked a question. I presume he wants to hear the answer.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: In response to the question from the Member for Pembina, I had indicated last week outside of the House and by correspondence that I was satisfied there was nothing in the conduct of this file by MPIC which would warrant intervention on my part such as requested in the letter of February 24.

However, I did say that the matter will proceed to appeal with every effort being made to overturn this judgment, which can only be viewed as inordinately high. However, with the filing of a Statement of Claim against the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation by Carman Agri, I think that particular action has foreclosed any possibility of MPIC trying to resolve the matter to Carman Agri's satisfaction.

First-contract legislation - applications

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

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

On Friday, March 6, the Honourable Member for Brandon West asked a question: Since the first-contract legislation was brought in by this government, how many first-contract applications have been filed by bargaining agents with the Manitoba Labour Board, and how many have been filed by employers?

The answer, Madam Speaker, is 24 by employees or employee groups, 1 by an employer. I just add a further note that the one brought by an employer for first contract led to the curtailment of a legal strike that was then ongoing.

New assessment classification re Headingley - refusal to establish

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, on Friday last, I tabled in the House a petition from a number of residents of the hamlet of South Headingley, requesting the Minister of Urban Affairs to take certain actions regarding a new assessment classification for their particular situation, as well as other large-lot situations surrounding Winnipeg. Yesterday, the Mayor was quoted as saying that the Minister had refused to establish that additional classification.

Can the Minister now advise the House if he has indeed made that statement?

MADAM SPEAKER: That question is out of order. It's a member's duty to ascertain the truth of statements that he brings before the House.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: If I may rephrase that, Madam Speaker: Can the Minister advise the House if that's the policy of the government at this time?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, as you are aware, Beauchesne very clearly prohibits the asking of questions as to whether or not a matter is a matter of policy under the government. I believe you will find it in the section of Beauchesne entitled "Questions," under Citations 357 and 358.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood on the point of order?

MR. J. ERNST: No.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West on the point of order?

MR. J. McCRAE: I'm rising on the point to ask the Government House Leader just which citation he's referring to in Citation 357?

MADAM SPEAKER: It's my opinion that - the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: I thought the Assistant House Leader on the other side would have known. However, if he

requires assistance, we're always pleased to provide it to him as we were able to last week.

The Citation is: ". . . ask the Government's opinion on matters of policy." It's 357(bb).

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, the Government House Leader draws our attention to 357(bb), but I ask Your Honour to refer to Citation 357.(2) which reads: "Many of the traditional limitations on questions are now applied more strictly to written questions than to oral questions. In the words of one Speaker: '. . . one need only look at Citation 171 of Beausnesne's Fourth Edition,'" which, Madam Speaker, is reprinted in Citation 357. of this, the Fifth Edition, ". . . in which will be found numerous, and in many cases, inoperable, restrictions covering the form and content of questions. I suggest that if each and every one of these restrictions were applied in every case, very few questions would ever reach the Order Paper."

Madam Speaker, that would certainly apply to Oral Questions as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Again, the Member for Brandon West makes our point. The point is - and we made it earlier - we do not want to restrict members on either side of this House in respect to the questions they ask or the answers they give. We on this side feel that a free flow of information is important, not only to the workings of this House, but to the provision of information to the public. When members opposite stand up today, as they did first, and start to suggest that we have to follow Beausnesne to the nth degree in respect to our answers, then we suggest that, if that is going to be the case, they must follow Beausnesne to the nth degree in respect to their questions.

If they follow Beausnesne in the nth degree in respect to their questions, I would suggest this is what will happen, and I'll repeat what the Member for Brandon West said. I suggest that if each and every one of these restrictions were applied in every case, very few questions would ever reach the Order Paper, and he suggests that applies to Oral Questions as well. That is exactly a problem we have been trying to avoid by allowing flexibility in the asking of questions and flexibility in the answering of questions, so that there will be that full flow of information.

I thank the Honourable Member for Brandon West for his assistance and his help, because I think he has made exactly the type of case that we were trying to suggest would happen if we followed their advice.

Madam Speaker, we want that free and flowing question period. We do not want this, to have to stand up on every instance and suggest the question is out of order because, in fact, very few questions will reach this House if that is the case; but as well we don't want to have to stand here and listen to them every time we try to give full and factual information, suggesting that we are not abiding by Beausnesne. Let us have the free and open-flowing debate that's required for the proper working of this House.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I think a discussion in the Chamber as to how question period should be conducted is always very enlightening to all sides, including to the Speaker.

On this particular question that has been asked and the point of order specifically that was raised to deal with the Member for Charleswood's question, Citation 357.(bb) suggests that a question is out of order if it seeks the government's opinion on a matter of policy.

Citation 358.(f) says that a question "should not raise a matter of policy too large to be dealt with as an answer to a question."

Those are the two major Citations that deal with policy issues and questions.

In my opinion - and my recollection was that the Member for Charleswood asked the Minister to advise the Opposition as to a specific policy. If that answer is not in contravention of 358.(f), which is too large to be dealt with as an answer to a question, I suggest that the question is in order.

The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Did the Honourable Minister want the question repeated, which might be helpful after this length of time?

New assessment classification re Headingley - refusal to establish

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, it was so long ago I might have forgotten as well.

The people of Charleswood asked a simple question. Will the Minister create a classification to resolve their assessment problem? My question to the Minister is: Has he done it? Will he do it?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

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

In answer to the question, I did meet with the City of Winnipeg yesterday, the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, the Chairperson of the Finance Committee, and did reiterate that we would not be creating a ninth classification for purposes of differential mill rates. I can also say, Madam Speaker, that it was also the city's opinion that a ninth category should not be created but, notwithstanding that factor, I wouldn't be recommending it.

There will be shifts in the eight classifications. After 25 years without reassessment, there will be shifts within those classifications: in the home sector, from the inner city to some of the suburban areas, in the commercial sector, in some of the other sectors that have been identified. But we are not going to create 15, 16, 17 classifications, based on ad hoc information from the City of Winnipeg.

We still have not received information, Madam Speaker, on some of the specifics. I understand the assessments for some of those properties are under appeal. I also understand that the phasing-in legislation that we have discussed, all members have discussed, is very positive, which will allow the increases to be

over a three-year period, will be very positive for those people and similarly affected people in the City of Winnipeg.

However, it was certainly the verbal conclusion of the members I met with from the city and certainly my own position that I would not recommend to my caucus and government that a ninth category be created. I think it's very important that we be honest with those citizens. This is a very complicated item. I just would like to say one other point on it, with your indulgence.

MADAM SPEAKER: I'm sure the honourable member will ask a supplementary.

HON. G. DOER: I think he will.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, the Minister referred in his response to the fact that the City of Winnipeg's position was, they were not in favour. Does the Minister have in his possession now a resolution of the Council of the City of Winnipeg to that effect?

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, quite frankly, I haven't got a resolution from the city council on any one of the classifications we've created throughout this process.

We have got some letters back and forth through the committee that the city has created and the committee that the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and myself - we've been meeting with the city to resolve many of the differences. The answer is there has been no resolution in my possession. I have said that there may be areas in The City of Winnipeg Act that would provide some sensitivity to the situation, subject of course to the facts being made available so we'll know what, in fact, we're dealing with.

Deferral of taxes - legislation re

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. The Mayor again yesterday is quoted as saying that the city does not have the right to defer taxes, but that the Minister had promised in fact to introduce legislation to allow the city to defer taxes. Is the Minister going to introduce such legislation?

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, there are two aspects of the legislation we are planning to introduce that we've consulted with members of the House on and members of city council. One is to deal with extending the appeal period to deal with the very real situation of comparing tax assessments across the city and the staggering of how those tax notices went out by city.

The second issue is to provide phasing-in legislation, again in consultation with members in this House and members of city council, to allow for those tax increases within those classifications to take place over three years. I have not seen the data, Madam Speaker, on the allegations of these houses. I have legal opinions from the province that say there may be all kinds of flexible means within The City of Winnipeg Act and other acts. Apparently the officials are meeting, between the city and the province. I am not intending, and the proposed bill on the Order Paper does not contain that proposed amendment, but I have always said

throughout this process that we're flexible and sensitive and we would be willing to take that under advisement.

I said that to the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, the Chairman of the Finance Committee yesterday morning when I met with them.

Manitoba Hydro - review by PUB

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro.

A lawyer representing the Manitoba Organization for Seniors and the Consumers Association has accused the Hydro of trying to stifle the public hearing with respect to Manitoba Hydro's rate increase. I would ask the Minister if Manitoba Hydro is acting on his direction in attempting to stifle the scope of the review by the Public Utilities Board.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: The counsel has been acting on behalf of Manitoba Hydro. I have not been issuing instructions to counsel for Manitoba Hydro as to how to act on this matter. Manitoba Hydro is acting as they have acted before National Energy Boards in the past, and as they have acted I guess many years ago before the Public Utilities Board. They have said that, if there is an appeal of a 2.8 percent rate increase, they're quite happy to defend the application to have the 2.8 percent rate increase defended and that's what they will be.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, let me ask the Minister.

Unlike the Attorney-General and the Minister of Culture, who have chosen not to proclaim The Freedom of Information Act and open up the deep, dark government secrets, would the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro intervene in this matter? As Mr. Peltz has stated, and unfortunately Manitoba Hydro wants to operate in the shadows, would he then direct Manitoba Hydro to agree to a full hearing and review of the rates before the Public Utilities Board?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I'm very surprised that Mr. Peltz said that, in fact, because Mr. Peltz over the last year-and-a-half has been provided with a great deal of information that he has asked for. I'm very surprised that he would make that statement, given the full information that he has indeed been provided over the past year-and-a-half.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, would the Honourable Minister then agree to meet with Mr. Peltz to review his concerns and agree with his request that the Public Utilities Board have a full review of the rates to be set by Manitoba Hydro, and that Manitoba Hydro not continue to object to an attempt to stifle that review and limit its scope?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Certainly, I have in fact had conversations with Mr. Peltz on this in the past, and

that if he felt he wasn't getting sufficient information that I certainly would be quite happy to meet with him. I've not heard from him directly; I think he's chosen to make a statement in the press, which I disagree with. But I certainly would be quite happy to meet with him and discuss this matter, and in fact discuss the matter of the rate review. Manitoba Hydro is quite prepared, as per the act, to have the rate increase reviewed, or future rate increases reviewed by the Public Utilities Board as the act and as the policy provides for.

Day Care - Federal Gov't intentions

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: My question is to the Minister of Community Services.

As we all know, there is a great demand for day-care spaces and, as we all know, the Federal Government has promised much in this regard. Has the Minister any direct contact by correspondence or phone calls to let us know what the Federal Government is doing in regard to day care?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, we are in the process of meeting with the Federal Government. Five of their officials have come and met with my officials again to hear the provincial position yet again. We, as yet, have no information on the federal intentions, though we do have a time frame within which they have promised that they will come to some conclusion on what their policy is. They say that they will meet with all the provinces some time in March. The Parliamentary Committee will report March 21, and they will have their strategy ready by May for final - I don't know whether it's to be implementation or the final dotting of the "i's" and crossing of the "t's" in September - but to date, Madam Speaker, we have no idea as to what the parameters of that policy will be.

Water Rights Act - drainage inspections

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

It is my understanding that The Water Rights Act has been proclaimed recently. Under this act, will the farmers and municipalities not be required to have drainage projects on their property or within their jurisdiction inspected by government inspectors?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

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

Yes, The Water Rights Act has been proclaimed. The regulations pursuant to that act will soon be passed,

and it is within that framework there will be provision for ensuring that any alteration of water flow in any area will be done in an orderly manner and doesn't impose hardship on neighbouring properties.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Further to the same Minister, has the Minister made any effort in terms of making the municipalities or the farming community aware of the new impositions that will be imposed upon their privilege in terms of providing proper drainage for their land?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: There was a process of consultation that was undertaken at the time that the act was being reviewed, and it is our intent to undertake communication when the regulations are passed with various, in fact all, parties that would be interested, whether we have the municipalities, landowners, other parties of interest. We will be undertaking a process of communication with those groups to ensure that the intent of the legislation and the regulations are understood - understood in that it is not meant to impose a hardship or a burden on landowners, but it is intended indeed to prevent the creation of a hardship by indiscriminate alteration of water flows, whether by individuals or property holders.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson, who has 24 minutes remaining.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I feel a little awkward today. Last night, when I launched my speech, I was sort of on a roll, and then had to sort of be cut off in the middle of it, and I feel sort of like somebody that's in the middle of a race. When you stop in the middle, you sort of lose your momentum. But under the circumstances, Madam Speaker, maybe it was just as well.- (Interjection)-

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Because since yesterday when I was speaking, I have been informed by my colleagues that they weren't sure on which side of the House I was on, that I was making this sort of a highroad loving speech. After reconsidering my comments, I think maybe it's just as well maybe that I was interrupted and maybe can get down to some of the serious things that I wanted to raise.

Basically, the things that I was coming to yesterday was the record of this government, and I alluded to it in certain circumstances, what their record has been since 1981 actually, but more so actually since 1983 as I mentioned. Since that time, this government has been a very shy and timid government and seemingly don't have the ability or the desire to proceed with positive action that would be beneficial to all the people

in Manitoba. When I look at them sitting there, and I've heard comments being called from time to time, tell us what to do. For a government that has been in power for less than a year, to already be asking, tell us what to do, illustrates to me that there are problems there. I sometimes make light of this, Madam Speaker, but I always say, when a socialist hasn't got money to -{Interjection}- spend anymore . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.

If honourable members would like to have private conversations, would they kindly do so elsewhere.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I indicated to Madam Speaker already, I was on a roll last night and it takes a little while until you get the momentum built up again.

But what we see across from us, Madam Speaker, is a government with no plan of action and apparently no desire to move on any major thing. There is no long-range planning.

My colleague from Lakeside yesterday spoke eloquently as usual and gave us a bit of history as to some of the bigger things that have been undertaken in this province, for example, the installation of telephones throughout Manitoba, hydro, these kind of things. This takes imagination and planning. We don't have that. Madam Speaker, you can hear that in the speeches from the government side, that there is no initiative left with them and this is in less than a year since they formed government.

Madam Speaker, methinks, when I look at the Minister of Finance sitting in his chair from time to time, he looks like death warmed over already and he still hasn't brought his Budget forward. So I expect that there are not going to be very many good things happening in there. Madam Speaker, the fact that the government side knows what is in that Budget, that is why they are all sort of playing a low-key type of approach to things, even their feebashing has slowed down a little. It shows that the zing is gone out of this government, in spite of some of the comments by some individuals.

Some of the comments concerning feebashing, for example - there has been a lot of criticism of the Federal Government and some of it rightfully so. I walked into a coffee shop the other day and there were about 10 people sitting there. The topic of conversation was Prime Minister Mulroney and what should be done with him. The criticism was quite severe, but people sometimes don't think through these matters very clearly. As I sat, they were trying to get me into the debate. I said: "Gentlemen, it's true. There are many mistakes being made at the federal scene, but you know, I find it so hard. How do you defend them?" I said the fact that the inflation rate is lowest for more than a decade now, more than a decade, for a long time; inflation is under control. The other thing I said, it is hard to defend the low interest rate. In this particular case, some individuals said, "Well, our interest rate reflects what happens in the States."

Madam Speaker, I had the occasion to go on a little holiday to Mexico, which is the neighbour on the other side of the States and certainly it has no reflection there, so I don't know whether it has that much of a reflection here. But these kind of things we don't think

about very much when we talk about inflation, when we talk of low interest rates and how it has stimulated the economy. The building starts in this province, for example, are directly related to the low interest rates. But, you know, these things always have a way of being distorted a little bit. Everybody can play with figures. The government does it to their ability as best they can. We do it in our way.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to relate incidents that happened in my constituency, for example. I met a farmer the other day. I said, "How are things going?" He said, "Well, not so good." I said, "What's the problem?" He said, "Thirty-three percent of my herd died." I picked up my ears and said, "Well, what happened?" He said, "I only had three, one died."

Madam Speaker, what I was trying to illustrate is how you can play with figures. In that example, one out of three makes 33 percent, and when I looked at that pre-Budget document that the Minister of Finance sent out, all these graphs and stuff like that, we, Madam Speaker, do the same thing. We play with figures to our advantage, if we can to some degree, but we are the Opposition, Madam Speaker. We are the Opposition. They are the government and they are supposed to be accountable and give direction. That is why they sit there and, as I heard the Attorney-General say, "We got elected again and we're proud of it, and we like it." And rightfully so, they should, but they don't seem to be such a proud and energetic bunch, Madam Speaker.

As I indicated before, you take the money away from a socialist and then he's stuck; then he doesn't know what to do. That's what's happened here and I think that is why the glum faces on the government side, Madam Speaker. That is why the lack of being able to support the Throne Speech properly - just because of things like that.

I am sure that when it comes to the agricultural dilemma right now, if financially they could see their way clear, that they would come forward with programs that would be beneficial. But what they have done, they are reaping the benefits of their five years of mismanagement of all the areas of government. They are not reaping the benefits to where our deficit is so large that just servicing the deficit is already costing us more than most of the departments are spending, and that is the tragedy of it, that we do not understand what a deficit does to a government.

I believe, Madam Speaker, that the deficit in Manitoba, to service the deficit that we have, our debt costs us over \$300 million a year. I believe I am correct in that - 320-something, whatever the case may be.

Madam Speaker, when you take the Capital Budget, where Highways construction was around \$89 million last year, or let's say \$90 million, when we consider that over \$300 million is being spent to service the debt of the province, that shows why we can't come forward with programs anymore. It is a tragedy, but they have created it and they are hung on the horns of their own dilemma at the present time. I don't know what is going to happen.

If you consider that even if they do raise taxes, Madam Speaker - and the Budget coming up on March 16, we'll all have a chance to debate that - if they do raise the taxes, as we suspect they will, they'll still have to be cutting programs and you know what, Madam

Speaker? I predict that the deficit will not be going down. That's going to be a tragedy and the people of Manitoba will become aware and start catching on to what is going on. They will not be that proud of this government. We're looking forward to the day when finally the true story catches up.

The true story is catching up on the federal scene, too. Members took great delight in the showing of the polls. I, Madam Speaker, would predict that this is going to be a roll around. People will understand they went back to what they had and what they are having now and what they could be getting again, and then there is going to be a change of heart. I certainly, Madam Speaker, believe that, because the people by and large know what happens. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

Madam Speaker, we all pick up certain interesting things that happen in the House and the comments that are made in and out of the House. I find it interesting that the Member for Inkster, at the annual meeting of the NDP Party, came forward - you know, him of all people, and I don't say that necessarily disrespectfully - with the suggestion that Crown corporations should be sold and the money applied to the deficit. Madam Speaker, I'm impressed that there is at least one individual who has that kind of thinking even showing forward. Of course, it got squashed and beaten down, but at least somebody was thinking out there about the deficit and it's most amazing and refreshing. Madam Speaker, I think I've embarrassed the Member for Inkster. He's sort of blushing. I think he was probably raked over pretty good because the Premier made short work of that.

But, Madam Speaker, in relation to the debt and the deficit of this province, so many projects could be undertaken. I know, Madam Speaker, that the Minister of Natural Resources has endless projects that he should be dealing with. That poor fellow, Madam Speaker, the poor Minister has a problem. He's got a problem of making decisions. He's got a problem of being influential in his caucus and as a result they've taken and stripped him virtually of any funding for projects, so many of them.

I want to bring up some of this and I'm finally now to the area where I feel most comfortable, which is the Department of Natural Resources and the Minister we had. Madam Speaker, I have made many comments and speeches about that in this House.

Madam Speaker, last year with the new Minister I used a certain amount of compassion. I was kind and I am a kind person, Madam Speaker, my colleagues know that. But it's come to the point and I felt it was only fair to give the Minister time to get his feet under him. But being a bit of a cocky individual, as he was last year, I think he's changed somewhat at this stage of the game. But I raised the issue of problems within his department. I raised it, Madam Speaker. I warned him time and time again and the Minister was being cute about it. He was making smart remarks and being cute about it until finally we had to table documents and finally, with kicking and screaming, we finally got some results out of it. Madam Speaker, that told me one thing, that the caution flag was up as to this Minister.

Madam Speaker, it's been illustrated again. This Minister just went through an episode about elk

ranching, and again he showed the problems that he has within his caucus and within his Cabinet. He came forward after months of window dressing, running around indicating that he was listening to the public. This argument had been going for years already, Madam Speaker, and the Minister could have very easily resolved the whole problem of elk ranching if he had been forthright and honest in his department and educated the public as to what had been done with the experimental ranch in Minitonas. If they'd been open about the facts and explained so there was no doubt that things were not being done properly, there was no accountability, that's all he would have had to do.

He had the information, Madam Speaker. I, to this day, have not had it yet. I asked the Minister in question period the other day whether he would be prepared to table all those documents. Whether The Freedom of Information Act is passed or not, this Minister is going to give those documents in this House, because I know that the taxpayers of Manitoba are going to be footing a bill of anywhere from over \$600,000 to \$1 million in compensation to an individual, Madam Speaker, who the province gave the right to catch elk out of the wild, and we will be turning around and paying compensation. It's just a matter of how much and when. Madam Speaker, the whole problem could have been resolved if that Minister had known what he was doing.

Madam Speaker, we have more issues like that. We have a problem - and a lot of these problems are related back to the fact that he hasn't got money to undertake projects - we have a major drainage problem in the Portage area and the Whitemud Water District. A farmer won a legal case against the government, one farmer, but I don't know how many more who will follow this same area of attack on this government. If the Minister would come forward with a major project and resolve it, the rest of them would withdraw their actions. And we have this going on and on and on.

I want to tell you, Madam Speaker, that on Highway 216, where last year we had a problem there where some of the irate farmers were ready to blow up a highway, and I was out there and some of the resource people were out there, and we will be out there again this spring, the situation virtually nothing has been done unfortunately.

I want to encourage the Minister, and we'll go into this more in-depth when we get into the Estimates about some of these projects, about how much money we would be able to save in the long run if we could undertake proper planning in terms of staging projects, something like the five-year hospital plan that we have in place, so that these people know it's on the drawing board somewhere along the line.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

What we have is a knee-jerk reaction, you know; depending who jockeys hardest with the Minister, that's where maybe a project will develop. He follows the same line as the Minister of Transportation did. I think out of almost all the highway projects, he had well over half of them in his area. I'm talking about the Minister of Highways. If this Minister thinks that his drainage projects are going to work in the same way, that that's going to make him popular, I dare say he'll have a surprise.

I'm throwing out some suggestions for the Minister. Why doesn't he develop a five-year program and then establish the priorities and do it that way? It would make a lot more sense. I haven't seen the Estimates yet. I'm very keen to look at the Estimates, though with some apprehension, because if it follows the pattern of last year, there's going to be more reduction again with this Minister's department, the Minister of Highway's department, in agriculture, you know, and the general operations, probably there'll be cutbacks in there. Those are usually the ones that get kicked first; they're easy to do.

I want to make some more suggestions. I don't want to be totally critical, but the invitation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from time to time has been, "Give us some ideas." Really, I feel sorry for them. I think we should give them some ideas; for example, habitat retention, and the Member for Arthur made reference to it already. We are in a crisis situation in the farm area. Farmers are not even sure whether they're going to be seeding or not. We have much land out there that actually could be used for wildlife habitat - habitat retention.

I'm suggesting to the Minister why don't we, together with the Wildlife Associations, work out a long-range plan in terms of keeping some of this land, setting it aside, let's pay the taxes for it. Some farmers would just be happy if the taxes were paid, they'd leave it that way. So these are things to be looked at.

But what do we have? We have no ideas coming forward. It's a try and stay alive type of attitude that we have. Maybe if we don't do anything, it'll go away or nobody will notice. Well, we're noticing, we're watching, because we plan to form government next time around. So we're being very attentive, and I don't mind sharing these ideas of things that should be done in that regard.

For example, I want to suggest to the Minister why he is not actively pursuing at a time when we're concerned about unemployment, when we're concerned about economic conditions, why we're not proceeding to look for processing of rough fish. That's a thing that's been there, a lot of potential there, but no, there's no initiative, nothing happening.

While we talk on the area of fishing, I want to talk a little bit about commercial fishing, and I just want to raise this concern with the Minister because there's a lot of concern being expressed. They did an experimental thing with the small mesh in the south basin catching perch, and in two years time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people are already saying the results were showing well.

What does this Minister do? He chops the program.-(Interjection)- Not on the advice of the fishermen. We'll get into that in-depth because I have petitions that I will be presenting to this Minister.

Anyway, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've been sort of trying to pick up in a sense where I left off yesterday, and it doesn't do the same thing, like you can't get going quite as properly. You probably know what I mean. But I will have ample opportunity, as will all of us, to take and watch this government. Yes, we will give you advice; we will give all of you advice, and we hope that you will listen to some of it and follow up some of that.

It is going to be with great interest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we look forward to the presentation of the Budget on March 16 to see exactly what direction this government is taking the people in Manitoba.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: I would first of all say how pleased I am to take part in this debate, and I'd also like to congratulate the Speaker, who's not here now, but to congratulate her on her survival. I cannot believe the rough and tumbleness and the vicious attacks that exist in this Chamber from time to time.

But, first of all, I'd like in my speech to discuss the Opposition. In the Leader of the Opposition's speech the other day, he said, "Where are the government's priorities? Are they agriculture or the deficit or jobs or education or health or roads?" The fact is . . .

A MEMBER: They're not roads.

MR. H. SMITH: Well, sure, they're not roads as you've been maintaining. But the fact is in the Throne Speech, numerous pages, starting on page 3, but throughout the Throne Speech, it tells you the priorities of this government.

For example, on page 3, it says, "My government is determined to meet the challenge of protecting and maintaining needed vital public services like health and education through careful scrutiny of resource commitments and revenue-raising initiatives." Throughout the whole Throne Speech, it explains what our priorities are, but somehow the Leader of the Opposition cannot grasp that.

A MEMBER: Harvey, you're more naive than I thought.

MR. H. SMITH: Well, all I can do is listen to his words. He obviously cannot listen or read very well. But, you know, he does read the newspaper; this is what I find amazing about the Opposition. They get all their information from the newspaper. They very rarely come up with anything where they have researched and developed a case; they very rarely do that.

For example, the other day there was an article in the newspaper on AIDS. That day, the Leader of the Opposition got up and pointed out the facts the newspaper reporter had uncovered that, in effect, two provinces did not have in legislation that the AIDS cases had to be reported. Then he came out with the big thing about this. It was a valid point but it didn't come from the Opposition; it came from the news media. Also, they didn't even have enough courtesy to go ahead and praise this government for the educational efforts on AIDS, the commitment on AIDS. We are doing more than any other Western Province. They didn't mention this; they just had a scare appeal and that was all. They find it difficult to praise this government when this government is doing an excellent job.

For example, in the Leader of the Opposition's speech, he referred to the fact that occasionally you've heard from this side of the House and from Crown spokespeople, that hydro and telephone rates are the lowest in North America in Manitoba. He dismissed that with just saying something like, he used that old saw again, instead of saying, look, these are achievements of this government that are worthwhile.

Now's there's also an attempt to distort a lot, for example, in the Opposition speeches. For example, the

Leader of the Opposition got up and he quoted the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, where they made a point that 23 percent of all positions created by the Manitoba Jobs Fund were given to women. Then he goes on from that point and he says: "That's an acknowledgement of failure." What the Status of Women were saying was, this is, in effect, something that concerns us. The point wasn't raised by the Leader of the Opposition when the Jobs Fund was formulated. It wasn't used last Session. We haven't heard anything about it until the Status of Women came out and said, look, here is a weakness in this plan. I don't know why the opposition can't do a little bit of research work and uncover some of those things themselves.

Another distortion in the reply to the Throne Speech - the Leader of the Opposition discussed having a conversation with his colleague, the Member for Morris. He sort of quoted the Member for Morris saying that the Minister of Finance, in consultation meetings throughout the province had said something to the effect that - don't tell us how to save money or to cut back on expenditures; we're not interested in that. That's not true. I attended some of those consultation meetings. The whole point that was made all the time was: Where can we provide this same service at less cost? Where can we cut programs that are not as valuable to us, not as vital to us? He made every effort. Yet we have this distortion taking place.

Now, I must admit that this Session I have noticed a difference in the Opposition. I guess they should be congratulated in that way. They have made a point of suggesting a few things that we should cut. For example, in talking about aid to the farm community, they brought up the fact that we could take some of the Jobs Fund allocation, and give it to the farmers. They don't say how much of the Jobs Fund allocation; they don't say anything except give some of it. Now how much would you like to cut it by? Why not give specifically some information on that? In other words, the opposition should give us an idea what a Conservative Government would be like. What programs would they cut when they talk about controlling the deficit? How would they control the deficit?

When you go to Estimates, as I was a new member in the House last Session, go into Estimates, and I thought it was a joke sometimes, the questions I heard. There was no seriousness. For example, one of the members, I guess it was the Member for Springfield, talked about gravel on his local highway. We heard one member talk about a broken park bench somewhere in the province. We actually heard one member talk about the weeds on one side of this building or other. The ultimate question I heard in Estimates was this: What questions should I have asked that I have not asked? What sort of Opposition is this? If they're discussing Budget, controlling the deficit, they should be telling us what programs they would want cut.

You go to Estimates, it's like a honeymoon session. There is very little suggestion by any member of the opposition of programs to cut. Now, admittedly I do see, as I said before, some improvement in the Opposition since they do discuss some things they think are not important. For example, in the reply to the Throne Speech, the Leader of the Opposition attacked the small business bonds proposal. He said it's not

necessary; there's available capital, interest rates are low. But the fact is, he discarded the need for capital help for small businesses.

Now, let me tell you this. They need capital help when they first form their firm. I know somebody in my riding, for example, who wanted to start an autobody shop. He only had the amount of money for rent. He started it. - (Interjection)- I thought you were going to speak

A MEMBER: I'll get my chance.

MR. H. SMITH: You'll get your chance but why don't you give someone else a chance.

The fact is when business is formed they need - all the calls I've received are from new businesses wanting to form or just formed six months ago. Most of them need some help wherever they can get it, encouragement to start their business. The idea that money is out there because people are willing to lend it at the current interest rates is not good enough. It's not good enough because people have an idea, they have faith in the idea and banks and financial institutions ask for secured loans, ask for what property they own, etc.

So you, in effect, need to go ahead and have some financial help, some encouragement to small businesses, especially when you realize that small businesses create over half the jobs. So I think that is important. You tell that to, for example, someone who tries to start a small business, saying they have no problems with raising capital. It's obvious that they have problems.

Now, I should point out that the Leader of the Opposition also suggested in his speech, that pressures are building. There's new demands on services, technology, falling world prices for resources. He says: "But surely every other Provincial Government in this country is facing the same problems." That is true, they are. But how are they tackling it?

Here I have an Alberta News Release. This is dated 1:00 p.m., Friday, January 9, and in it says: "The Education Minister of Alberta, Nancy Batkowski (phonetic) today announced a 3 percent decrease in the 1987-88 per pupil foundation grants for basic education". A decrease of 3 percent. And then it goes on and a few paragraphs further down it says this: "This is in sharp contrast to the planning scenario of 5 or 10 percent decreases that were considered," and in Mrs. Batkowski's (phonetic) words: "Reflects the high priority which this government places on education". They place such a high priority on education that they only had a 3 percent decrease - that's Alberta's answer. This includes everything in education. This includes transportation grants, grants for early childhood services, grants for vocational education, grants for private schools, grants for extension programs and the provincial portion of the language grant. They've also cut funding for community school programs - it will be reduced by 50 percent. Now, that's the Alberta answer. That's the Alberta answer.

Now, we have a news story here that appeared the other day, March 6, Globe and Mail, on Saskatchewan: "Wage Freeze Set as Deficit Triples in Saskatchewan." And they go down, and then, talking about education and other budgetary items, they said this, "Operating

grants to schools, to hospitals, municipalities and universities will be frozen for the next two years." For two years, frozen. So when we talk about vital services we're talking about those services that we consider vital, like education, health. We think it is important to maintain those services.

Now, let's look at British Columbia. What is British Columbia doing to deal with its deficit problem? No funds from provincial general revenue go to universities or community colleges. Only federal dollars are allocated. So, they don't spend a cent other than what they get from the Federal Government. B.C. has no system of bursaries for post-secondary students. No bursaries or loans.

Now, what do we do in comparison on these two things? For one, we are spending over \$100 million more than we get from the Federal Government on post-secondary education. So we are doing a considerably lot more than British Columbia is doing.

Bursaries and loan rebate program in Manitoba. In 1985-86 there were 3,498 awards providing a total of \$2,787,000 in bursaries and \$3,422,000 in loan rebates and B.C.'s doing nothing. Nothing.

Tuition fees are the highest in Canada in British Columbia. University of British Columbia, \$1,530; Manitoba \$982.00. So, B.C., how they're doing it, is they are cutting the services, the essential services.

Now, all three other western provinces are cutting back in services. So that's what you people across the way should note. We are trying to maintain these services to the children of Manitoba, to the young adults. And in every area of government we are attempting to provide the services that we have provided.

Now, from time to time the Opposition attacks on isolated instances from the newspapers. They do this quite often. I would like to tell them the only way not to make an error is not to do anything. And that seems to be the idea of the Conservative Opposition.

Now, they can't even get here. They can't even be present in most days of the House to have all their numbers here. You can note the numbers in last Session where our whole team was here. How can you expect them to take it seriously when they only consider it really a part-time job?

I can remember last Session the Leader of the Opposition took a week and went to Expo. That's the sort of thing that - I mean, they are not serious. They deserve to be in Opposition. It's clear cut.

Now, they are also insincere in other areas of criticism. They pretend that they are concerned about the status of women.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek, state the point of order.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is it now going to be routine for members to start talking about when other members were here, or when they weren't here, or when they were out of the House, or not out of the House?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There should be no reference about the absence or presence of members in the Chamber.

MR. H. SMITH: Now, I believe the Opposition is not sincere most times, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they are speaking. For example, in today's paper there is the headline story: "McDougal Breaks Date With Male-only Club," the Conservative Club, all-male, and she said she is not going to attend this because it, in effect, violates something that she believes in - equality and opportunity for women.

But who rushes in? Janice Filmon, wife of the Provincial Conservative Leader, Leader of the Opposition. And what does she say? She said yesterday she does not approve of men only clubs but considers it an opportunity to give members a women's point of view. She wants it both ways. It's much like the Progressive Conservative Party generally, progressive and conservative put together. It doesn't make sense. They want to have it both ways.

I just think that the wife of the Leader of the Opposition should not have attended this gathering. She should have not attended it because this group is an all-male group and they basically are not really concerned with an exchange of ideas amongst the Conservative Party.

But, you know, there is also a contradiction in times from members from the Conservative Party. You get comments, for example, the Leader of the Opposition said this the other day in his reply to the Throne Speech: "Only the arrogant would believe that monies belong in the hands of government rather than in the individual who earns it." The fact is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have always, and most people do believe in this province and in Canada, that when we cannot do something as an individual, the government itself as a whole acting on behalf of all people, can do it better than I as an individual, then it belongs in government hands to do it.

Now, obviously, he does not agree with the Member for Lakeside, Mr. Harry Enns who said this, and I think this is surprising and encouraging to see this sort of outspokenness and frankness by the Member for Lakeside. He said this about the Inter-City Gas Corporation. He said: "Frankly a takeover of ICG is a sensible option." A sensible option. That's Harry, the Member for Lakeside in direct contradiction to his leader. - (Interjection)- Well, I think it is a sensible option.

I'll talk to you about some of the things that people are concerned about. For example, in the Globe and Mail the other day there was an article about unemployment, 41 percent of the Canadian population said unemployment is their top worry. Their top concern. - (Interjection)- But I find this, getting back to my main point, all your main efforts are all from the paper the day before. What I'm referring to now is a survey on concerns of Canadians and they say 41 percent are concerned about having a job. And yet you people say do away with most of the Jobs Fund, which doesn't make much sense at all.

Now, one of the other things, by the way, I found interesting the other day is your Urban Affairs critic, talking about the Core Area Initiative. He actually credited someone with the formation of the leadership in this and I found it amazing how that person could sit in his desk without squirming because every Manitoban knows that the pressure came largely from the core area itself and pressures on a federal member in the federal Cabinet, who basically pressured for

the Core Area Initiative. It didn't come from a member of the Conservative Cabinet.

Now, with the Core Area Initiative, let me tell you this, a lot is happening in my area. Sargent Avenue is going to be revitalized, much like Selkirk Avenue. So is Ellice Avenue, both in my riding. And that in itself is very, very important.

I find that the criticism of the Member for Charleswood, regarding the \$12 million training program is not very useful. Obviously, we need people to be trained for jobs. We need to create more employment. And training people is important as we've shown in education, in comparison to the Conservative Governments elsewhere in Western Canada. And he, likewise, echoes the same outlook - training is not important. Training is important if you want people to be able to get better qualified jobs.

You may say I'm not responsible, but I really do believe that listening to you people, like you have your own fantasies, your own world. The fact is, this is an excellent Throne Speech.-(Interjection)- No, I've never seen you hit a woman or a child, for that matter, and I don't think you would. But the fact is you're not refuting our comments; you're just mixing it all up, pretending to go ahead and confuse the world. The fact is it is very, very clear that our job is to maintain the existing services and to let them grow. Your outlook is to cut, cut, cut, cut. You are people who supported the Lyon Government. Many of your members were in the Lyon Government.

MR. J. McCRAE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There's a point of order being raised by the Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: The honourable member opposite says that we, on this side of the House, would cut, cut, cut, cut. Would he care to comment today on the situation at the Brandon General Hospital?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Differences of opinions are not a point of order. May I remind the member on the floor that he should direct the remarks to the Chair.

MR. H. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.-(Interjection)- Brandon General Hospital, any change you look as a cut, what the Minister of Health is trying to do is rationalize the delivery of health services so we all have adequate health care but at the lowest possible price. Why not go ahead and do that? Why not, in effect, change the program to adjust it to modern times? It's very, very clear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Conservatives, in Opposition, they always talk about new services or more and more of this and more and more of that, but let them get into government and see what they bring us. Let's see what they bring us. They have never, in fact, isn't there a saying? There's a saying that Tory times are bad times or tough times, and that's very, very true, they are. They are because you, in Opposition, appear to be people of all - to support every cause, to support every program, to give more money to this and that. Once you assume office, you want to go ahead and cut, cut, cut. That's your theme.

MR. J. McCRAE: Now you're saying it again.

MR. H. SMITH: I'm saying it because, quite truthfully, to the Member for Brandon, that you don't understand, you don't listen. You don't even follow history. All through Canada's history, the Conservative Government were times of bad times, and just a short time ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that . . .

A MEMBER: Did Sterling Lyon cut beds at Brandon General?

MR. H. SMITH: Sterling Lyon cut, cut, cut, all across the board. So you know, "protracted restraint" is what he called it. He used nice terms for it. Health care reform is important.-(Interjection)- Well, let me tell you this. Let's talk about highways, to the Member for Portage, let's talk about highways. I believe health care is more important than the gravel on the road in Springfield. The fact is we're spending the money.

Our priorities are health, education, community services. We're concerned about the whole province. You know, listening to the Leader of the Opposition the other day, the Leader of the Opposition goes ahead and tells us - he tries to pit rural area against urban area. The Jobs Fund occurs throughout Manitoba, not just in the urban areas. We all have enjoyed, in all parts of Manitoba, the benefits of the Jobs Fund, creating jobs.-(Interjection)- No.

A MEMBER: You're just concerned about your area then.

MR. H. SMITH: I'm concerned about the whole province and that is I think what you should all be concerned about. In fact, that's one of the things I notice when all you get up to ask a question or to make a speech, you generally just talk about your road or your park bench that has not been repaired.-(Interjection)- Look, this government, by spending priorities, has established that education and health care are its utmost priorities and that is clear. Your priorities are deficit and roads.

The Member for Portage talked about the establishment in Portage for training of teachers and for children who have handicaps. He said in this House, "Are there any members on the government side that are willing to come out, I'll take them out, I'll rent a bus? Are there any members there that will come out with me and take a trip through this facility?" So I put up my hand. To this very date I have never had an invitation; I've never had a ride offered and I've reminded him four or five times. He wasn't interested in that project. He wasn't interested; he was only interested in making political hay.

What I'm saying is I'm trying to prove the insincerity of the members in the Opposition forthwith. That's why they deserve to be in the Opposition. When you offer to take us to someplace to show a program, to point out the errors of our ways, you should at least be prepared to do it if you make the offer. I just see a motley crew.

I had a letter yesterday, by the way, that was interesting, from an individual on Dutch elm tree disease. He's talking about maybe he'll be put in jail because he wouldn't allow them to cut down the trees

that were diseased with Dutch elm.- (Interjection)- Because I think this is unfair and absolutely ridiculous. Here we have a government who, on one hand, is so concerned about the natural environment that they'll even put a farmer in jail in order to get a few dead trees. On the other hand, this same government sets up casinos so as to create an environment which will lure young people into gambling addiction and a life of corruption. The fact is there's no relationship between those two things. The fact is you have to get those Dutch elm trees before they spread further and further and so you have to do it, but that's the type of thinking that the Opposition comes out with all the time.

In conclusion, let me just tell you this. I believe you people should take your jobs seriously. I believe you should all resign today and have an election in each one of your ridings. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. D. ROCAN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and as Peter Warren would say, "Let's get right down to business."

I would like to start, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by saying not only am I pleased to be a member of the Legislative Assembly when our new Lieutenant-Governor, Dr. George Johnson, was appointed; but as well, feel very good about the appointment of Sterling Lyon, former Premier of the Province of Manitoba to the high Court of Appeal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, once again, I wish you - oh, I better change that - to Madam Speaker, once again, I wish you every success in carrying out your responsibilities in a fair and impartial manner, and to all the other members of this Legislature, I wish you all good health and hope that we will all remember that we are here to represent those people who expressed their confidence in our ability to serve them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've been looking forward to this opportunity to speak on the Throne Speech for quite some time now. I realize that this is my opportunity to express the views and concerns of my constituents of Turtle Mountain.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Madam Speaker, the constituency of Turtle Mountain, under its original conditions and prior to settlement had wooded areas and plains and valleys. That particular combination led to a great diversity of wildlife. That, in turn, resulted in providing the basis for the earliest inhabitants of the area who were, first of all, Assiniboine Indians, and later the Plain Sioux. There is a great deal of history associated with the area and it is proudly displayed in the Moncur Gallery of pre-history, dating back some 10,000 years. This incredible museum is located in the town of Boissevain.

A MEMBER: Nice town.

MR. D. ROCAN: It is, too.

Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to the Throne Speech positively, but as you have heard from previous speakers, it is a nothing document. Therefore, I'll say nothing. It is like commenting on the contents of an

empty box. Nature abhors a vacuum and yet the government tried to deliver one.

Let's consider what my constituents expected. They were anxiously awaiting some positive moves towards assistance to the economic farm crisis. But what did they get? Nothing. More of the empty-box syndrome. Small business is treated the same way. What did they hear in the Throne Speech? Nothing. What did they get? Nothing. More of the empty-box syndrome.

Madam Speaker, here we are in one of the prettiest areas in Manitoba. Even the difference in the American dollar should have attracted many to our part of the province, but, obviously, we don't rate with tourism, advertising and promotion. Obviously, we don't rate when competing with the NDP-controlled urban constituencies.

Madam Speaker, I can't explain to my constituents why tourist attractions such as the Assiniboia Downs, North Portage Development with its Omnivax Theatre, the Planetarium, are of greater importance than the resources that we have available to us in Turtle Mountain, such as Pelican Lake and Swan Lake, and we, too, also have numerous golf courses. Madam Speaker, these are important to my constituents and they are available to all Manitobans, indeed, all tourists. But, Madam Speaker, they are not given the attention that they should be given.

We are not average Manitobans that the Premier so often describes. We are proud Manitobans, proud of our history, and we are proud of our potential and we are proud of our diversity. Madam Speaker, we have so much to offer to the rest of Manitoba. We contribute our fair share and we reap the empty box. Madam Speaker, where do we go from here?

Farmers are looking at reduced incomes. If last year wasn't bad enough, we can tell them, emphatically, it is going to get worse. For small business who depend on agriculture, expect the worst. The tourism industry, well, we have nothing for you. What message of hope do I convey to my 15,000-plus constituents that this government knows they exist and that they care about them? That's a joke. Is it safe to say that farm land will have to be taken out of production? Are we asking these proud Manitobans to become complacent, mediocre and average?

Madam Speaker, as you have heard time and time again, the farming communities are in dire straits. When will this present administration get it through their thick heads that they had better put something in the box? Conversation doesn't cut it. Action is where it's at and inactivity is what we are getting. Every time that my colleagues make a suggestion, the government ends up feebashing. How constructive is that, Madam Speaker? I call it paranoia. This government is not responsible; they are accountable. Everyone else is to blame.

Les électeurs Manitobains n'ont-ils pas élu ce gouvernement pour gérer les affaires de la province. Je présume qu'ils se rendent compte qu'ils seraient tous congédiés si c'était l'entreprise publique. Il n'y a aucun conseil d'administration qui tolérerait votre incompetence, et je dis bien incompetence, Madame la présidente.

(English translation)

Did not the average Manitoban elect this government to manage the affairs of this province? I suppose they realize that if this was free enterprise, they would all be fired for gross mismanagement. No Board of Directors would tolerate their incompetence, and I stress incompetence, Madam Speaker.

They should be charged under The Clean Air Act for their pollution. It smells like sour gas. Madam Speaker, the Rules of the House provide me with 40 minutes to debate this Throne Speech. The document is not worthy of 40 seconds. Why waste time debating the contents of the empty box?

It's difficult to explain regional disparity of an insignificant nature, but how would I explain to my constituents the building of a \$20 million bridge that goes nowhere, Madam Speaker? When I'm trying to get a little bit of water control . . .

A MEMBER: Well, they closed the Boissevain Land Titles.

MR. H. ENNS: No, the river got wider.

MR. D. ROCAN: That's what happened. I believe you, Harry. I believe you.

But I'm trying to get a little bit of water control between these incredibly pretty lakes that are a major tourist attraction. Maybe Duckie's Bridge is to someday become a tourist attraction. What a legacy for the Premier to leave! You can be sure that my constituents will be as thrilled as they are over our involvement in Saudi Arabia.

Madam Speaker, another question that my constituents raise is how can we alienate our American neighbours by being opposed to everything, and I mean everything, that they represent, and scream when we lose a CF-18 contract? Is the NDP totally opposed to the U.S. military; in fact, even NATO? Then why should we be interested in a contract that ensures that fighter aircraft remain airworthy?

Madam Speaker, I was quite surprised by some of the comments made by the Member for Kildonan regarding Versatile. This member is part of a government who criticized a Federal Government for not giving the Province of Manitoba the CF-18 contract; and, Madam Speaker, we on this side of the House made it clear to the people of Manitoba that we did not agree with the Federal Government's decision.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Member for Kildonan has the nerve to rise in his place Monday last and say how wonderful this deal was on one hand and then on the other criticize the Federal Government for making it. I was interested in noting, Madam Speaker, that the province was not involved in this deal and that it was the Federal Government and the Federal Government only who looked after the Versatile workers. One has to wonder, Madam Speaker, why the Provincial Government wasn't involved or didn't even take part in this deal.

I think I have the answer, Madam Speaker, because if the Premier and the Minister responsible for Industry, Trade and Technology would have been involved, it would have screwed the whole thing up and the Member for Kildonan would have probably stood in his place and blamed the Federal Government for his colleague's

own stupidity. It simply goes to show you, Madam Speaker, who really cares for the Versatile workers. It's the Conservatives in Ottawa, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, having said all this, and I can understand why the Member for Kildonan is upset. It's because the Ford Motor Company of Canada parent corporation is based in the United States. And what does United States stand for, Madam Speaker? It stands for free enterprise. Something totally foreign to the members opposite for they feel the state can do everything. Well, Madam Speaker, the Versatile deal shows that this is wrong.

I resent having somebody who fled his own country, because he was afraid to defend it, stand in this House and criticize the same institution, namely the Government of Canada, who let him in. Or maybe we should find a way of sending him back as was proposed by his federal leader, Ed Broadbent, who said on a recent Vancouver radio talk show: "If a person has had a fair and just hearing, if he has had all the rights of appeal inherent now in Canadian law, and he is found not to be a real refugee, then kick him out of the country." That's from Ed Broadbent, your leader. Don't talk about compassionate and morals.

Madame la presidente, je ne prendrai pas de temps précieux à débattre un document vide. Les actions parlent plus fort que les paroles. Des actions positives, des actions constructives, des actions affirmatives, en fait n'importe quelle action serait bienvenue par mes commettants. Ce discours du trône promet que le gouvernement restes endormi et stagnant.

(English translation)

Madam Speaker, I'm not going to waste valuable time debating an empty box document. Action speaks louder than words, positive action, constructive action, affirmative action. Indeed, any kind of action would be welcomed by my constituents. This Throne Speech promises only that this government will lie dormant, stagnate.

There is no optimism, there is no light at the end of the tunnel for those people who I represent, and for me to waste more time talking about nothing serves no useful purpose. My only hope is that in the near future this menagerie that calls itself a government will take off its blinders, remove its earplugs, and wise up to the needs of those they serve, meaning all of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I am not the only one who thinks that the farmers of Manitoba are served poorly by this government. As an MP from Manitoba advised the Minister of Agriculture when he said, and I quote: "It would be more appreciated and more beneficial to all Manitoba farmers if you would concentrate your efforts on delivering wholesome, sound and beneficial programs from the Provincial Government. To simply complain about Federal Government initiative was not, I would suggest, the reason you were elevated to the position of Minister of Agriculture."

Madam Speaker, the Throne Speech stressed the firm need and the determination to fight for fairness from Ottawa. Madam Speaker, I want fairness for Manitobans, not contingent on Ottawa's participation, just fairness for all Manitobans, by Manitobans, for Manitobans.

Fedbashing does not generate results that positively affect the quality of life of my constituents. To them, fedbashing is just proof of incompetence, mismanagement and irresponsibility, like watching kids fall. I'll pick up my marbles and go home.

Madam Speaker, the constituents of Turtle Mountain are hardworking and proud. They recognize that two out of three people in Manitoba live in Winnipeg. Whose fault is that? What incentives are provided to encourage rural lifestyles? Is this government proud of their ability to discourage creativity, innovation, dignity and self-respect, and reward complacency, mediocrity and stupidity by appointing their followers to boards and commissions, etc.?

How is a small businessman in my constituency, struggling to make a profit in spite of the obstacles thrown in front of him by this government such as payroll tax, unfair labour laws and all the rest, supposed to take a lead from a government whose only claim to fame is consistent failure? Madam Speaker, never in the history of the NDP have they been able to run a business profitably, and they continue to gouge the taxpayers to fund their ill-conceived ventures at home and abroad. Their efforts at turning rural Manitoba into a Third World environment is succeeding at an alarming pace.

My constituents are fed up. When will you stand up and be identified as a do-nothing, irresponsible bunch of hypocrites, always blaming somebody else? Madam Speaker, which way do they want it?

Consider the removal of police protection from a rural town. Does it really matter to these people to make these decisions when they have no understanding of rural life? Could we presume that, if we became a special-interest group with a minority point of view, would they then get the attention that we have been denied? Madam Speaker, the pride of the people who I represent is not for sale, and cannot be diminished by the antics of a government whose shortsightedness prevents them from seeing beyond the Perimeter Highway.

The stuff they smear, they call campaign promises; in my constituency, we call it biodegradable fertilizer. Has this government lived up to any of their campaign promises? I ask you, have you? This government is trying to steal our way of life, our heritage. The NDP and its Sherwood Forest philosophy, ably led by its own version of Robin Hood, flanked on his right by Friar Tuck and on his left by Maid Marion, ably assisted by Little John and the rest of the Merry Men, are stripping the lifestyles of many Manitobans to accommodate their own bunch of ne'er-do-wells.

This can't be appreciated by those who have worked hard, starting with nothing, but proud to be fiercely independent. They raise, feed, educate their families in the hope of a prosperous future, only to have it stolen from them by these philosophers. A century ago, this theft would not warrant a court appearance. The end was swift and sure, and society was not asked to carry the burden of their existence.

Madam Speaker, is it not true that in 1984 this government took an attitudinal survey on image and, when asked, 69 percent of the Manitobans said it is time that the government did something to give Manitobans a greater sense of pride in their province? And what do we get? A bridge north of Selkirk. Also, 66 percent were in favour of the province being involved

in Expo '86, despite the existing economic times and the \$5 million investment. Madam Speaker, is this a government that listens? No wonder my constituents cannot believe the words identifying government policies or objectives. We are back to the empty box syndrome, because Robin Hood's bag is empty, Madam Speaker, and all indications suggest nothing but bad news is coming with the Budget, Pandora's Box.

Nothing out of the Throne Speech provides me with any opportunity to be optimistic about the future of Turtle Mountain. Madam Speaker, this government says that it is an open government, and that they are listening to the people of Manitoba. They stood in their places in 1985 when this House passed The Freedom of Information Act and said to this House and to the people of Manitoba, in a couple of months, this act will be proclaimed.

MR. H. ENNS: That's what they said.

MR. D. ROCAN: Don't worry, trust us. That's what they said. Well, Madam Speaker, we saw an example of their trust yesterday when my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, asked a question regarding this act, and the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation said, in a year this act will be proclaimed, in a year because the documents aren't ready. Well, Madam Speaker, why weren't they ready when the Attorney-General introduced the legislation into this House? I guess he never thought Manitobans wanted to see the act.

Madam Speaker, I couldn't believe the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation's answer when she said "limited resources." This Minister and those before her have cut the budget of the Legislative Library and the Public Archives and, along with the rest of her Cabinet colleagues, increased their hacks and flacks instead of channelling those resources to get The Freedom of Information Act ready and established for the use of all Manitobans.

On page 6 of the Throne Speech, Madam Speaker, we find the following words: "The traditional reporting relationship between the Crowns and the government is no longer adequate. In order to increase the accountability of the Crowns to the government and to the people of Manitoba, my government will introduce reforms which will be the most comprehensive in Canada."

What a crock, Madam Speaker. They squandered \$27 million in MTX and they've lost millions in Flyer; and after being in government for six years, they only now realize that the reporting structure of Crown corps is not adequate, sort of closing the door after the horse leaves. We talk about Crown corps. We have our Autopac; we have our Lotteries; we have Manfor; we have our MTS. Madam Speaker, it says here that the alarm bells should have been ringing a long time ago, had the Minister responsible at that time taken heed.

The politics of power are power of politics. Limestone, Madam Speaker. We talk about jobs in the North. They're saying somewhere, I think there's 1,400 short-term jobs at Limestone, to make hydro that we can't even seem to give away. McKenzie Seeds - had it not been for the previous Member for Turtle Mountain, I would hate to see the figures on McKenzie Seeds.

I have no faith in this government to reform our Crown corps. Look who they put in charge, an opportunist,

the Minister of Urban Affairs to chair the newly formed Crown Reform Committee of Cabinet. If the Premier was serious about reform, why did he not chair this committee himself? Why did he appoint this Minister to chair this committee? Could it be that the Premier is grooming the Minister as a possible replacement? Who knows, Madam Speaker? This government is tired and this Throne Speech shows it.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Before I begin my remarks today, I would like to commend our new Lieutenant-Governor on his grace in delivering the Speech from the Throne; and to you, Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to welcome you back to this Chamber, and I trust that all members of this Legislature will strive to prevent some of the rancor which existed during the last Session of this Chamber.

I want to pledge, certainly on behalf of all my colleagues on this side of the Chamber, our fullest cooperation to you in order to ensure that parliamentary business is conducted in a way in which it ought to be conducted in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, I want to also congratulate the Mover and the Seconder for their insightful grasp of the problems confronting Manitobans. I thought their contribution was one that certainly ranks high among contributions in previous years. To the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I believe he has brought a realistic insight insofar as the problems of rural Manitoba, particularly those of the farmers of this province, and has articulated those well, not only during his speech, but also in subsequent opportunities that he's had since, and I thank him for that contribution.

Insofar as the Seconder, the Honourable Member for Elmwood, he has, by his presence in this Chamber, and by his address, brought to the attention of this Chamber, I believe, a number of issues, a number of suggestions that are constructive; and we welcome suggestions from all members, not just on this side, but from the other side, hoping to hear as many as we can that are constructive and will positively work to the general betterment of all and certainly, to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, he has done that on a consistent basis and we are pleased to receive those contributions.

I believe, Madam Speaker, that the insightful address of both members demonstrates that the vision of the New Democratic Party Government of the Province of Manitoba burns brightly. Members on this side of the Chamber understand the challenges that we face as Manitobans, the challenge of creating a better quality of life for all Manitobans to ensure that our society is one that is made more just, more equitable, more fair, the challenge of the creation of more jobs and better job opportunities for all Manitobans, the development of stronger rural communities and greater opportunities for the farmers of this province, despite the difficulties that obviously farmers right across Canada are presently being confronted with, the challenge of maintaining and enhancing the amount of social and economic security that is available to every Manitoban.

The people of Manitoba are no strangers to challenge. Whether you speak of the original inhabitants of Manitoba, our original people, aboriginal people, the early trappers, the traders of the Selkirk Settlers who, Madam Speaker, if I can say so, through their wisdom chose lands in the constituency that I have the honour of representing, many years ago, the other early pioneers of this province have faced this challenge and they have met the challenge head on, the spirit of Manitoba, the spirit of our pioneers, pioneers who arrived in Manitoba from a spirit of, yes, courage and radicalism, because they were prepared to leave the safety and the stability of the old land to face the challenges, the uncertainties and the harshness of the new land, the original settlers who came to this province who were, first and foremost, motivated by the spirit of cooperation, realizing that by working together we could accomplish much more than by working individually.

That was the spirit of our original settlers and that is the spirit of Manitoba today and that is the spirit that I believe, Madam Speaker, is as strong for newcomers to our province as it is for those whose roots have been here for many, many generations.

Successfully meeting challenges engenders a tremendous sense of confidence and of pride. That, Madam Speaker, pretty well describes Manitobans, proud folk, confident folk, moved by the spirit of cooperative motivation.

When this country was faced by a devastating depression in 1980 through 1981 to 1982, Manitobans expressed their confidence in the New Democratic Party of the Province of Manitoba to represent their interests and to move the province along, out of that recession. It was the people of the Province of Manitoba who utilized sense of good judgment to elect a New Democratic Party, because they knew in the New Democratic Party there was a realistic alternative to recession and to unemployment and to poverty.

I believe, Madam Speaker, that Manitobans are proud of that decision. They are proud of the fact that once again they, with their fellow citizens, could work together cooperatively in harmony to stave off the effects of the recession, and to emerge even more strongly, better prepared to meet the challenges confronting us.

I must say, Madam Speaker, that I was, yes, just a little bit more than disappointed in the address by the Leader of the Opposition in respect to the Speech from the Throne. I had thought, in view of the abysmal showing that the Conservative Party is showing in the polls both federally and provincially, we would have had a stirring appeal from the Leader of the Opposition; that it would be an appeal that would be emotional and would be charged with a vision that the Conservative Party has for the future of the Province of Manitoba; that it would be a speech that would contain within it constructive ideas and constructive proposals for remedying, yes, serious challenges that we face in the Province of Manitoba. I thought fully, Madam Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition would use that particular occasion to shore up his position in order to beat off the wolves from within his own party who, of course, we all recognize on this side of the Chamber.

Madam Speaker, I was particularly disappointed in the unfortunate personal attack by the Leader of the

Opposition on the Minister of Northern Affairs in his address. I found no class in that attack. I found it a very personal attack, an attack that lacked sensitivity. I don't know what the Leader of the Opposition was attempting to accomplish by that sort of personal attack on the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs in this Chamber. It was an attack that, I think, was unbecoming of a Leader of the Opposition. I believe that the people in the Province of Manitoba, as they have demonstrated again and again, rebuff that sort of headline attack, which is only based upon smear and the attempt to personally attack someone in a very low sort of manner.

Madam Speaker, that sort of effort on the part of the Leader of the Opposition was as dispirited as I've ever seen in a speech of any member of this House. It was an admission of failure. It was a failure to come up with comprehensive alternatives to this government's programs and policies. It was a failure on the part of the Leader of the Opposition to understand the real issues confronting Manitobans. Frankly, Madam Speaker, it was a failure on the part of the Leader of the Opposition to provide leadership on behalf of Manitobans in this Chamber.

The Member for Tuxedo, yes I acknowledge, was content to continue to represent his traditional allies and special interests that formed the basis of the Conservative Party: the banks, the oil companies, and large big business. You know, Madam Speaker, when I hear some howls from across the way, then I know that honourable members are hurting when they hear the truth being espoused in this Chamber in respect to the basis of the Conservative Party in the Province of Manitoba.

Members opposite were content to make another attempt - and they've demonstrated this from the beginning of this Session - to fool people. Madam Speaker, they ought to have discovered by this time that you can't fool all the people all the time.

I suppose, Madam Speaker, we on this side of the Chamber should feel ourselves fortunate. We should feel fortunate that we have an Opposition such as that which we have in this Chamber, an Opposition that persistently and constantly involves itself in contradiction, inconsistencies, an Opposition that continues to demand more and more services. Madam Speaker, let me remind you that not a day has escaped us so far this Session where there hasn't been more demand for additional services.

In fact, just the other day, one of the honourable members got up - I guess he received a telephone call from one of his friends in Ottawa - and wanted us to take over the Gypsumville Base for \$1.00, even though it would cost, according to the information provided to this Chamber by the Honourable Minister for Natural Resources, \$6 million to 8 million to renovate. What we have, Madam Speaker, is an Opposition that's geared to telephone calls from their kissing cousins in Ottawa.

That was demonstrated fully by that question that was directed in this Chamber but last week. - (Interjection) - Members opposite - well, let me assure the Honourable Member for Riel, we don't need telephone calls like that and, if honourable members are not wise enough to assess those calls and to sort out valid, genuine calls from calls that are unworthy of your defence, then I feel sorry for you.

But, Madam Speaker, in the last few days, I have wondered where honourable members have been since the end of the last Session to the beginning of this Session. I thought that we would have seen an Opposition entering this Chamber with all kinds of ideas and thrusts, new thoughts, ingenuity, innovation. You've had months to prepare, to plan for this Session. Yet, in the very first question period following the Throne Speech, Madam Speaker - and I have heard this from others who are not necessarily of our political kin - the only question that was really worthwhile and the very first question, February 27 of this year, the day after the Throne Speech, was a question directed to us by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, the very first question period. It was embarrassing, Madam Speaker. It's like they've given up on their side, a namby-pamby kind of Opposition. I don't believe that such an Opposition serves the people of this province well.

The Opposition is, Madam Speaker, picking up exactly where they left off last Session. It's posturing; it's empty words; it's nothing but rhetoric. They postured over the real crisis that our farmers and our rural communities have been afflicted with but, Madam Speaker, do you notice, when push comes to shove, honourable members are nowhere to be found?

Where were they, Madam Speaker, I ask you, just last week when the devastating news was received in the Province of Manitoba that the Canadian Wheat Board was recommending a 20 percent cut in grain payments? You sat in this House, Madam Speaker, on that particular day. Did you hear a word from honourable members across the way? Was there some sound? Was there even some whisper from honourable members across the way when word came forth that was potentially so devastating to the farmers of the Province of Manitoba? Nothing but silence. Madam Speaker, why? Because we have an Opposition that's horrified at the prospect of their being seen by their constituents as being apologists for the Federal Government in Ottawa.

Where was the posturing from the Provincial Conservatives in this Chamber then, Madam Speaker? Sometimes I think there must be a leak in the Tory think tank. They can stand up in this House, they can take the side of the banks against those of the Manitoba farmer, and now they appear to be abandoning the farmer again in favour of their Ottawa cousins. It's expediency, Madam Speaker; it's nothing but empty posturing on the part of honourable members across the way.

Why didn't the Leader of the Opposition, in his lengthy diatribe during the Throne Speech Debate, tell the people of the province what his government would do if they were in office? Why didn't he stand up in this Chamber, I wonder, and say what he would do if he were in power?

In fact, I can remember some advice I gave to the honourable members across the way in the Session before the last election. They were still at that time feeling pretty good about their poll results; they were 20-25 percent ahead of us on this side of the Chamber at that particular time. It was one of their better days. Even the Honourable Member for Pembina was more cheerful in those days than he has been of recent date, but he has, of course, nothing to cheer about at this point, Madam Speaker, which is quite recognizable on this side of the Chamber.

But, Madam Speaker, I suggested to honourable members: "Come forth with your constructive ideas. Surely, you've got some thoughts and some ideas." What did the Leader of the Opposition say, Madam Speaker? The Leader of the Opposition said: "Well, I don't want to give you any ideas, you might steal those ideas." We pressed the Leader of the Opposition further - no ideas. And at the end of that Session, what did the Leader of the Opposition say? "Well, they didn't give us a target to shoot at."

Madam Speaker, why didn't the Leader of the Opposition rise in his place, when he wants to talk about last year's Saskatchewan, and talk about this year's Saskatchewan and what the Devine Conservative administration is doing insofar as the rural economy of the Province of Saskatchewan this year after they won their election last year? Why isn't the Leader of the Opposition telling us in this Chamber and, through us, to the people of the Province of Manitoba that the Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba is reducing funding to schools and to hospitals and other groups and agencies affecting the Province of Manitoba to zero percent funding and less?

Why isn't the Leader of the Opposition getting up in this Chamber, when he talks about the great thrusts in the Province of Alberta over the past two years, and tell us about what is happening now in the Province of Alberta? What is happening now to farm programs? What is happening now to education and to health and social services in the Province of Alberta?

Do we hear, Madam Speaker, any admissions of their callous hard-hearted approach they would take to the poor, the unemployed, the other disadvantaged in our province? Not very likely, not very likely at all. Did members opposite choose to tell Manitobans what they would really do if they were on this side of the House? No, Madam Speaker. Instead, we get a defence of the Federal Tories.

"I don't want to be an apologist for the Federal Government," says the Leader of the Opposition, but the Leader of the Opposition then proceeds to go right on and to do that. Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, that is one tough challenge. How do you defend the blatant shafting of this province that has suffered at the hands of the cousins of the honourable members across the way, their cousins in Ottawa? -(Interjection)- Well, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology corrects me. It's not cousins; it's brothers and sisters in Ottawa.

Madam Speaker, I'm not just referring to the CF-18. I'm speaking of the reduced growth in federal transfer payments to this province, as well as other provinces, which makes it more difficult to preserve and to expand our vital services that are important to Manitobans, vital services such as health and education. Instead of prophesizing as they do, on a daily basis, that the sky is about to fall, they ought to join with other Manitobans and to take some pride in the accomplishments of Manitobans.

If I have one quarrel with the Speech from the Throne, Madam Speaker, it is that it did not go far enough in extolling the accomplishments of Manitobans, the future the independent forecasters see for our future as Manitobans. Madam Speaker, I think, when it comes to next year's Throne Speech, that we'll make the appropriate corrections in that respect. It did not, for

example, say, as the Manitoba Business magazine did, that as the general trend across the country is for slow but steady economic growth, Manitoba stands out as one of the exceptions. Manitoba Business Journal - not like Beausiesne that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek accused a little earlier today of being communistic literature - Beausiesne - but rather the Manitoba Business Journal . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The First Minister just singled out the Member for Sturgeon Creek as referring to Beausiesne as communist literature. Madam Speaker, I did not do that and I request the First Minister retract it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the House Leader advises me that was referred to by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek as a socialist bible was the precise . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No. I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that the First Minister is getting wrong information from his House Leader, and I would ask him to retract that statement or show it to me in Beausiesne.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, many people did hear the comment of the honourable member. It was a comment certainly quite similar to that; and if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek denies that, then I will certainly retract it. I'm glad, in fact, to hear, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek didn't utter those comments and I'm glad that he's now placed on the record that he didn't call Beausiesne a socialist bible. I'm pleased to hear that the honourable member denies that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.
The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The First Minister again made a reference that I said about Beausiesne which is not true and factual, and singled me out. I ask him to retract it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek heard me correctly. I said I was pleased that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek denied in this House that he had ever used the words, "socialist bible," in describing Beausiesne.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You're right, I didn't.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, that's just what I said. I was pleased that you denied that statement, one that honourable members on this side of the House would

have thought you had uttered. You might at some point want to clarify what you did say.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: You're on, you're on.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be part of the Throne Speech Debate . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

A MEMBER: There's no point of order. He's speaking, he sat down.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your position this year . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.—
(Interjection)—

I recognized the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

A MEMBER: There was no point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: If he does not have a point of order, then I have not recognized him.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, there was no point of order. The First Minister sat down; and the Member for Sturgeon Creek stood up to speak and you recognized him and he's speaking.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader on a point of order?

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Madam Speaker, I am . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . which is exactly what I said to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. G. MERCIER: No, you did not, Madam Speaker, and that is my point.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: The First Minister sat down; and the Member for Sturgeon Creek stood up to speak and you recognized him without any reference to any point of order. I ask you for a ruling, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I very clearly heard you recognize the Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order. As a matter of fact, I believe your exact words and Hansard will bear them out was: "The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order," and he said, "No, not on a point of order." That was the reference.

Madam Speaker, I would suggest that you review this matter, take it under advisement, review Hansard, and the Hansard I suggest will show very clearly that you did recognize the Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order. Then I think it would be incumbent upon the Opposition House Leader to retract his statements and apologize for suggesting that you said that it was a point of order and suggesting that you did not in fact say that. So I would suggest you review Hansard and then we'll have the apology forthcoming from the Opposition House Leader.

MADAM SPEAKER: I do not need to take anything under advisement. I asked the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek if he was rising on a point of order.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, as well, the Throne Speech did not quote the Royal Bank, which said Manitoba's real gross domestic product should expand by 4 percent this year and next, higher than the expected Canadian average of 3.3 percent in 1986; 3 percent in 1987. "In fact," said the Royal Bank of Canada, "we expect Manitoba to lead the nation in terms of real growth during the decade to 1994." To lead the nation, Madam Speaker, ahead of - not Conservative Saskatchewan, not Conservative Alberta to lead the nation, not Liberal Ontario or Liberal Prince Edward Island, not even free enterprise Social Credit British Columbia to lead the nation by way of growth, business growth, but New Democratic Party Manitoba between now and 1994.

The Royal Bank went on in its commentary to state, ". . . or that business investment should be substantially better than in most other provinces in the nation as a whole," the Royal Bank analyst predicts.

The speech did not refer to the report of the Bank of Commerce, predicting an abundance of new jobs which will be created this year, or that personal income gains in Manitoba are expected to rank among the highest in Canada; or the Conference Board of Canada, which stated, and I quote, "Since the 1982 recession, Manitoba's been one of the bright spots in Canada's economy with above average economic growth relative to other provinces."

Even the Prime Minister of Canada, Brian Mulroney, admitted that at the First Ministers' Conference in Vancouver last November. I remember it very well, when the Prime Minister was trying to explain to the nation his decision to award the CF-18 contract to Canadair of Montreal, rather than to Bristol Aerospace of the City of Winnipeg. What did the Prime Minister say? "Why are Manitobans crying? Their rate of job increase, their unemployment rate," said the Prime Minister, "is like Ontario; they're among the privileged in Canada."

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: Manitobans are proud of their record, Madam Speaker, justifiably proud. About the only people who aren't proud of the accomplishments of the ordinary men and women of the Province of Manitoba in this province are members opposite, nay sayers and doom sayers in the Province of Manitoba.

Yes, Madam Speaker, the people of Manitoba are proud of what they have done. Members opposite are constantly poo-pooing the accomplishments of the people of the Province of Manitoba. At other times, we hear from honourable members that Manitoba is doing so well, and this is advanced as an argument in this Chamber, then it's due to the results of their friends, the Tories, in Ottawa, not the cooperation of Manitobans.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

I've heard honourable members across the way sing the same phrases as the present Prime Minister of this country that Manitoba is doing well because of federal Conservative initiatives in Ottawa. We hear now honourable members across the way say, "it's the truth; it's the truth," as they proudly boast of the accomplishments of the Conservative Government in Ottawa.

The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology has asked a very telling question from his seat, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If indeed Manitoba's doing so well as the Prime Minister has suggested, and as other honourable members have also echoed, then why aren't the Conservative Governments of Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Alberta doing so well? Why wouldn't British Columbia be doing better if that is indeed the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, honourable members across the way appear not to understand that Manitobans cannot be fooled. Manitobans know the strength of the economy. They know that our low unemployment rates are in spite of the Federal Government and not because of it. Manitobans cannot hear those glowing comments about our economic employment opportunities sufficiently, but Manitobans know that it's only one battle they have won, an extremely important battle to be sure, but that the struggle is far from over and much more remains to be done; and there are many difficult challenges that confront us as Manitobans in the months and years that lie ahead.

Still, Manitobans are proud how they faced the challenge of the recession. They are justifiably proud, as Manitobans. What we have done in Manitoba is similar to the Winnipeg Jets, finishing first in their division. It's an incredible achievement, but there is still a Stanley Cup to capture. As a province, our Stanley Cup will come when we are self sufficient, when we become one of the "have" provinces in Canada. When that day comes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that day will come, we will be able to call on the plays from our own benches and not have to rely on the plays sent to us from Ottawa. But because our gross domestic product or our goal output, if you like, is lower than the national average, we must rely on the Federal Government for assistance if we are to continue to keep even with the other provinces.

If I can repeat, continue the sports analogy for just a little bit longer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you continue to hear about the various leagues talk about parity, and for very good reason. When the top team keeps kicking the heck out of the lesser teams, everybody loses. The fans stay home. Pretty well, interest begins to decline, and the league suffers. So the team owners are constantly striving to even out their talent, so there is

not such a large difference between the top teams in the league and the low teams in the league. That is, for example, in the Canadian Football League. They have an equalization program so that the teams who make all the money share with those teams that aren't doing so well.

As a country, we have the same type of program to try to close the gap between the have and have-no provinces. Manitoba has traditionally been one of the have-not provinces. As a result, we have a larger share of the federal equalization funds than richer provinces. As long as those funds are distributed in a fair and an equitable manner, Manitobans can enjoy the same level of important services like health and education as residents of other provinces.

We can recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the new Constitution was finally assented to in 1983, one of the most important provisions in that new Constitution was that all . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: One of the provisions in that new Constitution was that all public services like health and education should be provided to Canadians everywhere, from Newfoundland through to British Columbia, from Lethbridge to Churchill, Manitoba, to Northern Ontario to Corner Brook, Newfoundland, in a way that those services would be comparable, one to the other by comparable levels of service, as well as comparable tax rates being charged.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you have no commitment on the part of your Canadian society to Confederation and to equalization, then the provisions of that Constitution are thwarted. Regrettably, the previous Liberal administration plus this administration have turned their backs on the very, very fine words and commitments that were made in the Constitution of Canada. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if that fairness isn't there, the whole complexion of the game that I referred to earlier is changed.

Right now, Manitobans are being penalized by the Federal Government to the tune of some \$300 for each man, woman and child in the Province of Manitoba. That's money that will come from provincial sources if we're to maintain and to improve basic vital services in the Province of Manitoba. That's like the actions of the previous Liberal administration and this administration in respect to this fundamental principle of Confederation. It is like requiring provinces such as Manitoba to play for the Stanley Cup with one player in the penalty box.

Now honourable members across the way have been shouting and arguing back and forth about the CF-18. I wouldn't want to disappoint honourable members by not discussing the CF-18 this afternoon in this Chamber, since it appears to be honourable members across the way who are expressing grave sensitivity to the CF-18. I certainly understand why they're expressing such grave sensitivity, because they've seen so much of their expectation dashed by one blundering stupid move on

the part of the government in Ottawa. If there ever was a stupid move, a move that blundered and slapped the face of Manitobans, it was the CF-18 decision. Manitobans' dream, as I say, of self-sufficiency was dashed by the CF-18 affair.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Now while I can't go as far as to say the awarding of that CF-18, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would be the equivalent of a Wayne Gretzky coming to the Jets but, if that contract had been awarded to Bristol Aero, the boost to our province and to Western Canada would be the same as the Jets picking up another strong defenseman or a first-rate centre. In other words, while it wouldn't have brought us self-sufficiency in itself, it would certainly have taken us a large step in that direction. Manitoba cannot continue its successful march to the future if it continues to be given cheap penalties by the same Federal Government which is charged with helping us meet our goals.

How do members opposite react to that? Well, when they're not falling all over themselves attempting to be apologists for the Federal Government, then they're shouting, hoorah, we got the CF-5 contract in Manitoba. Well that's like saying, well we didn't get Gretzky but we did get Wrong-Way Corrigan. We got the old CF-5, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a symbol of where Canada has been in the past, not where it's going. Montreal received the symbol of where Canada is going in the future from this Conservative Government in Ottawa.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Did the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba stand up for the people of Manitoba over this issue, or did they threaten to hold their breath, to turn any colour than blue? It was the Honourable Member for Brandon West who first suggested this. Let's change our name so we can't be recognized. I don't know what the honourable member is going to change it to. I think a very appropriate name would have been the Regressive Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba. I think everybody could have understood that change in name.

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

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I just could not come up with a better name. That's all there is to it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have a point of order.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: You know, the Honourable Member for Charleswood—(Interjection)—It's been suggested to me that a better name would have been the No-Name Party of the Province of Manitoba.

Then the Honourable Member for Charleswood, where's he? Well I seem to recall that the Honourable Member for Charleswood resigned from a Tory fund-

raising committee, a great heroic act of self-sacrifice, Madam Speaker, until we found out that he wasn't even a member of that fund-raising committee.

Then I remember the tremendous relief on the part of Conservative delegates to their provincial convention last year. It was the first time, Madam Speaker, that I can recall during my time as certainly a member of this Chamber when any single political party, whether it's Liberal or Conservative or New Democrat, sighed one tremendous sigh of relief when their convention couldn't proceed because of a blizzard. They didn't want to face up to the snow job inflicted upon the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. J. McCRAE: I've been checking . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

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

MR. J. McCRAE: Perhaps the Government House Leader can help me, but is there not something in Beauséjour about an incredibly bad speech?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I'm always delighted to know that the Member for Brandon West is uncomfortable, and the more that honourable members across the way can make the Honourable Member for Brandon West and other members in this Chamber uncomfortable, the more we're going to do it; let me assure them of that.

Well, Madam Speaker, as I say, despite the sensitivity of honourable members across the way, they sure showed Ottawa, didn't they? They showed Manitobans where they stand, didn't they? But when this government stood up on behalf of the people of the Province of Manitoba, along with the Chambers of Commerce, along with working men and women in this province, to protest this lack of fairness, members across the way howled, "fedbashing, fedbashing."

In fact, I think, Madam Speaker, it was the height of hypocrisy for members opposite to accuse us of fedbashing when we demand fair treatment from our Federal Government; that when a Don Getty speaks up for the people of Alberta with respect to energy resources, when Brian Peckford speaks up for the people of the Province of Newfoundland in respect to fisheries, that's not fedbashing. That's speaking up for the people of the Province of Alberta and Newfoundland.

I would ask the Leader of the Opposition whether he considers Mr. Doole of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce a fedbasher? I would ask the Leader of the Opposition whether he considers the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg a fedbasher? I didn't hear the voices of the Tory caucus raised against them, Madam Speaker.

Well, let all members of this Chamber be assured that this is one Premier, this is one Government, this is one caucus which will continue to demand that Ottawa treat all provinces equitably and fairly in Canada.

We will also continue to demand that the Federal Government initiate comprehensive reforms to the taxation system in this country. Canadians, and all Canadians, must shoulder their fair share of the costs of maintaining vital services. That means we will have to have a tax system where there are no fat-cat corporations which pay no income tax or where the wealthy can shelter their income to the detriment of the less well off and the poor within our society.

Madam Speaker, we read only a few days ago in the paper where personal income taxes had risen, I think it's some 30 percent in Canada, and I have no quarrel with the raising of tax revenue in order to pay for vital services. You have never heard me quarrel with the Federal Government in their right to do that in order to pay for vital services. But what I do quarrel with, Madam Speaker, is when those who are earning \$80,000 and \$90,000 and \$100,000 in income get away practically scot free with a tax increase and those who are low-income and low middle-income Manitobans and Canadians are expected to pay up more than their fair share.

Madam Speaker, that is the difference between honourable members on this side of the Chamber and honourable members on that side of the Chamber. When we talk about tax reform, we talk about fairness for ordinary Canadians and not just for a few; and honourable members, rather than participate in their righteous indignation, had better start speaking to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa to ensure that there's true tax reform that treats Canadians fairly.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, honourable members obviously had a wrong nerve touched and properly so. I can understand that in view of the record of the last two or three years - tax increases that have not been shared fairly amongst those Canadians with ability to pay.

We will not, Madam Speaker, demand special treatment of our Federal Government. We will ask only what is our due as members of confederation. Our demands are for fairness and for justice and for equity.

When the banks threatened, Madam Speaker, to foreclose upon the farmers of this province and we proposed The Family Farm Protection Act last Session, on which side did honourable members across the way come down on? Madam Speaker, honourable members across the way came down on the side of the banks and not the farmers of this province. They stood up for the bankers.

And when, Madam Speaker, we introduced changes to legislation that would allow us to stop the oil companies from gouging Manitoba motorists, which side were honourable members across the way on? They stood up, Madam Speaker, squarely and firmly on the side of the oil giants. The honourable members across the way opposed legislation introduced in this Chamber by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs solidly to prevent gouging of Manitobans by the oil and by other unfair consumer exploitation.

What about natural gas pricing? Again, this government has said that it will stand up for Manitoba consumers who were being forced to shell out, according to a thorough analysis done by the

Department of Energy, represented by our Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in this House, millions of dollars of unnecessary ripping off of the consumers of this province. It is this government that has stood up, it is this government that has made representations to the Public Utilities Board, and it said, "Enough is enough."

And honourable members across the way - and I remember the Honourable Member for Lakeside the other day in a very, very pleading voice ask, "Would honourable members impose legislative action or not?" I said to the Member for Lakeside that every option is available to us, as Manitobans, to ensure that Manitoba consumers are not gouged by unnecessary exploitation.

Madam Speaker, so I ask you: on which side are the Conservatives? The Conservatives in this Chamber, are they on the side of the consumers, are they on the side of the ordinary Manitoban, or are they on the side of big business and the banks and the oil companies?

What about the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order?

MR. H. ENNS: I would request, Madam Speaker, whether or not the First Minister would entertain a question at this time?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'll be glad to entertain questions if there's time left at the conclusion of my remarks, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I always appreciate the questions from the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

Madam Speaker, what about the question of trade negotiations with the United States. I didn't hear any comments by the Leader of the Opposition in respect to this important, vital issue that confronts Canadians and Manitobans in particular. I thought, Madam Speaker, we would have some questions in this Chamber about the issue of trade which we are presently involved in discussing with the Federal Government at this time. But not a question in this Chamber. Manitobans want their Federal Government and their Provincial Governments, including the Manitoba Government to ensure that their interests are protected in the present trade negotiations between Canada and the United States.

A great many people in this province were concerned by the recent press reports that have been made about these negotiations, reports which left Canadians confused about just how firmly committed the Federal Government is to preserving supply management in agriculture, reports which indicated that those few sectors which absolutely must have protection, such as fruit and vegetable growers and food processors are about to lose that protection, reports that the Federal Government may agree to weaken or to even surrender our sovereign right to control the takeover of Canadian businesses by U.S. interests.

Madam Speaker, we on this side of the House would have very serious reservations about any international

trade agreement that required us to make any significant concessions on any of those fronts.

As I have indicated on several occasions, we are prepared to keep an open mind on the question of Canada-U.S. trade agreement until the provisions and content of any proposed agreement becomes quite clear. However, as I also made clear to the Prime Minister as early as May of last year, we, unlike some others in Canada, are not prepared to give blanket endorsement or a leap of blind faith, to just any free trade agreement without regard to its substance and to its cost.

The Prime Minister has promised, of course, that each province is going to be net gainers from any new trade agreement, so that we look forward with anticipation to any agreement that is going to ensure that all regions and all provinces as promised by the Prime Minister will be net gainers and there will be no net losers.

Manitobans expect their government to stand up for their interests, to be vigilant to their concerns in assessing an economic agreement of this magnitude, potential importance. In such matters, Manitobans do not want a government that is prepared to jump on a bandwagon or to buy a pig-in-a-poke.

Manitobans can be assured that when I meet my fellow Premiers and the Prime Minister tomorrow night I will make it very plain, once again, that there are some things that Manitobans simply cannot accept in any international trade agreement.

And at that meeting I will also be indicating my continuing concern that there presently exists no mutually agreed process for provincial approval of a Canada-U.S. trade agreement. Such a process will be essential for any trade agreement that touches upon provincial jurisdiction.

I will be also indicating that the present system of First Ministers' meetings on trade, although quite adequate for consultation, information-sharing purposes, will not constitute an adequate process for securing provincial approval of an international agreement.

And, Madam Speaker, it is also our view that once there is a proposed agreement, that that agreement ought to be released so that Canadians can fully debate that agreement before any such proposed agreement is sent to the Congress of the United States for their approval. And we'll be urging that Canadians have an opportunity to fully and completely and totally debate the entire issue of free trade.

Madam Speaker, one of the great concerns that we have in Manitoba is the approach that has been used up to this point in the free trade discussions, negotiations. Before we even sat down, in fact to negotiate a free trade agreement, two of the most important and vital aspects that ought to be the subject of negotiation were bargained away. One relates to the deregulation of transportation and the impact that that is likely to have in the Province of Manitoba, and the consequent loss of businesses and hundreds of jobs in the Province of Manitoba and the impact upon the families of this province.

And, Madam Speaker, I must say that I was just but a little surprised at a meeting attended by the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Industry Trade and Technology, and myself the other day and the Minister

responsible for Transportation, to receive a brief from the Canadian Manufacturers Association that told us that we should be thankful because the Federal Government had moved to the deregulation of the transportation industry in Canada. And I must say this, that the Minister of Transportation, I believe, articulated well to the Canadian Manufacturers Association that they may be talking for Toronto, they may be talking for Montreal, they may be talking for Hamilton, Ontario, but they certainly are not, as a Canadian organization, speaking on behalf of the West or the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I worry because if it is the likes of the Canadian Manufacturers Association that found nothing to dispute insofar as present federal Conservative Government initiatives, if indeed it's the Canadian Manufacturers Association that has major input into the policy making of the Conservative Party of Canada, then I fear - I fear for the people of Western Canada; I fear for the people of Atlantic Canada; I fear for the poor and the disadvantaged of this country.

Members opposite, Madam Speaker, do not raise their voice with ours and I believe that they will one day, be called upon to explain their silence to the people of Manitoba. Because, Madam Speaker, that is what this Session of the Manitoba Legislature is all about. It's about fairness, it's about justice, it's about standing up to challenges. This Session is about jobs, creating new ones, so that Manitobans can share fully in the benefits of the Canadian society. It's about maintaining vital services, health, education, in the face of mounting costs and shrinking participation of the Federal Government. It's about the plight of the struggling farmer, the northern fisherman, the working mother, the new immigrant, the young, the elderly. It's about working together as Manitobans to find innovative solutions to the challenges which face Manitoba today and in the future, because, Madam Speaker, these are the concerns of ordinary Manitobans. They understand the challenge. They are confident of their ability to meet that challenge, and believe me, anyone who stands in the way of them meeting that challenge, will not be measured up as having truly and fully represented the interests of the people of the province.

That is the challenge that faces members opposite this Session. They either have to be part of the solution or indeed they will suffer for it. The Tories were part of the problem 25 years ago, Madam Speaker, when the foresighted and caring CCF in the Province of Saskatchewan under the former Premier of Saskatchewan, T.C. Douglas, brought in North America's Medicare scheme, a comprehensive scheme which would lead to guaranteed health service for all Canadians, based not upon their ability to pay but rather on their need.

Manitobans know that the costs of providing medical care are skyrocketing, not just here but all across Canada. They know that the best response is reform of the system, not to privatize it, not to bring in user fees, deterrent fees. In fact, Madam Speaker, Manitobans are aware of the escalating costs of vital services that they want and they expect. They do not believe, Madam Speaker, that the answer is to cut back those services. They know it costs more to continue those services, to ensure that there be medical justice for all citizens of Manitoba. I believe that they are

prepared to pay more, provided they are only asked to pay for their fair share.

Manitobans are proud of the fact that they pay less than other Canadians for their telephones, their electricity, for the automobile insurance. They know that there have been troubles in our Crown corporations and, let me say, I have appreciated constructive advice and suggestions in this Chamber in respect to ways and means of strengthening the operations of Crown corporations. It is this government that is moving to insure that we implement measures to strengthen the Crown corporations of the Province of Manitoba, so they can carry on with their historic purpose in this province of providing cost-efficient service to the people of Manitoba, so that those basic services that are important to Manitobans can be provided in a way that will focus in on the need rather than on profit.

I can remember, Madam Speaker, in fact because there have been quite a few comments about automobile insurance in this Chamber - and I've mentioned the battle of T.C. Douglas to bring in the first Medicare scheme in the Province of Saskatchewan that would be based upon need, and not profit. I can remember - and there are still some honourable members across the way - the opposition that was mounted by the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba, along with the Insurance Bureau of Canada

MR. H. ENNS: Not true.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, the Honourable Member for Lakeside says "not true." Madam Speaker, I was here; I saw that opposition. I saw how closely it worked in hand with the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba. I wonder in fact, Madam Speaker, whether honourable members can be proud of the fact that every area of economic and social reform from Medicare, automobile insurance or pay equity, either they fight it or they drag their heels in being brought into the 20th Century. And then, of course, after a few years they take credit for it. You would think that they never had opposed it in the first place.

But just think, Madam Speaker, if we had had in the Province of Manitoba and elsewhere nothing but Conservative Governments. We'd be still in the 1920's - or would it be the 1880's? - and not in the 1980's insofar as socioeconomic progress. It appears that it requires governments that are prepared to exercise boldness and initiative and ingenuity to provide basic public services. That's why, Madam Speaker, I am proud, despite the problems that we have had - and every Crown corporation, every government will have problems - of the Crown corporations in the Province of Manitoba. I can say this, Madam Speaker. When we visit other jurisdictions, one of the biggest selling cards in the Province of Manitoba is our low telephone rates, our low electricity rates, our low automobile insurance rates in the Province of Manitoba, all thanks to our Crown corporations.

Madam Speaker, ordinary Manitobans can see that the Federal Government and members opposite do not share their priorities, nor their sense of fairness and economic justice. Manitobans want their government to stand up for their priorities and their interests. They

expect their government to stand up against a Federal Government that sometimes has demonstrated uncaring attitudes; that will allocate development money and jobs on the basis of political partisanship, rather than sound economic reasons and justice. Manitobans expect their Provincial Government to stand up, even if it is against the interests of the banking community, insofar as the plight of the farmers; to stand up to big business when they run roughshod over the Manitoba consumer, inflating prices and profiteering unfairly off the backs of Manitobans. They demand that we continue strong leadership and direction, which has resulted in a Manitoba economic and employment picture which is the envy of many, many other Canadians.

Let me assure honourable members opposite that Manitobans are not going to look kindly on an Opposition that strives to thwart those goals and those objectives. They know that there is only one reason why Manitoba has scaled lofty heights in the wake of the recession. It was because all Manitobans worked together. They worked together shoulder to shoulder to create, to preserve jobs, to stimulate our economy, to keep their province moving and looking ahead.

Madam Speaker, on that point, I was amazed earlier today - and puzzled, I must admit - and taken aback that the Honourable Member for Arthur raised the question of population figures in this Chamber when the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Minister responsible for Employment, has again and again demonstrated fully in this House the tragic circumstances that existed between 1979-1981 when the Honourable Member for Arthur sat in the Treasury Benches of this government, and when there was a net loss in population in the Province of Manitoba, when all around us we were still in a period of boom, 1979, 1980. The recession hit in the latter part of 1980 and 1981.

All the honourable members need do is compare the economic performance of the Province of Manitoba to other provinces in this country at that time, as compared to now, to discover that Manitoba ranked near the bottom in just about every economic indicator, whether it was by way of job creation, housing, investment growth, population decrease. Manitoba ranked amongst the lowest under a government that was elected in 1977 on the basis they were going to turn the economy around. They turned the economy upside down regrettably, Madam Speaker, and Manitobans know that. They remember that.

It required, in fact, the Minister of Employment to demonstrate to honourable members across the way - and I must give the honourable member credit, because I believe the honourable member probably was more effective than anyone I can think of in exposing the economic inadequacies and inefficiencies of the former Lyon administration in this province. The Minister responsible for Employment, not only in this House but through the towns and villages and rural municipalities of this province, clearly demonstrated over and over and over again, despite efforts by the former Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology in this province, that Manitoba's performance was worse than other parts of this country due to mismanaged economic policies and programs, followed by a government, which included the present Leader of the

Opposition, the Member for Arthur, who served in this Chamber at that time as the Minister of Agriculture.

Madam Speaker, Manitobans continued to demand that we continue strong leadership and direction, which has resulted in Manitoba's economic and employment picture being the envy of other Canadians.

My advice to honourable members across the way is to drop your strident opposition. Cease the kind of personal attacks that the Leader of the Opposition participated in the other day during his speech when he attacked the Member for Rupertsland, the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs, and as I said at the beginning of my remarks, what I thought was one of the cheapest attacks that I've heard in this Chamber in a long, long time upon another member of this Chamber. That is not the way, honourable members, that you're going to achieve power in the Province of Manitoba.

But I'm not worried about giving them advice, Madam Speaker, because I gave them advice in 1984 and '85 and they laughed. I was delighted because honourable members across the way, of course, have all the answers. They prefer not to listen. So I was fully confident that honourable members would follow their tradition of not listening to constructive advice. I was, without any doubt, satisfied that they would ignore my advice, and I'm just as satisfied today, Madam Speaker, that they will continue to ignore the advice that I offer them, and they will continue to sit in the Opposition benches rather than on the benches of the government in the Province of Manitoba.

My advice to honourable members across the way would be to attempt to get into step with the aspirations, the expectations and the hopes of Manitobans to attempt to reflect those hopes and expectations and aspirations, to attempt to lead and not to follow, to attempt to be creative and innovative rather than to be, as you have been, stratified in your thinking. Stand with us, stand with ordinary Manitobans.

When Ottawa treats us unfairly, you needn't worry about changing your name; or when our farmers are threatened, when Manitobans are gouged by big business, show Manitobans where you stand and don't be afraid of taking a position. Because, my friends, the winds of change are already blowing across the Prairies, and you're aware of that, and the Conservative Party of Canada stands to be blown away by these new winds that are blowing across the Prairies.

Madam Speaker, I must just say for a moment that I would never have dreamed two years ago that the Conservative Party would be, poll wise, ranked No. 3 in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, that they would be . . . I'm not sure whether they're still No. 1 in Alberta.

A MEMBER: They worked hard for that.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, they worked hard for that, I must admit. I commend you for working hard for that. That they would be fighting for their lives in the Province of Alberta, who would ever have thought that?

You know, I must just tell you, Madam Speaker, I was in Edmonton three weeks ago, and I looked at a couple of our members aghast. Do you know what they said to me, our members, members of the Legislature? "We're going to win a couple of seats in Calgary in

the next election." Madam Speaker, I thought maybe they were a little bit stunned out of their minds until I came back and looked at the poll results for the Province of Alberta. Even Tory Calgary is in trouble.

And in British Columbia, I understand there's been the greatest shift in political fortunes anywhere in Canada has occurred in the Province of British Columbia. It's my understanding that the Conservatives in the Province of British Columbia are running a very poor third.

And in Ontario, what do you have in Ontario? Twenty percent, and your national figure is 22 percent.

I'm surprised the Member for Emerson looks so happy because I'm wondering what his figures are in the constituency of Emerson. If you're going to lose seats in Tory Calgary, I'm sure that Emerson is down the drain.

I must commend the Member for Emerson for his comments last night. I was impressed when the Member for Emerson did speak because I thought he was very graceful in the tribute that he paid to the Member for Thompson who was the member in this Chamber that came back in four years from the narrowest of wins to one of the largest percentage wins of any member in this House due to his hard work.

I want to express my appreciation to the Member for Emerson because I thought he spoke eloquently last night, much more eloquently than today - eloquently and effectively, and demonstrated real compassion and feeling last night when he expressed himself. I must admit, if the honourable member spoke like that from the platforms of his constituency in the last election, then I understand why, indeed, he was re-elected to this Chamber with the eloquent address of last night.

Madam Speaker, I can say with confidence that the programs and policies of this government mirror the desires of Manitobans from one end of Manitoba to the other. They've worked hard, they've watched the kinds of programs that this government has introduced to meet the challenges of the recession and the aftermath. I don't believe that they have been disappointed by what they have seen. As I said, Madam Speaker, the proof of the pudding is in the economic and in the employment forecasts of independent economists. That is a great source of pride for all Manitobans. They can look at those achievements and they can say, "I helped to make that happen." And they will help to make it happen again in the future, Madam Speaker. They will watch, too, Madam Speaker. They will see the strong, sound legislative package that this government, this New Democratic Party Government, will be introducing during this Session.

They will see that our commitment to job creation has not been diminished. They will see, Madam Speaker, the new environmental legislation, new environmental legislation as well as new legislation dealing with wildlife and fishery acts that will assure that the natural beauties of the Province of Manitoba will be used intelligently and will be preserved for future generations. Legislation, I might say, that has already been discussed at many different meetings in this province with Manitobans to obtain their input and their advice, and one of the main themes certainly of this Session will be the improvement of the environment, the protection of the environment, in order to assure ourselves of clean water and soil and air.

They will see, during the process of this Session, continued efforts on the part of this government to strengthen the family farm, to improve the rural communities of Manitoba. There is a major challenge that we must all work together as Manitobans in this respect.

I want to simply indicate to honourable members that I welcome all constructive suggestions that can be made to this government in respect to alleviating the very serious problems that we're faced with in rural Manitoba. We will do what we can within our own fiscal and jurisdictional capacity as we have committed ourselves to do within the Throne Speech. We will be looking to the Federal Government, of course, to do what is necessary on its part, because what we are faced with is not a provincial crisis, it is not a regional crisis. What we are confronted with insofar as the agricultural crisis is a national crisis brought about by international factors and unfortunately the undercutting of the heavy subsidization of grain prices on the European and on the American fronts.

The only long-term solution, of course, is for us to ensure that there is negotiated an end to such heavy subsidies by the different national governments, because we cannot continue to subsidize heavily through our national treasuries the agricultural sectors. The only long-term solution must be a negotiated agreement. But until that occurs, it will be a responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure that 100,000 farmers in Western Canada are not required to carry on their shoulders the burden of the international competition which is taking place and the suffocating influence of massive subsidies in Europe and in the United States.

We will, of course, continue to proceed, through the Minister responsible for Business and Tourism, with our efforts to provide help to the small business community by way of providing small business bonds, as outlined in the Throne Speech, to ensure that the small business community - which is particularly going to be impacted in rural communities, Madam Speaker, because of the agricultural situation, and I know that they'll be the first in line as a result of the declining farm incomes. Need is required by way of particular target from the Department of Business and Tourism in order to ensure that the small businesses of rural Manitoba are given as much support and assistance as they can in order to survive what will be a very difficult time in the several years ahead.

Madam Speaker, Manitobans, I believe, will see this Session that our concern for our young people, our elderly, the unemployed and the disadvantaged remains unabated. They will also see that our efforts to contain the costs of the health care system, while maintaining the excellence of that system, is in the best interests of all Manitobans, and they will see that we are seriously determined to strengthen our Crown corporations, which have had a long and proud history of providing service to Manitobans at costs far below that in other jurisdictions.

Madam Speaker, Manitobans can be assured of a government, that despite the challenges we're confronted with, will continue responsible, caring and prudent administration in which they have placed their trust.

I'm looking forward to this Session, Madam Speaker. I believe that the Speech from the Throne has laid

before this House a strong sense of direction, a blueprint for future of Manitobans, a strong sense of the courage and determination of this government working in cooperation with Manitobans in order to achieve accomplishments to obtain self-sufficiency as a province.

Madam Speaker, when I talk about self-sufficiency, I can't help but divert just for a moment and again recall, as we discussed Medicare and Autopac and pay equity and other areas where Conservatives have opposed, to recall for a moment their opposition to hydro-electric development in Limestone, their opposition at the National Energy Board hearings to the development of hydro-development projects in Northern Manitoba, their opposition to the establishment of a national energy foundation in order to provide funds for future economic and social development in Manitoba from the profits and benefits that will flow from the sale of our hydro-electricity to the United States. Madam Speaker, that move, that initiative by this government, is going to contribute towards the achievement in the long run of self-sufficiency in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, if Manitoba Government and if Manitobans had taken the lead of honourable members across the way, then there would be no project in Northern Manitoba today. There would be no Affirmative Action Program to particularly target Northerners and Native people in Northern Manitoba. In fact, Madam Speaker, it's comparable to the situation that existed in the 1940's in Alberta. Their kind of thinking, their paralysis insofar as innovation and creativity, if that had been applied in Alberta in the 1940's, we would not have had the oil industry in the Province of Alberta. There would have been no energy industry in the Province of Alberta, if in fact Albertans in the 1940's had followed the kind of paralysis and idealism and planning and program development that is so frequently and constantly proclaimed by honourable members across the way.

Madam Speaker, as I say, I believe the Speech from the Throne has very clearly established a blueprint insofar as Manitobans are concerned. We are pledged to continue to listen to Manitobans, to hear the thoughts, the dreams of Manitobans, to acknowledge, Madam Speaker, where in fact we have made mistakes and we have freely acknowledged those mistakes in the past and we will do so in the future and recognize that there is need on the part of our government to make improvements and to do a better job in the future.

New Democrats are never hesitant to acknowledge that there is much need for improvement, unlike honourable members across the way, that never are prepared, because of their own sense of insecurity, their own sense of inferiority, whatever it is, to acknowledge that they could be doing a better job. I have never heard honourable members across the way stand up in this House and admit that mistakes were made during the four years and some under the leadership of former Premier Lyon in the Province of Manitoba. Never have I heard acknowledgement of mistakes during that term in government - never. It is a party that is so wrapped up in its own holy guise, their own righteous indignation, their own attitude of the divine right on their part to govern, and we see it every day.

We see the smarting across the way by honourable members, because they have lost elections in 1981 and 1986. We don't deserve to be on this side of the Chamber because, after all, they were born to govern, and not New Democrats. Madam Speaker, it is so obvious to honourable members across the way and I don't know why it isn't obvious to honourable members as well when they're sitting in Opposition as to what kind of message that they provide to us day-by-day in that respect.

We have pledged to continue to work with our Federal Government and with local government to maintain and enhance Manitoba's enviable position in this country and I do believe, Madam Speaker, that there are many different areas that require joint participation and cooperation between the Federal and the Provincial Governments.

I do, however, Madam Speaker, in closing, indicate that I believe it's important that we are all prepared to examine ways and means by which smaller provinces, poorer provinces, are given more strength within Confederation, within the Constitution, to ensure that they are treated more fairly, more equitably.

I know the Liberal Party, represented by the Member for River Heights in this Chamber, has proclaimed the soundness of some sort of Triple E proposal insofar as the Senate is concerned. They call it elected, effective, and I forget the third - (Interjection) - Yes, well, honourable members, I think, ought to think a second time about adding another layer of government within Canada because I doubt, Madam Speaker, whether or not Senator Devine, Senator Getty would have acted any differently than Premier Devine and Premier Getty when it came to the crunch of the CF-18. They would have been whipped in line.

So, Madam Speaker, I believe we must be prepared to look at a strengthening of the Constitution beyond what exists now in order to ensure that economic development is guaranteed on a regional basis for all parts of Canada; that equalization and transfer payments are more strongly recognized and reflected in the existing Constitution than is the case now.

I believe that we must be prepared to examine other alternatives such as proportional representation for some Members of Parliament. We might be required even to look at a House of Regents in order to ensure that there be effective representation insofar as the different provinces of Canada are concerned.

This is a challenge, Madam Speaker, that confronts us all as Manitobans, as we move towards discussion of the Quebec resolution which will be taking place in the next few months as proposed by the Province of Quebec - we haven't still received an indication from the Federal Government as to where they stand on that, but we'll be discussing it obviously in the next few months, the Quebec proposal - as we proceed to the discussions on aboriginal rights at the Constitutional Conference which will be taking place March 25 and March 26 on the question of self-government.

I would be interested in hearing from honourable members across the way as to what message they feel that the Attorney-General and the Minister of Northern Affairs and myself should be taking to that Constitutional Conference. Where do you stand insofar

as the issue of aboriginal self-government in Canada? We'll obviously be talking about other constitutional issues over the next few months in order to ensure greater equity, greater fairness insofar as Canadians of all regions.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, I am proud of the accomplishments of this government, of this province but, most important, of the people of Manitoba. I think too often we all forget that which has been made possible has been through the initiative, effort, contribution and cooperation of Manitobans of north, south and urban areas.

Let me assure you that we, as the New Democratic Party Government of Manitoba, will continue to bring Manitoba's vision of their future closer to reality. It will not be easy. There'll be many challenges as we travel the road ahead, challenges that we are faced with insofar as job creation, insofar as vital services and maintaining those vital services, insofar as dealing with the agricultural crisis, insofar as dealing with regional economic development, insofar as ensuring that we deal with this, as the Honourable Member for Arthur pointed out the other day, feeling of separation that has grown on the part of his constituents. He mentioned that - I think it was a vote in his constituency - there could even be a majority for separation.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Arthur says I caused it. Let me tell the Honourable Member for Arthur that past and present, whether it be Liberal or Conservative, federal administrations have been the greatest allies of alienation, of Western Concept Party, of COR, and all those dispirited groups than any leadership that those organizations could provide. For the honourable member to suggest that this government has caused that feeling is total and complete hogwash. I would suggest that the honourable member ensure that his statements be factual and not fictional, and that the honourable member had better address his comments elsewhere in order to ensure that this threat to the Confederation of Canada is fully addressed and dealt with by those who are causing the mood of alienation that in fact has crossed throughout all of Western Canada, and which is deplorable.

Madam Speaker, I commend this Throne Speech to all honourable members. I urge all honourable members to join in providing support to this Throne Speech, one which provides direction and insight, one which is committed to the service of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: In accordance with Rule 35.(4), the question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet for an address to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, in answer to his speech at the opening of the Session.

All those in favour, say aye; all those opposed, say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it it.

MR. G. MERCIER: On division, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: On division.

Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? The hour being 6:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 1:30 p.m. tomorrow. (Wednesday)