

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 19 February, 1988.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

HON. A. MACKLING: I have a statement, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, as members of this Legislature are well aware, the tourism industry in Manitoba is a dynamic growth sector that contributes very significantly to the economy of the Province of Manitoba through the generation of new dollars into our businesses from non-resident visitors and through the spending by Manitobans themselves on travel and vacations in this beautiful province of ours.

Over the years, an excellent cooperative working relationship has been developed between this industry and our departmental tourism programming. With virtually all of our marketing and development activities, nowadays we work in partnership with the industry associations and increasingly, as the associations have grown and matured, we look to them to take the lead role in setting our agenda for marketing activities.

I mention this by way of background and to let members know that credit for the news that I bring belongs primarily to the businesspeople who make up this industry sector. Tourism in Manitoba remains a "good news" industry.

In 1987, our preliminary statistics, which we obtained from Statistics Canada and the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, indicate that tourism receipts have reached \$701 million. This is a growth of 5 percent over the levels recorded last year, which was \$667.8 million. I'm particularly happy to report that the United States travel market performed well in 1987.

Total visitors increased by 4.1 percent to 740,300 while expenditures reached \$96.7 million. The department and the industry have been increasing the marketing efforts in the State of Minnesota, and the level of visitors from that area has grown by 24 percent. We will continue our targeted efforts in the Twin Cities this year with a new advertising campaign and with continued promotions in partnership with Manitoba business.

The domestic travel markets maintained the record levels which were recorded in 1986. Residents of other Canadian provinces spent an estimated \$168.6 million

in Manitoba, while residents of Manitoba spent \$41.58 million.

As you may know, the Tourism Industry Association — (Interjection) — Well, Madam Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and others are making derisory comments from their seats. I wish they would refrain themselves and listen to the good news that we have to say in Manitoba. I know they don't like good news.

As you may know, the Tourism Industry Association, with departmental assistance, held the first-ever Vacation and Travel Mart in Winnipeg last year. This event was designed to showcase Manitoba tourism products to Manitobans, and I think it's an excellent new innovation that has a great future. It will be held again this spring, and we expect it will continue to encourage residents to vacation in our tourism area.

Finally, I'd like to draw attention to the 14 percent growth obtained last year from overseas visitors. While we have not undertaken major marketing efforts in overseas markets, this good performance continues to demonstrate the immense potential of the extremely large markets in places like Europe and Asia.

For this reason, we added a tourism component to the Pacific Rim Tour of the Royal Winnipeg Ballet to capitalize on the high profile that this tour will give to Manitoba. Judging by the press reports of the tour thus far, it would appear that the ballet is capturing the hearts of millions in Asia. In addition to our Pacific Rim initiatives, we are looking at opportunities in the German market with private-sector operators.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for allowing me this time to report on the growing tourism industry in our province. I know that all members of the House have a close attachment to this industry, as it involves all of our constituencies and all Manitobans.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, Madam Speaker, I'm indeed pleased to respond to the Minister and his report. As we know on this side of the House, tourism is not doing well in this Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, it is typical of this Minister and this government to mislead the people of Manitoba in trying to indicate that things are going well. Yes, Madam Speaker, tourism in Manitoba has the potential of being one of the best industries in this province. It is in the Dominion of Canada, but it is not in the Province of Manitoba, Madam Speaker. This Minister does a disservice to try to mislead the people of Manitoba.

He says he's working in a cooperative way with the people of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, this is not all that true. He wants to let it be known that the industries are the ones that need to take the credit for what is happening in tourism. Madam Speaker, that's the only true part he made in this total speech, because it is the industries that have rallied behind an inept and inadequate government to try to maintain it. Industry

has been asking this government for more money for media expense, for media sell, so we can bring more Americans into here.

Madam Speaker, I don't know where he gets the information that he has on American tourism, but the results that I get from the Statistics Canada is a 1.2 percent increase in people crossing the border this year. Those are accurate figures, and you can get them from the border counts - 1.2 percent, and he says 4.1 percent, Madam Speaker. That is an erroneous statement. Madam Speaker, he also says that the offshore people have increased, yes, but it is a very minute part of our tourism industry.

Madam Speaker, he says of the millions of dollars that we are doing in tourism, but the Minister also fails to tell you that any money you spend on buying a ticket to fly to another province is included in what he calls the dollars that tourism is spending on Manitoba, Madam Speaker.

For this Minister to stand up and say how anxious they are to have Americans here, why is it that he was the one who was a demonstration where the American flag was burnt, and you expect us to believe that you want the Americans here?

This is the Minister who said at a school, trying to scare students, that if we had a free trade agreement, the Marines could be brought in to enforce that agreement. This is the Minister who was anxious and thinks the Americans are going to believe him. Madam Speaker, this is not so.

And, Madam Speaker, right at this point, his staff in the Tourism Department has been dwindling down. The Assistant Deputy Minister or the previous Assistant Deputy Minister is gone, and the previous director is going to be leaving shortly. We don't see any replacements for these people in the Tourism Department. So when this minister says that, Madam Speaker, he is wrong.

He says that Manitobans are making up the difference, Madam Speaker, and yet last year, for '86, the statistics show that accommodations were down, the food industry was down, the parks were at marginal. Madam Speaker, what were these Manitobans doing while they were driving around Manitoba? They sure weren't spending money, so they weren't helping the industry.

So, Madam Speaker, I hope that this Minister really takes an interest in tourism. It is a thriving industry in Canada. We want to make sure that Manitobans get their fair share.

The lack of a pavilion at Expo in B.C. was the most foolish decision this government ever made. It was an opportunity to tell those people from other countries what a great province we had here in Manitoba. The members opposite were not proud enough to go and tell people what a great province you have.

So, Madam Speaker, I will watch with interest further statements from this Minister to see just what direction he's going to take on tourism.

Thank you.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have from Goose Lake High School, 26 Grade 11 students under the direction of Mrs. Irene Buytendorp. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MPIC - appointment new president

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

I would like him to let us know who will be responsible for hiring the new president of MPIC, and what guidelines have been put in place to ensure that the new president has better qualifications than the former president did.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the hiring of the new president for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation will be done by Order-in-Council, based upon recommendation from the Minister responsible.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, on November 4 of 1987, I wrote to the Premier asking how it could happen that the Minister responsible for MPIC could hire on September 4, by this Order-in-Council 1069, as an executive assistant, an individual who at that time - at that time of his appointment - was facing charges relating to fraud, uttering forged documents and false pretenses, writing bad cheques and failure to appear in court.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is, and since he hasn't replied to me, does the Premier really believe that the Minister responsible for MPIC, who has such atrocious judgment, should be put in a position to hire the new president of MPIC?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, let me just say in respect to that, obviously the honourable members might wish to reflect for a few moments on what's been happening in Ottawa vis-a-vis decisions there, one after one I believe - what is it, No. 8 now, at the Cabinet level, in fact. The Honourable Minister responsible for Municipal Affairs took instant action as soon as he realized that there was a problem pursuant to the executive assistant in question and, Madam Speaker,

there was very speedy and quick action. We all from time to time - maybe the Leader of the Opposition doesn't like to admit this - but it is clear from Ottawa that we all from time to time make mistakes, and that was one.

Political appointments - hiring guidelines

MR. G. FILMON: Have the guidelines with respect to hiring of staff for this government, particularly political staff and Order-in-Council appointments been changed so that they now require a complete review of the applicant's background to ensure that this sort of thing doesn't happen?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I wish the Leader of the Opposition would have done his research and he would have found out that in fact there was no knowledge at any level that any charges were impending. In fact, I was as shocked as anyone.

Madam Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition on his application forms for staff asks whether anyone has been charged, let him say so. There are no application forms in the Civil Service that say whether in fact you are being charged at the present time. Madam Speaker, you ask the normal questions. I was as surprised as anyone when I returned from my own — (Interjection) — In fact, it was three weeks after that I found out on my return from an overseas mission that charges were in fact being laid and the individual had left the employ three weeks before that, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, is the Premier indicating or agreeing with his Minister when he says that for a position as sensitive as executive assistant, a position that would require very close liaison in working with the Minister, knowing all about his work and the things that are being done in Cabinet - documents and all those things - that under those circumstances that he wouldn't have any idea of the background of the individual he is hiring and have no idea that this individual might be facing charges such as fraud, uttering forged documents, false pretenses, writing bad cheques, failure to appear in court, he would have no way of looking into that matter? Is that what the Premier is saying?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, we have, in my view, an excellent group of executive assistants and special assistants. In the space of six years there has been but one problem that I'm aware of.

Madam Speaker, I refer the honourable member - and maybe he'd like to reflect a little bit about the present Minister of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa and the \$76,000 defrauded by her assistant while working in her department as an assistant to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. So let the honourable member not suggest in this House that some way or other Tories are perfect and and pure and white, and New Democrats are black.

Madam Speaker, the Minister took action immediately upon obtaining the information after a few days, after a very few days, that this particular individual had been working for him.

MR. G. FILMON: All I want to know from the Premier is whether or not the hiring practices and guidelines have been changed so that this sort of thing cannot happen again.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, of some 75, 80, hirings in the last six years there has been but one problem, which was dealt with immediately, so there is no significant problem. Our political assistants and staff, I believe, stand up well compared to any other jurisdiction, federal or provincial. They're a hard working group. There have been no problems, Madam Speaker, with the one particular exception that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wants to muckrake through the proceedings of this House.

Pharmacists - dispensing fee increase

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

A pharmacist, Madam Speaker, is a professional, occupying a rightful place on the health care continuum. We wouldn't recommend that individuals in this province shop around for their heart specialist strictly on the basis of dollars and cents. Why is this Minister recommending that this health care professional is shopped for in the Province of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, if the pharmacists decide to extra bill, as doctors did in the past, I will give any constituent the same advice that I gave at that time. I said you don't have to go to a doctor that extra bills. There are doctors who don't extra bill who operate within the Medicare system. I believe the same thing will hold true with pharmacists, Madam Speaker. Indeed, Mr. Davis - who represents the Pharmacists' Association - indicated, when asked what pharmacists would actually charge instead of what the Pharmacists' Association recommended, namely \$7.50, the dispensing fee, he indicated he didn't know what the pharmacists will establish because, quote, "They still have to compete in the marketplace and we have absolutely no idea what the fees may be. Some may not even change."

So Mr. Davis is saying that there is a marketplace out there when it comes to dispensing fees. I assume that all pharmacists who dispense prescriptions are professionals and do their job in a conscientious way. Therefore, if certain people want to extra bill, and they want to have an increase of 45 percent in a dispensing fee, then I suggest that people do have the right and the option to look around and determine what is best for them, because under Pharmacare there is a deductible of \$125.00. There is no government

assistance on that, and beyond that the government pays 80 percent. We have increased what we paid for Pharmacare since the start from \$4 million to \$38 million. I believe this government has a very solid commitment to pharmacists, to the pharmaceutical program, to consumers. I believe we have the best program in Canada, Madam Speaker, and I believe therefore that if people want to extra bill within it that the consumers do have a right to look around for something that they think is reasonable and fair and just.

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

The original prescription for controlled drugs must be kept by the pharmacist. As a result, if an individual wants to shop around, they're going to be required to go back to their doctor and incur another additional doctor's fee in order to get a new prescription. How does the Minister propose to deal with this system in his invitation to shop around?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, Judy Erola, a former Minister in the Liberal Government, is now a lobbyist for the Pharmaceutical Association of Canada. I'm surprised that the Member for River Heights, who generally with respect to health questions has taken very responsible positions, would on this particular instance start advocating some system whereby we would have 45 percent increases in dispensing fees.

Madam Speaker, we indeed are trying to provide a reasoned and a reasonable program for all Manitobans with respect to Pharmacare. We introduced Pharmacare in this province; the New Democratic Party did that. We believe we set a model for some other provinces. Not all the other provinces of Canada have a Pharmacare program.

So I believe that what we should do is try and make the program better. We made some further offers to the pharmacists. They have rejected those. They have indicated that unilaterally they are interested in extra billing.

We are still prepared to negotiate with them. We are still prepared to discuss particular issues that they feel are important. We also have issues that we think are important with respect to differences in dispensing fees that are being charged by various pharmacists, big ones and small ones. It is not only the big ones who are charging lower dispensing fees, but there are small pharmacists who are doing so as well.

We believe this should be the topic of rational discussion to come up with a solution that is best for all.

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

Study after study demonstrates that seniors in our province are over medicated. They are over medicated because they go to a number of doctors for a number of different ailments. It has been consistently the pharmacist who has picked up those errors in medication. What will happen in this situation in this province now under a philosophy, Mr. Minister, of going to pharmacist after pharmacist and therefore getting into the same problems with over medication?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I'm quite surprised at the Member for River Heights' low opinion of consumers in Manitoba. I don't expect any consumer to go around looking for a pharmacist with respect to every prescription. I believe that they will look around and determine what pharmacists are charging as their general prescription fee. They will take a look at that person who they think is reasonable and fair and just in terms of their dispensing fee, and they will establish a long-term relationship with that pharmacist. I certainly hope they would.

Because one of the factors influencing who a person will go to will be the professional competence; the way in which the pharmacist relates to that individual as an individual, as a subject, not as an object; and thirdly, the price that person pays. If a consumer believes that price is out of line, they will in fact go to that pharmacist who they believe will provide them the best service over the long run.

I certainly believe that pharmacists do have a very valuable role to play in the delivery of health care. I indicated that to them when I met with them. But at the same time, I think that a unilateral increase of 45 percent with respect to dispensing fees, if everyone brought about 45 percent increases in the dispensing fees, we wouldn't be able to deal with the new diseases, we wouldn't be able to deal with the aging population, because everything would be going in fees into people's pockets and it wouldn't be going out to consumers in terms of health services.

WCB - rehabilitation injured workers

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Yes, Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, when I was questioning the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation on their inadequate rehabilitation plan and, in fact, employees being kept from 12 to 18 months away from proper rehabilitation, I suggested to him, Madam Speaker, that a proper rehabilitation plan would bring some efficiencies into it.

I quote from Hansard, Madam Speaker. He says, "I think he is the classic example of contradictions. He talks about rehabilitation, and yet he talks about reducing costs. You cannot have both."

Madam Speaker, this Minister then walked out into the hall and said to a reporter, "An enhanced rehabilitation program should lead to reductions in the cost of operating the WCB."

Madam Speaker, does this show the incompetence of this Minister, does this Minister just say whatever comes into his head, or did this Minister deliberately mislead the Legislature of this House?

I'd like him to give us an answer.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I do hope the honourable member isn't accusing the Minister of deliberately misleading the House.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, Hansard will show you that I asked. I'm asking him if he did. Now give him the opportunity to tell us.

MADAM SPEAKER: Can the honourable member please make it clear that he's not accusing the Minister of deliberately misleading the House.

MR. E. CONNERY: Listen very carefully, Madam Speaker. I did not say the Minister was misleading. I asked him if he "deliberately." Did he? I'm asking him. He can reply to it.

MADAM SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member . . .

Order please.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, I asked the Minister three questions: does this show his incompetence; does he just say what comes into his mind; or did he deliberately mislead the House? I asked the Minister three simple questions and I'd like to know which one is the answer; that's all. I didn't say he misled the House. I'm asking him if he did.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, the member is asking a totally inappropriate question.

We are not allowed, in this House, Madam Speaker - I would not be allowed - to ask the Member for Portage to confirm or deny the fact that he is a liar or any such kind of question. The Member for Portage knows that well. It is not in keeping with the decorum of the House or an appropriate way to ask a question. He knows how to phrase a question, Madam Speaker, and he should be directed to ask an appropriate question.

MADAM SPEAKER: May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that there are many citations in *Beauchesne* that talk about innuendo and inferences, and I'm suggesting that the way the honourable member has phrased his question that he is implying that the honourable member has deliberately misled the House.

Would the honourable member please make it very clear that he's not implying that if there is any difference in statements that they were deliberately made to mislead the House.

MR. E. CONNERY: No, Madam Speaker, I'm not accusing him of deliberately misleading the House . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. E. CONNERY: . . . but why, Madam Speaker, then . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I'll have the Minister answer your first questions.

The Honourable Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, there is no doubt about value of the rehabilitation program. When we first brought the rehabilitation program in, we knew that there was going to be up-front costs and it would

not immediately be cost effective. But over the long run, everybody looks to rehabilitation to be the salvation of the Workers Compensation system.

But what we were referring to is that there was a need for more cooperation - more cooperation between the injured workers, the employers, and, of course, the Workers Compensation Board. That is what I was referring to. I was referring to the cooperative effort that was needed by everyone if we are going to be getting the Workers Compensation working in a cost-effective way.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, Madam Speaker, the buzzword today seems to be "cooperation"; but on Wednesday, the Minister made no reference to legislation forcing employers to rehire injured workers. Madam Speaker, nowhere in the King Report does it suggest that this force should be there. The King Report says that it should be cooperation and a method of looking after the injured workers.

Madam Speaker, I would like the Minister to tell us: where did the recommendation to pass legislation to force employers to rehire injured workers when that worker might not fit into their operation, might not be comfortable in that operation, where did this recommendation come from?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I would suggest that the Member for Portage la Prairie, if he would quit reading the headlines and go into the meat of the article that was written in the paper, then he would see exactly where we were coming from.

I was not suggesting there would be legislation. When I was asked if that was one of the areas that was being considered, I said the Legislative Review Committee did raise that point and there were presentations made by the employers' task force saying that they would prefer not to go the legislative route, they would prefer to go the cooperative route, and those are the options I was explaining when the interview was being done.

MR. E. CONNERY: A final question, Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

On Wednesday, during the Throne Speech Debate, Madam Speaker, the Member for Kildonan - and I'll quote from Hansard - he said, "This is an employers protection act. What the employers of this province are paying - and not bloody well enough as far as I'm concerned," are the words from the Member for Kildonan.

Madam Speaker, does this member know something that nobody else knows? Is there some sort of hidden agenda or a program that nobody in this province understands except that side of the government? What was he referring to when he said the employer should be paying a bloody lot more money?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I'm asking you for a clarification, because he's asking me to comment on another member's comments and I don't think it's appropriate.

MADAM SPEAKER: It's my understanding the honourable member's question was asking whether something was government policy.

The Honourable Minister responsible for Workers Compensation.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, last summer, we received the Legislative Review Committee Report which was carried on after 18 months of meetings with employers and the employees throughout the province. In that report, when it was tabled, there were 178 recommendations and that covered the whole area of the Workers Compensation.

We presently have a Legislative Review Committee or implementation committee that is looking at the cost of all of those recommendations. We also have a new board in place who are looking at the implementation that needs to be done. We've said that we will be bringing forward during this Session of the Legislature new Workers Compensation legislation and at which time we will be addressing all of the recommendations brought forward in that report.

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

MR. E. CONNERY: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, because I think it's important.

The Minister said in Estimates last year that if they implemented all of the recommendations of the King Report, and there are 178, that it would be cost neutral. That's on the record. So where does the Member for Kildonan get up and say that they should be paying a lot more money, because if it was cost neutral, it should be . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. That question is argumentative.

Pharmacare - deductible increase

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health. It stems from an earlier answer this morning.

Now, Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that currently the Pharmacare deductible is \$100 for Manitobans. In this morning's answer, the Minister indicated \$125.00. Has that increased without my knowledge, I will fully admit?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I didn't quite hear the question of the member and I can appreciate the frustration of the Member for Pembina, having sat in the House for a few days with some laryngitis, but I'm sorry, I was trying to get the hearing aid out to hear the question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I must have missed the government announcement which raised the Pharmacare deductible from \$100 to \$125, as the Minister indicated this morning.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, I in fact might stand to be corrected and I would certainly acknowledge that. Four

months on the job still may lead me in a position of making some mistakes. I assumed that the deductible was \$125; it may indeed be \$100.00. In that case, I certainly would check that and indicate that to the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, the Minister, no doubt, will clarify that at a later date.

Free Trade - advertising costs

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, my question is for the First Minister.

Madam Speaker, can the First Minister indicate to Manitobans how much is budgeted for the current state of free trade ads that are now on radio, television, newspapers, paid for by the much beleaguered taxpayers of Manitoba? How big is that budget?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I thought that amount was already public. I want to check it out. Let me assure the honourable member it's but a small fraction per capita of what is being spent by the Mulroney Government in Ottawa, and I must also say a very small fraction of what the Government of Saskatchewan is spending, including the sponsoring of Chamber of Commerce seminars in the City of Saskatoon in order to sell the particular deal. I will get the precise figures for him.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, to the First Minister again. Is the First Minister indicating to us that he believes that that budget figure has been made public, because not to my knowledge or to anyone else's knowledge has that dollar figure been made available. I find that, Madam Speaker, to be rather confusing where this government is spending a full one-third of the Throne Speech Debate against free trade would not be able to tell Manitobans this morning how much of the beleaguered taxpayers' dollars they're spending on a free trade advertising campaign, or is the First Minister still just simply wishing to hide that figure from the people of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I think probably the Minister has the exact figures. But let me tell the honourable member that this particular trade deal, this particular issue, is one of the most momentous that's faced by all Canadians at the present time. The consequences of this Mulroney trade deal, and I specifically don't refer to it as a free trade deal, has enormous, potentially negative impacts on Canada insofar as investment is concerned, services, energy policy - no protection against future countervailing action, Madam Speaker. It has the impact upon the future sovereignty of Canadians, Madam Speaker.

Manitobans particularly want information in respect to this deal. They don't want only one-sided information from the Tories in Ottawa. They look to their government that provides other information so they can make up their own minds through the process of examining our material with that being issued from Ottawa, Madam Speaker. What the members opposite don't want, of

course, is that Canadians have an opportunity not to just simply accept the information as spoon fed from Ottawa, but to examine that information in a critical fashion. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology may have the precise figures as to the expenditure.

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

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do have the number, but I don't have it with me here this morning. I'll undertake to get it to the member fairly quickly. But I can assure you, Madam Speaker, that it's nothing like all these different pamphlets that are coming at Manitobans from the feds, from all over the place. It is a modest campaign for the most important issue to face Canadians during our lifetime. We believe that it is an important issue on which we should be providing information. I know that thousands of Manitobans have already responded to those advertisements.

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

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A final question to the Premier.

Would the Premier order an immediate cancellation of that free trade advertising budget, an advertising budget that tells Manitobans absolutely nothing of substance about free trade, and will the First Minister then use those monies to put the money into the Cancer Treatment Foundation so that Manitobans suffering from cancer won't have to wait six to eight weeks for radiotherapy in the Province of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I find that question ironic coming from a member who's a member of the party that presently governs in Ottawa, whose government along with the previous Liberal administration in Ottawa who have between 1980 and 1988 reduced the funding for health care in this province from 52 to 53 cents of every dollar down to approximately 41 cents - 42 cents of every dollar, in fact, dollars that would represent all the monies being spent for hospitals and personal care homes in rural Manitoba. I find it ironic, in fact despicable, to receive a question and to be lectured by the Honourable Member for Pembina who is a member of such a party.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I indicated to the Member for Pembina that I would check on the Pharmacare deductible, and the Pharmacare deductible is at \$125 for families or individuals under 65; and \$75 for families or individuals, for seniors over 65. That was established on January 1, 1987.

I just thought I would provide that information for the Member for Pembina.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you Madam Speaker.

I'm sure that Manitobans who are waiting six to eight weeks for cancer treatment in this province are happy to know that this Premier's priorities are free trade ads which say nothing. Madam Speaker, I find it offensive that this First Minister . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, Madam Speaker, I do.

My simple question to this First Minister is: When is he going to start telling the truth about federal financial contributions towards health?

MADAM SPEAKER: Oh dear, oh dear.

The Honourable Member for Pembina — (Interjection) — order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina, would you please withdraw the imputation that honourable members in this House are not telling the truth?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, my question to the First Minister is: When was he going to start telling the truth to Manitobans about federal cost sharing and health care, something that he and his government have failed to do and it is their obligation to do so?

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the honourable member please withdraw the remark that the Honourable Minister was not telling the truth? It is unparliamentary to accuse another member of not telling the truth.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I simply ask the question: When do we get the truth from the Premier on federal health funding? That is a question to which all Manitobans want an answer. That is not unparliamentary, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would hope that the honourable member would kindly withdraw the imputation that honourable members are not telling the truth.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, would you please indicate to me where in Beauséjour it is unparliamentary to ask a Minister when he will be telling the truth to the people of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

For the Honourable Member for Pembina, Beauséjour, Citation 322, says that "no imputation of intentional falsehood" is permitted - "no imputation of intentional falsehood" - and that a member's word must be taken as his knowledge of the truth. To imply that an honourable member is not telling the truth is not parliamentary, and I request the Honourable Member for Pembina to withdraw that imputation.

MR. C. BIRT: On a point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: We are on a point of order.
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: To help my colleague who is having a little trouble with his voice, could you advise what is the imputation, because a simple question was asked to tell the truth? This question has been asked many times. Now in the question that my colleague placed, where is the imputation because then we can deal with the issue? No one is disputing that section in Beuchesne, but where is the imputation that you're referring to?

MADAM SPEAKER: First of all, the honourable member asked the Premier a question. The Premier answered the question. The honourable member then asked if the Honourable Premier would start telling the truth. I presume that — (Interjection) — order please.

I am paraphrasing the situation as it happened. In my opinion, the honourable member was imputing that the Honourable First Minister was not telling the truth to the House or the people of Manitoba, and I am asking the honourable member without any argument to withdraw that imputation.

Order please. The honourable member on the point of order.

MR. C. BIRT: I would ask that you reserve your decision on this matter and review Hansard. It is not what you understood it to be. It's the precise phrasing. I believe, if you read Hansard on Monday, there will not be what you impute that the phrasing said. The phrasing itself was correct and proper by the rules and procedures of this House. So I would ask that you review and not consider what imputation you took from the question, and I think, if you do that, we won't be in this position.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, perhaps it would be helpful if all members had the opportunity to review exactly what was said in this particular instance. In fact, there is precedent for that to take place where there is a disagreement as to what exactly had been said.

In the past, Hansard has been reviewed and we would expect that, in this particular instance, if the Member for Pembina made comments which were out of order or unparliamentary and he does not withdraw those comments to the satisfaction of the House and to the satisfaction, as has been the case in the past, of the member who was offended by those comments, then he would do the honourable thing and withdraw those comments. So perhaps, with that assurance from the Member for Pembina, if you could review the Hansard, as well as others, this matter could be brought back to our attention on Monday.

MADAM SPEAKER: I appreciate the advice by honourable members from both sides. I will take it under consideration and review Hansard and, at that time, bring it back to the House for resolution.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, if I'm permitted to answer the ...

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Emerson on a point of order.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, based on the question on the availability of Hansard, is there a problem with obtaining Hansard at the present time because we are about four or five days behind, I believe? In order for us to pursue that, would it be possible that we could have some assurance that Hansard is available to ourselves?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, members opposite should be aware that it is inappropriate to ask the Speaker questions of that nature. I would endeavour to find out the answer and report back to the House in my capacity as Government House Leader as to the specifics of that question.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: If I could answer the specific question, Madam Speaker, the honourable member had asked for information as to the cost of the advertising. I now have the cost. I thought the honourable member was very desirous and very anxious to have the information immediately. If he doesn't want the information now that I have it and can give it to him in precise dollar figures, then I'll have to — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, the amount of the cost of the ads in production is \$82,000.00. The cost of the packages being sent out is \$15,000.00. I am pleased to announce, Madam Speaker, that there have already been some 3,000 packages sent out as a consequence of requests by Manitobans for information on this particular trade deal.

Madam Speaker, insofar as suggestions somewhere or other this information wasn't divulged, the information was divulged in fact on a regular program some two or three weeks ago, so that is a totally facetious remark on the part of the Member for Pembina.

Also, Madam Speaker, just for the honourable member's information, federal and provincial Ministers of Finance estimate some \$8.5 billion in both post-secondary education and health care funding has been reduced from the provinces since 1982 - an all-province report, not the Premier of Manitoba speaking but all 10 Finance Ministers in Canada speaking - \$8.5 billion since 1982, Madam Speaker.

Workers Compensation Board - provisions under

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan. — (Interjection) — Order please.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan has the floor.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board.

A constituent of mine who's permanently and totally disabled, where the situation was negligence on the

part of the employer, the worker has no right whatsoever to sue. Are there any circumstances under The Workers' Compensation Act, if the worker did not even collect compensation, can that worker take legal action for negligence against an employer?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I have not recognized the Honourable Minister. Could the Honourable Member for Kildonan please repeat the question?

MR. M. DOLIN: Yes.

Is there any recourse to an employee under The Workers' Compensation Act to take action outside of the act, or is this prohibited by section 10(1) of the act in the case of negligence in a workplace?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Workers Compensation.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, very clearly, the act states that, if an employer is covered under the act, then the injured worker cannot sue. That is the whole intent of The Workers' Compensations Act is to give the employers that protection, so there is no recourse to that.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, in clarification to the Minister's answer, a supplementary.

If the employer is covered under the act, whether or not the worker files a claim of compensation, is the Minister telling this Assembly that the worker still cannot take action?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: This is correct, Madam Speaker. As long as the employer is part of the group that is eligible for coverage under The Workers' Compensation Act, then the employee is not eligible to proceed through the courts.

WCB - employer classification rate

MR. M. DOLIN: A final supplementary to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

The rates paid on Workers Compensation levies by employers, are they affected in any way by employers being charged and convicted of negligence in the workplace, or are the rates the same per 100 for every employer regardless of whether or not they provide a safe workplace or not?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, there are around 78 classifications that employers fall under. So there are different assessment rates for the different categories that they may fall in. It is the hope of the government that there will be some participation by the employers to participate in worker safety. There are examples in this year's assessment where there are employers' groups that did participate and reduced the numbers of injuries in the workplace. Their assessment was not increased this year because of the initiative that was taken by those employers' groups.

MR. M. DOLIN: A final supplementary, just for clarification to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

My understanding is that what the Minister is saying is an employer by classification would pay a certain rate no matter what his track record was at providing a safe workplace. Is that what the Minister is saying, that that is the present circumstance?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, it is within that classification. That is, if that entire classification takes such a great deal of initiative and reduces the number of injuries that are happening in the workplace, then that is taken into consideration, but within that classification that is not taken into consideration.

Doerksen - custody action

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My questions are directed to the Minister of Community Services.

On the 9th of February, I believe the 12th of February, a Linda Hildebrand was in touch with the Minister, and on the 15th she subsequently provided her with a written letter requesting assistance. It related to one Beverly Doerksen, for medical reasons and health reasons, was an expectant mother, and had agreed to turn over her child after birth to the Child and Family Services. Just prior to the birth the mother changed her mind and advised the agency that she wished to change her decision and turn it over to a family member.

At the birth of the child, the grandmother, Mrs. Ulianow was present in the hospital and helped take care of the child for some three days. On the third day, representatives of the Child and Family Services appeared at the hospital and physically removed the new child from the hands of the grandmother.

Under what authority did they act, because the legislation clearly gives authority for children to the mother, to the grandmother and other members of the family. On what basis and what authority did they remove that child?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Community Services and Corrections.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have been in contact, Madam Speaker, with Mrs. Hildebrand and with the grandparents and the uncle, I think, on a daily basis - as a matter of fact, two or three times a day. This is a case, Madam Speaker, that is now presently before the court. There are two applications before the court. They are being dealt with and my department has been working and talking with Mrs. Hildebrand, with the grandparents, and with the agency to work out a comfortable and satisfactory arrangement for the interim care of the child while the court cases are being determined, while the applications are being heard. Mrs. Hildebrand and the grandmother were visiting the baby yesterday afternoon. We spoke to them just after. They are satisfied with the care that the baby is getting, and Mrs. Hildebrand is going back to Toronto. The grandparents are going to continue to

have full visitation rights with the baby, and they are all awaiting due process of having the applications heard by the courts.

MR. C. BIRT: The only matter before the court is the application of the aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Hildebrand, for interim custody of the child. The question I asked of the Minister is, why wasn't the child left in the authority of the grandmother? Why did the agency, after it was informed that the mother had changed her mind about turning the child over, on what basis did they remove the child from the family, as it is permitted under the act? That's the question I want dealt with and answered, not the matter before the court.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, the agency's responsibility is to make sure that the rights and the wishes of the mother and the best interests of the child are the number one consideration, and they have a responsibility to determine that, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I've indicated that this case is before the courts and all of the relevant information related to the permanent placement of the child, and the interim placement of the child will be brought out during those court hearings, Madam Speaker.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, it's interesting that some three to four weeks later, when the grandparents applied to have custody of the child on an interim basis until the larger issue was resolved, when they appeared in the court, your agency and their legal counsel agreed that the grandmother should have the care and control of the child until the larger issue was decided by the court.

The court was then advised that they did not have the authority to grant that; it was a discretionary decision within the department. When they left the courtroom, after having agreed to have the grandmother have the child, why did they change their mind as soon as they left the courtroom and did not give that child to the grandparents, when moments before, in the courtroom, they had agreed that the grandmother should have that child?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, I would ask that the Member for Fort Garry just wait to make sure that all of the information about the case is available before he makes any judgment about the case or the handling of the case. Madam Speaker, these are very sensitive issues, they are very complicated issues. They deal with the health, the care and the placement of a child. It is being dealt with, with full consideration for the child and the mother.

It is before the courts, and those decisions and all the information and questions relevant that he is asking about interim placement will come out at that time. I just want to finally say, Madam Speaker, that what I suggested is that the people in question, the grandparents and the family, are satisfied - to my understanding - with the process. She has gone back to Ontario, the grandparents are in close and daily contact in visitation with the baby, they are agreeing to the process and awaiting the outcome of the permanent guardianship.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if it's proper to ask the Government House Leader a question on House Business for the coming week.

It is my understanding that on Wednesday and Thursday of next week that we will be debating resolutions, and I'd like to ask the Government House Leader which resolutions would we be debating, or when will we be able to have copies of them?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We will be debating resolutions on Wednesday. It may be that we'll be debating some legislation on Wednesday or Thursday as well. The members will note that there is a Notice of Motion on the Order Paper today for a number of bills.

The resolution which we intend to bring forward, Madam Speaker, will very clearly demonstrate the opposition of this government to the trade deal which has been recently negotiated. We'll be calling upon the House to take certain action in respect to ensuring that trade deal does not adversely affect this province or this nation.

The resolution will be on the Order Paper, as is required, on Monday so that members opposite will have an opportunity to see it at that time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

I've had the opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech Debate since 1977, which was the first year that I got elected. This must be, in a ten-and-a-half year history, the most interesting development in terms of a Throne Speech that I've seen. Rather interesting things have happened.

Normally, Madam Speaker, when a Throne Speech is read, irregardless of which government does it, it sort of gives a plan of action. The government side, who present the Throne Speech, have enthusiasm with them. You can see it in their faces and their eyes. It's sort of a charge on into the Session. This most certainly was not the case when we had the Throne Speech brought forward this year. Government Ministers looked dejected, they looked tired. There is no enthusiasm left there. I want to cover that a little further after a while yet, but it's been a dramatic change from last year.

In the short months, less than two years, since this government got re-elected, there's been a dramatic change going on, and I can understand why. It's not necessarily just the fact that the polling shows that this government is way down in the popularity roll. There are other things involved as well. It's a series of things.

The Autopac thing, in my mind, is just the straw that broke the camel's back because what I found most interesting, Madam Speaker, was that the Member for St. Vital, who has been here longer than I have been here and did the movement of the Throne Speech, ended up kicking the dickens out of the Premier and his Cabinet. I find it most interesting that the Premier, in self-defence, then says it was constructive criticism. When we use that kind of approach, you know, it's negativism. When the Member for St. Vital comes forward in that respect, then they use a different approach on it.

I find this most interesting, Madam Speaker, that the Member for St. Vital, in moving the Throne Speech - you know, this is the Movers and Seconders, and I think he referred to it in his speech. You normally are the ones who applaud the actions of the government, and this was unique. I hadn't experienced that, and I enjoyed that. I have to say, you know, that a member of the government side would take the opportunity in moving the Throne Speech and rake the dickens out of the government, I found that very enjoyable but also, you know, sort of outside from the norm.

Madam Speaker, then we have the other, the Secunder of the Throne Speech, and we've heard his speeches here from time to time, trying to give the impression of fair government, fair treatment of everybody. That gives an interesting - you know, Madam Speaker, when we speak in the Legislature here, we all have the opportunity to bring forward our views, to present our view of what's happening with government. We, in Opposition, can bring our views forward. I found it most interesting in some of the comments that have come forward from the other side of the House.

The Member for Kildonan, I believe, was speaking about fairness. I found that sort of interesting. I think we all, in our minds, want to be fair. But I had some difficulty with his comments about being fair to everybody in society, when we consider the fact this government and their allocation of funding through highways, for example, that's one example where there has been a tremendous difference between the ridings held by Conservatives, members of the Opposition, and those held by the government side. In fact, the previous Minister of Highways, I think, maybe that is why they have to have a shuffle in that position, because I think he'd run out of roads to build in his own constituency.

When we talk of fairness, we should also talk of the Manitoba places program, Community Places Program. When the funds that have been allocated, almost 75 percent to the government ridings, versus the balance of it then to the ridings of the Opposition. When we talk of fair government, these are things that don't quite ring true.

That, Madam Speaker, is all part of what has been developing over a period of years now. The performance of this government has been abhorable. When they indicate that it's just Autopac that has created the problems for this government, that is not the case. It's been a legacy of problems which, almost invariably,

every Minister has been involved in to some degree and it's finally caught up. If the government feels for one instance, Madam Speaker, that their unpopularity now, that they can recover from that the way they did with the French language debate, they are going to be wrong because now it's sticking.

The people are genuinely unhappy with this government. Talk to who you like. You can talk to the labour class. You can talk to the business class. You can talk to the farm community. They are unhappy. I've never seen such negative attitudes in my constituency about a government and a leader who is totally unpopular.

This is, like I indicate, Madam Speaker, it isn't just Autopac. Autopac has basically brought it finally to a head. The legacy of mismanagement that has taken place by this government, we can go through Minister by Minister and see what's happened with them. On top of all that, they finally end up with one Minister, I think, who's really a time bomb on their hands, must be the Member for St. James. Whatever he has been involved with has been just a disaster and continues to be so. Those are many things that have been going on along those lines.

Madam Speaker, in my view, this government is morally, mentally, and economically bankrupt. There isn't a positive thing that has come forward. I've been trying to look in terms of what - when you bring forward a Throne Speech, I look at it as a new agenda for action. I fail to find anything that has happened or that is portrayed to be happening that is positive. This is the message that's out there. What is happening? I look around my constituency, Madam Speaker. Nothing is happening.

I've criticized the Minister of Natural Resources over the many years for the lack of funding that has taken place. His department has always been one that's been cut back in terms of drainage works. Highways has the same program. We have the new Minister who is now faced with the same situation. These are two areas, including agriculture and many areas, where they just keep cutting back. It'll be interesting to see, once we see the spending Estimates again, exactly what's happened, probably a further deterioration of that kind of service.

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

That is why I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there seems to be no enthusiasm left on the government side. There's no will and I can understand, a socialistic government, by and large, they thrive when they can spend money. When there's a problem, anything at all, throw money at it, and they have finally run out of funds. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can read it in their faces. We, who have been here for a while, get to understand each other in the House. We look at each other. We know when one side is sort of enthusiastic, moving forward positively, and when they are in the doldrums. This government, from the day of the opening of the Session last week, has looked relatively sick. They have looked - how should I put it? - they shouldn't be there. — (Interjection) — No, you're not. Well, the Minister of Education says I'm concerned about them looking relatively healthy. We're talking in the physical sense, nobody's sick, but their attitude is sick. When I say

that this government is morally bankrupt, I mean that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Last year, we dealt with the - and this the then Attorney-General brought forward - homosexual bill, the Human Rights Bill, the Human Rights Code, or whatever you want to call it, a very controversial bill. In my mind, it was a step backwards in the morals of our province.

This year, a thing that we haven't dealt with extensively yet, and hopefully I think we should because it's very high on the minds of people, is the abortion issue.

I dare say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the previous Minister of Health had not stepped down, the present Minister of Health would have not been that quick to jump in and say we will allow abortion on demand, because it would have been another problem in their caucus, and they have many of them, I believe.

It's most unfortunate, in my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that your past Minister of Health was not there to carry the load and keep away from this abortion on demand.

This is what I mean by moral decay on the other side. Those two issues, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are something that are sticking in people's minds. The public likes to have respect for people in the Legislature. In spite of the quips that get made and you know, they say it's a zoo in here at times, and during question period obviously it is. But they like to have some respect for the people in here.

With those two issues alone, those two moral issues, this government has lost a lot of face. I don't think they'll recover from that, never mind the other two issues which I think have a bearing on it as well. But those two issues are the ones that I get letters on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, like you wouldn't believe.

Then in the Throne Speech the big issue is free trade and obviously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is surprising how perceptive the public gets to be after a while. They read what's happening. They read the Premier of this province is attacking free trade when generally there seems to be agreement to go along with it, even in spite of the fact that many people still don't understand it fully, but that the Premier would take a negative position on that and use that as the biggest portion of his Throne Speech is in my mind and in the people's mind a way to cover up the inadequate performance of this government over the last almost two years. And it is there in the minds of people. They are certainly, you know, not being fooled any more.

When I talk of the lack of mental keenness on the government side, I see no long-range plan developing in terms of what can happen economically. The words you can say. We've had many Throne Speeches. They say nice words; they give direction; it gives an enthusiasm. That isn't there this year.

The fact that they're under tremendous pressure from their own constituency in many cases who are not happy with the action of this government. They are very unpopular. They have one of the most unpopular Premiers at the present time that we've seen for a long, long time. These things must all be preying on them in terms of how do you come forward and enthusiastically talk to the people of Manitoba and say this is our game plan, this is where we're going.

Not one of the Ministers has come forward with a proper plan as to where they're going. It's sort of fighting a rear-guard action is what's happening in most cases.

It seems that once the ball rolls downhill it keeps getting momentum. It keeps rolling faster and faster all the time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I move on, I'm talking about the Member for St. Vital, whose comments initially about the performance of government when he sort of indicated what he thought they should do, I wonder what he would feel like now after we had the resigning of the president of MPIC and getting the privilege of having a \$90,000 buying of his silence after he gave them the nice instructions in terms of what they should do. They end up firing him and paying him \$90,000.00. It is the myriad of little things that are building up in people's minds which have created the impression that this government is not competent. I don't think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is anything that this government can do to reverse that.

When I look back to the four years that we were in government from '77-81, at the time when they started the depression, when the then Premier Sterling Lyon foreread something that most other provinces and Federal Government did not necessarily read, that there was going to be a depression coming on. Put on the brakes in terms of spending after eight years of the NDP administration, put on the brakes and the people felt that he had not treated them fairly, he had been too tough, and four years later he got the answer.

Your answer is coming. Whether you like it or not, it is coming, because this time it's sticking, there are too many issues, too many things that have gone wrong. Go where you want. I don't know whether the Ministers are now taking the opportunity of basically hiding out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or whether you go out there and talk to people or maybe you shouldn't talk. You've always indicated this government has always indicated they'll listen. Well, if you go out and listen now, you will get the message. And it doesn't matter who you talk to, whether it's your friends, supporters, or the people who are supporting the P.C.'s or the people who support the Liberals, go and listen. If you're going to be listening, you'll get the message - unhappy, unhappy with this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you consider the lacklustre performance, the lack of attitude in this Legislature at the present time, plus the pressure that this government has on them in terms of the numbers game, it must be interesting just to imagine the scenario, ladies and gentlemen, in terms of the NDP Caucus room. They want to do certain things, but because of the numbers game being basically very, very close, and here they come in and they want to bring in legislation, or they want to pass something, and guess what? The first thing that the Premier has to ask is how does the Member for St. Vital feel about it? How does the Member for Inkster feel about it? Can you imagine the scenario?

The First Minister who comes up with legislation they will have to check to see whether the Member for St. Vital is going to support it; if not, we better not bring it in. Then they have that volatile individual there, the Member for Inkster, he's playing an important role. The Member for St. Vital has sort of cut his swath as to where he is going. He knows that they have to cater to him. The Member for Inkster wants to get in on the action, so he's saying, well, they're listening to me now, 'hey're listening to me now. Isn't that cute?

I can imagine the frustration in the caucus of the present administration, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It must be tremendous frustration in there. How can you imagine if one of their members walks, it's all over, we have an election, and you know what? We feel keenly, keenly about this matter that the people of Manitoba want an election. Why do we feel so keen? Because we know we'll win this time. We know we'll win and you know we'll win. Now it's a matter of how long can you hang onto it because, with the kind of performance we're having, they're getting more unpopular every day.

Well, look at the legacy. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just, a little while ago prior to this Session, sent out a questionnaire. As do both sides of the House, you send out questionnaires, and you sort of phrase the questions based on the things that you'd like to have reaction to. Of course, it's slanted to raising the issues of this government, the performance of this government, which I think is a fair ball game. Both sides do that. But the response to my questionnaires - and we didn't list the whole legacy of the misadventures of this government, just the things that were current issues right now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I got criticized, one of the main things I got criticized for when I got my mailers back was that the abortion issue was not addressed in my mailer. The reason why it wasn't addressed, why I hadn't included it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was because the issue was, at the time when I drew up the questionnaire, not at stake at that time.

So when I look through the answers that they sent back, there isn't a thing that they can come up with that's positive. How do you go out to meetings and address people? Do you put on a false face? The Member for Flin Flon is great at that, you know. He can deviate and talk about things that are not necessarily pertinent, and try and take the pressure off. But all of these Ministers, all these members opposite, 29 of them, how do you get up in front of a public arena now, in front of a public meeting, and talk enthusiastically? What do you talk about? You talk about free trade? Well I'd like to indicate to you — (Interjection) — okay fine.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to indicate to the members opposite that, in the return to my questionnaires — (Interjection) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon, like the Minister responsible for Autopac, when in trouble, yell loud. The Minister of Autopac, he was already here years before I got here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and when he was in trouble, he yells loudly. He will not deal with the issue, but he'll yell loudly. So does the Member for Flin Flon, who is now the Minister of energy and he has got himself a dandy coming. The Minister responsible for energy has got a dandy coming.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the things that are bothering people's minds, that no matter what this government does, they don't trust them anymore, and there's a major mistrust developing in terms of Limestone. I want to tell you, Manitoba Hydro, which used to be a very respected Crown corporation, I can recall when they first came in, you know, when they brought hydro into the rural areas, we used to have a representative in each small community who played a major role in it. I'll tell you something, there was respect.

Now the Crown corporation has developed, I'll give you a little example of how heartless, and how stupid

some things are being done. For example, our hydro bills in the rural area were due December 24. It's a little thing, but people are spending their money at Christmas time. They could have made it three days later, but Christmas Eve is when the hydro bills were due. It seems so negative. It's so stupid, you know, and these kinds of things build up.

The other thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the rural area, hydro bills get read normally, especially in small communities, every second month. One month they come and read it, and the next month they estimate. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you have a 100 percent increase in your estimate from the reading time to the next time, you know what's happening? You're overestimating, so they get funds in and then next month they make an adjustment. I had a hydro bill from one of the people in my area, that they estimated it so high, paid that month; the next month they had a credit, that little usage. I just use that as an example, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The stupidity and the maneuvering that takes place.

I have to say that the Member for St. Norbert the other day took - and very nicely - just a few shots at about eight or nine Ministers. He didn't cover half of what he could have done, made nice little shots at the things that have been wrong with this government. It continues and continues; there is no light at the end of the tunnel. The only light at the end of the tunnel that there is, is an election, and a change of government. The people of Manitoba want that. They want that.

If the government doesn't believe it, if they haven't done any polling, I advise, spend a little money, do some polling. I'll tell you something, if you do that, and not out of government money, use your own like we did. We didn't use government money, we used our own money when we polled.

Mind you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe I shouldn't encourage that, because if they're going to get those results in view of the things that you cannot do, lack of performance, with a tight numbers game, how are you going to operate for the next five months? How are you going to operate in this House for the next five months?

We'll be watching, because I want to reiterate publicly here that there is going to be no pairing. Our responsibility is to bring this government down and there is going to be no pairing whatsoever. That will stick. The government might say it's grandstanding. I'll tell you something, you'll find out, because you members will be here for five, six, or seven months, as long as it takes to bring you down. You will be here, you will be here.

While we feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the spread was bigger, maybe that approach was not acceptable. When the government's performance was a little better, that was acceptable, but at the present time that approach is acceptable. People want to get rid of this government.

The Member for St. Vital indicated, NDP members kept tearing up their cards. I have correspondence, I could table a raft of it, of people saying I voted NDP and I will not vote NDP again. Why is that? Is that because you guys are doing a good job? Why are they unhappy? Because you've done a lousy job; you're a lousy government. We feel very confident at this stage of the game that given the opportunity we can do a

better job. We can do a better job, but you've got yourselves so caught in this mesh of your advisors that I doubt whether the Ministers even have an opportunity to make decisions.

We now have the Member for Inkster here, who is now dictating policy because he is now the balance of power in there. I can just see the Minister of Education having to ask the Member for Inkster, should I bring this forward or should I not? I can see the Minister responsible for Autopac going to the Member for Inkster and saying, do you think this appointment as president would be acceptable or not? That is the scenario I envisioned there. You can see the way the Member for Inkster walks around. He's coming into his own finally. He might not get the wages of a Minister, but he is the strongest person there is on that side right now. I find it amusing though.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I like to be on the positive side, really. It's hard to always be negative. That is one reason why it's not nice to be in Opposition because you're continually going after the government. That is our responsibility. I'd rather fight for something than against something all the time. I don't really like the idea of fighting against this government all the time. In fact, I'm very tired of fighting against this government. But just to prove that my heart's in the right place, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I like to think of myself as a fair man. I'd like to think I'm a fair man and some positive things did happen, some positive things did happen.

Under the Community Places Program, the Minister responsible - we had a special project, the Red River Workshop in St. Malo. The building was condemned and they went out, the community went out and started working. This is why I feel proud to be representing my area because it wasn't just the community of St. Malo that got involved, it was a whole bunch of communities that went out, did fund raising. The wife and myself were out knocking on doors for the St. Malo community, and the government came through with some major grants, federal, as well as provincial, in the Community Places Program.

A MEMBER: Just ducky for St. Malo, but what about Brandon East?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I said I was trying to be fair, because they did contribute in my area there and that was a most worthwhile project. The balance of the adjudication of the money or the disbursement of that money leaves a lot of questions to be asked, which brought me to the opening remarks that I made about the fairness - the fairness.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find it very frustrating. We had a total change - an almost total change - of Ministers this fall. We heard an example of the Minister of Health saying well I've only been here four months, I don't have all the answers. That's understandable. That's understandable, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When you consider all the many changes, but invariably it hasn't improved anything, normally you'd think there'd be a breath of fresh air coming with the new Ministers. Not the case, not the case at all. More problems keep cropping up every day. We can go, you know, Minister by Minister, we can go through it, it's just a frightful story, as I indicated before. And on top of all that, they have the Member for St. James.

Think of the public perception, Mr. Deputy Speaker, think of the public perception of the Minister responsible for Tourism. He already has the legacy of MTX on his back and many other things. Now he is the Minister of Tourism and offends the people, gets up in this House today and makes a statement about how great tourism is and he has been the biggest negative factor that we've ever seen in tourism. This is my argument, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we talk of a plan. Tourism money is almost given money. Very little is needed. You get your money back easy. But there is no plan in place.

I've been after the Minister of Natural Resources - incidentally the sixth one since '81, they keep changing them. If they want someone out of the way a little bit they throw them into that capacity. Six Ministers since '81. It is that kind of thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that creates gradual negative thinking, that's why nothing positive is coming out. The Ministers are too busy trying to find out what their portfolios are about. For example, in Natural Resources, by the time the Minister even has an inkling what it's about bang, he's gone and the next one is in. It is this kind of thing that makes poor, poor business of government.

I've been asking whether there's a development program coming forward for development of lakes, new resort areas, etc., nothing. We can go through a myriad of this, you know.

Unfortunately, I can't refer to people who are not in the House and I won't. I hope that the Minister of Natural Resources will read Hansard. I have to say - there comes the previous Minister of Natural Resources. He got into a tangle with elk ranching, and out he was and onto the next one.

I have to say to some degree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the present Minister of Natural Resources, I sort of - how should I put it? I want to be careful. I don't want to pat him on the back too much, but the present Minister of Natural Resources at least has responded in a few cases where we had delegations come in, the pressure was put on, and he responded in a positive manner. And I want to make reference to that.

One was the previous Minister stopped the live fish bait industry, wiped off as of April 1, and he also stopped the elk ranching and agreed to compensate elk ranching. Now we'll get into the details of the compensation of elk ranching - my time will come with that - but substantial compensation was paid. The same Minister stopped the live fish bait industry - (Interjection) - I disagree. That's a walking time bomb, this one here. He stopped the live fish bait industry, then realized compensation would have to be paid, possibly on the same basis as the elk ranching, so they reinstated it. This Minister has reinstated it. I don't care what the reason. It is a positive thing for tourism, and I think it is a positive thing for the people involved.

The other thing is - (Interjection) - Oh my goodness, I'm just warming up. Mr. Deputy Speaker, then we want to deal with the experimental perch fishery in the south basin of Lake Winnipeg. It ran for two years; it was experimental. The information was inconclusive, but they stopped it. We had an occasion to come in with a delegation and meet with the Minister, discuss the pros and cons of it, and we now have an experimental perch fishery, three-inch mesh on the south basin of Lake Winnipeg. So I regard these as positive signs. If a Minister is going to be receptive

and listen and make decisions - those two issues at least, I have to commend the new Minister of Natural Resources.

I have great difficulty with this Minister about the Dutch Elm Disease Control Program, where we'll get into that in more detail later on when we have more time. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there again is an example. What's happening with the Dutch Elm Disease Control Program with this Minister is the same thing that happened with the previous Minister of Natural Resources all the time. He would not get out and acquaint himself with the circumstances. He made his decisions based totally on the influence of his staff, and never went out to see and hear what people really had to say. He gave the impression that he did but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the legacy of what's going on.

I'm just using two of the lighter departments. I call them maybe lighter departments. Natural Resources certainly is not a priority with this government. Highways is not a priority with this government. Agriculture will not be a priority with this government with this Minister. Municipal Affairs is not a priority with this government. When you look around at the — (Interjection) — My gosh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the two twins sitting in front here, I will leave that to some of our other people who will take a run at them, you know. I thought the Member for St. Norbert effectively started on that.

Anyway, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm glad to have the opportunity to express some of my views. I've done that conscientiously. I've told them like the Member for St. Vital. I hope that my criticism is regarded as constructive criticism, as the Premier said about the Member for St. Vital. If that is the case, then listen to it a little bit. If not, given the opportunity, I guarantee you, we will bring this government down and you'll be sitting a long ways back. It's going to be a whitewash this time. It's out there, I guarantee you.

So in spite of the fact that if you're already hopeless and have given up, try and do things in a fair manner for all people in Manitoba.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak in the Throne Speech Debate, and through you, I would like to commend Madam Speaker, congratulate her for being back in high office in this House, pay my respects to her, and simply ask that this House be as fair to her as she has been to this House.

I want to say to all members that I welcome them back, not always with the same degree of enthusiasm; but one of the members opposite who I do really welcome back is the Member for Emerson who just spoke. I sometimes, not always, disagree with him, but I think that he endeavours to be fair; that he endeavours to be a moral tone to the debate in this House, which is commendable, and I respect him very highly.

But I want to say to him, on the issue of morality about which he spoke - and that was not inappropriate - that he may search the Old Testament and the New

Testament, the Koran, the Torah, and nowhere will he find that the end justifies the means; and particularly with respect to parliamentary protocol and precedent, he will not find anything that says the end justifies the means, that you will do everything, including that which is a breach of parliamentary practice and precedent, to bring down a government.

You will not hide behind curtains, for example, thinking of your colleagues in Ottawa, pretending that you are not there, to come out and vote at the last moment; and that there is a golden rule: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." And if you begin to use breaches of parliamentary practice and precedent in order to attain power, then indeed you will have created a kind of climate with which you one day must live in all of the consequences thereto appertaining. So be careful.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his address, raised a fundamental question that I propose to deal with: What will we have to show for the years of NDP administration? And that was followed in his speech by a litany of gloom and doom typical of that negative approach which has kept them in the opposition for all but four years of the last what? - 18 years - and will keep them in opposition.

And I will make a prediction now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I made at the height of the French Language Debate, that when it's all over and when it's all done and when there's another election, we will be here and you will still be there. One of the reasons will be, and it was reflected in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, the temporary Leader of the Opposition, that you dump on Manitoba in your attempt to attack the government. It's all black; it's all gloom; it's all doom.

What have we to show? We have, in terms of jobs through the recession, one of the finest records in the country to show. With respect to housing, there is nowhere across this country that has the record with respect to housing in the public sector, in the private sector, in the cooperative sector, that we have through the years of our administration.

You walk north of Portage and compare it now to 1981 when I started campaigning North of Portage. There's a world of difference. And when the Shelter Corporation began a number of projects two years ago, tribute was paid to public initiative in making that possible - North of Portage.

What have we got to show? We've got Main Street Manitoba, for example, to show. Go through all of those towns and villages. Do you remember how they used to mock "Main Street Pete," a finer person you wouldn't want to meet, who represents the best that is in this province, who led that campaign for Main Street Manitoba? That's what we'll have to show.

The member has already referred to the Community Municipal Assets Program and Limestone, an initiative that has regenerated a whole economic development both in the North and the South, and with it an energy policy, not an energy giveaway.

With respect to seniors, with respect to youth, the future of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, jobs, training, education - I'll come back to that - with respect to labour, a fairer climate for the working persons of this province.

They mocked final offer selection. I want to tell you that that will prove to be a means of keeping the kind

of labour harmony we in fact do have in this province despite the sometimes mischievous efforts of the Member for Brandon West.

With respect to Natives, there is a totally different approach to the problem of the Native people in this province. I am not saying that we have resolved those problems, but there's an approach which has led to an improvement in the life of the Native people of the North that hasn't been seen in this province before. We're recognizing that from time immemorial they were here and they have lived, since the coming of European settlement, a life of misery and degradation which we must bear the responsibility for, which we must address, and which we are addressing with respect to northern developments, with respect to human rights - and I take pride in the Human Rights Code collectively, as a member of this government, and personally.

Conflict of interest - the Leader of the Opposition tells us - can you believe it? - that he's going to bring in a resolution on ethics. Do you remember - and I plead guilty that we gave way to their pressure on public disclosure that we corrected a Session later - he is going to bring in a resolution on ethics? Maybe he can have an endorsement from a few of the Federal Ministers. Sinc Stevens and all the rest of them might like to endorse that resolution on ethics.

The Law Enforcement Review Agency has brought equity into citizens' complaints with respect to the abuse of police power.

And yes - and I have no hesitation in saying this - freedom of information which will be proclaimed. Let there be no doubt about it, it will be proclaimed.

The former Attorney-General sat in office for four years. Did they introduce a bill with respect to freedom of information? Did they do anything to address the sorry state of the records and archives of this province? Not a thing. He has the nerve to get up and chirp, "Why don't you proclaim this wonderful bill?" Where was he for four years on that issue? As the A.G. of the time, he did nothing.

And pay equity - something we can be proud of - the Leader of the Opposition says in his speech - page 41 of the Hansard of Monday, the 15th of February at the top - "Frankly, I must confess," he says, "that I am confused." He might have stopped there. He says, "I am confused by the language that is being used by this NDP. I don't understand how words such as fairness, such as equity, such as commitment, can apply to this government."

Let him look at our pay equity legislation. You know what? I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to bring in a resolution calling upon us to introduce pay equity in the private sector. Okay? He doesn't understand how we can use the term equity. Bring in the resolution asking us to enact pay equity in the private sector for Eaton's, for Hudson's Bay, for Success/Angus and all the rest of them. Okay, let him bring in that resolution. He doesn't understand how we can talk about equity.

Overall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we some day are defeated - that might happen, not I think in my lifetime - the legacy which we will leave is in fact a legacy of fairness, a legacy of equity, a legacy of equality of opportunity about which I propose to speak in a moment.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

But on the question of fairness, there is in the address of the Leader of the Opposition one very, very key and vital comment. On Page 36 of Hansard of Monday, 15th of February, and I'm going to read the whole thing: "Mr. Acting Speaker" - he's talking about boards and commissions - "we will replace the politicians and the political hacks on the boards of directors with experienced and knowledgeable businesspeople."

Let's just consider the implications of that. We have made a monumental and a successful effort to make the representation on those boards and commissions as fair as we can possibly do in terms of representing women appropriately, in terms of representing the Native population, in terms of representing the whole fabric of Manitoban society. On the whole, you will find that most of those appointees are, in fact, non-political. They are going to be chucked out and replaced in toto with businesspeople, not ordinary Manitobans but with businesspeople. There is the giveaway of the kind of Manitoba the Tories promise us if, in fact, one day we are defeated.

I spoke about equality of opportunity. Incidentally, let me just in terms of that, before I get to my main theme on equality of opportunity and that has to do with the system of education in the Province of Manitoba, talk for a moment about judicial appointments in terms of equality of opportunity. I want to commend the Attorney-General for the steps that he took and the consultative process that he did go through - and I know that he did - to ensure that in fact we would have in a group of judicial appointments a significant number of women, a Francophone, a Native, and an experienced politician. We're proud of all of those appointments. I want to tell you, when I was Attorney-General - they talk about political appointments - the first full-time judge that I appointed was a Tory - (Interjection) - Yes, yes, in Thompson, J. Drapack, right?

Secondly, the former Attorney-General said, what about the part-time judges. There was one other full-time appointment up in Thompson and then the next two appointments were in the Dauphin district, both of them part-time judges.

Our record with respect to judicial appointments, Madam Speaker, is impeccable, and we make no apologies for it. You know, Madam Speaker - (Interjection) - That's right, Mike Allen. I spoke about equality of opportunity and that, of necessity, brings me to the topic of education because, in my view, even though we may deal with the question of fairness through legislation such as The Human Rights Code, the primary vehicle, the primary road to equality of opportunity must be through the system of education. At one point in his remarks, the Leader of the Opposition spoke about tell our young people to leave the province in search of education.

But more to the point, at page 45 of the Hansard of Monday, 15th of February, just listen to this, Madam Speaker. "In education, we still aren't seeing people talking about and doing something substantive about quality of education, of putting in standards into the system, of putting in province-wide checks and balances to try and ensure that our students are prepared for the challenges of the future, in the technologies, in all of the developmental areas. What are they doing? Absolutely nothing, all of these concerns."

Madam Speaker, what a shameful and unacceptable statement about what is considered one of the finest education systems in Canada. I want to start out by pointing to a poll that was published in the *Globe and Mail* on Saturday, February 6, 1986, an *Environics* poll. The question posed was this: Would you say you were very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the quality of public elementary and secondary education in your province? And the answers came province by province, and Manitoba's satisfaction rate was the second-highest in the country. Seventy-four percent of those answering in Manitoba said they were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied. Only 4 percent said they were dissatisfied. Madam Speaker, that is a tribute to one of the finest public school education systems in the country.

I want to talk about some particulars, because the Leader of the Opposition, for example, spoke about technology. There appeared in the *Free Press* a few days ago a story on "Computers turn history into adventure for students, Teacher's Aid," a whole analysis of the use of computers in Manitoba education: first of all, education about computers; then computer-based education; and then the use of computers in distance education. We lead the country overall with respect to advances in this area in the field of public school education, and I am proud of that fact. I am somewhat angry that the Leader of the Opposition is so opportunistic in his approach to, and lust for, power that he has to dump over our education system in order to get down that road.

With respect, Madam Speaker, to special needs, in dealing with the special needs category, we again are recognized as being in the lead in Canada on that. The number of special needs children who are being integrated into the school system, who are becoming adjusted and happy children, is increasing exponentially. This is something we can all be proud of and we should be proud of and we should be prepared, whether government or Opposition, to stand up and say so, instead of dumping over the education system.

With respect to language education and the heritage languages particularly, with respect to core curriculum, our core curriculum is recognized across the country as being an excellent core curriculum; with respect to curriculum development, with respect to access programs, with respect, as I had mentioned, to distance education.

Let me just talk about that for a moment. We, in fact — (Interjection) — leaving the door as he makes an off-the-cuff remark, unintelligible and somewhat unmannered. Madam Speaker, with respect to distance education, in fact we have reorganized the department, created a Department of Distance Education, the million dollars, 31 SY's. Why? Because in terms of equality of opportunity, there is, in addition to people who are disadvantaged for a variety of reasons, people who are disadvantaged in the rural and remote areas of this province because they do not have the same access to quality programming. They cannot, in every small community, with respect to, let's say, having the few expert teachers that might be in Physics 301, that teacher can be made available to the young people of rural and remote and northern regions by the use of modern technology, by the use of distance education.

The Leader of the Opposition's dumping on Manitoba's education system is, in effect, Madam Speaker, in my view, an unwarranted attack on as fine a group of teachers, leaders in education, education administrators as you can find anywhere in the Western World.

You know, I had the opportunity on Tuesday of visiting the Lord Selkirk Regional School, and I don't know how many members in this House have had that opportunity. If not, I would ask that you avail yourself of that. Here is a model, it's not the only model, but here is a model of what a good education system can do for a very significant group of young people in integrating, in a whole number of ways, various streams in educational goals, various groups, special needs students - students who don't have the same kind of special needs - in a variety of programs in which the aphorism education is not education for life - education should be life comes true, because you have, in effect, a model community at work in that school in a variety of ways.

And above all, what you have is a dedicated group of teachers and administrators who are making it happen because of their devotion to the children of that school and to the children of this province. And that doesn't just happen in that school; it happened throughout the public school system in the Province of Manitoba, and I am proud of that fact and every member in this House should be proud of that fact; and no member in this House should be heard to use the public's education system in this province as a means of criticizing the government, as a means to the end of power at any cost. No one should do that.

But that kind of dumping-on achievement - and I've mentioned a whole number of others - is so typical of why, certainly under that particular leader, that group opposite will never form government. You know, what is happening, of course, is that they are saying this time they are going to introduce a number of resolutions because the *Free Press*, for example, to which they pay a great deal of attention, has said, you know, you mustn't be negative; you have to have a program.

So they are going to bring in this resolution on ethics, and we'd just love to discuss that resolution with them. I can hardly wait. And they are going to ask us to proclaim freedom of information. I can hardly wait for that resolution. They are going to bring in a resolution, I suppose, on equity since the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned that. I can hardly wait for that one and ask him to bring in a resolution on pay equity in the private sector.

Madam Speaker, what will we leave? If we succeed, together with others, Madam Speaker, as we surely will in defeating the Mulroney trade deal, we will not only leave Manitobans with a pride in Manitoba, we, together with millions of ordinary Canadians, will leave the true North strong and free.

You know, in the *Free Press* of Wednesday, February the 17, two days ago, there was an article by Lovell Clark. Now, Lovell Clark is a Tory, has been all of his life, a traditional, perhaps a red Tory.

A MEMBER: Never held it against him?

HON. R. PENNER: No. A man for whom I have the greatest respect as a historian, as a person. And no

more so than when I read that article, and there's a cartoon, Canada 1867 - 1987, it's a tombstone. Trade deal endangers a unique and superior system. I would ask every member of the Opposition, indeed every Manitoban, to read that article. Because he goes beyond, as important as the details are, the details and comes to a fundamental question of what Canada was all about. Something Sir John A. Macdonald knew about when he had the national dream and the national vision, and something that everyone who loves Canada must do everything that he or she can to preserve. Towards the end, Lovell Clark, as I say, is a Tory who has not lost the Macdonald vision, who has not lost the national dream, and towards the end he says this.

He has throughout the article been referring to a statement by Lougheed, who is drumming hard for the trade deal, as Lougheed's answered to what he conceived to be the errors of a national energy policy. "Thus Lougheed has made clear the issue at stake in the trade deal. This is simply whether Canadians wish to adopt an alien ideology and be ruled by market forces alone, or whether they wish to continue to use government intervention in order to help pursue their own economic destiny. Lougheed rejoiced that the government would be powerless to adopt a national policy with regard to our resources, but it is clear that the powerlessness would extend to other facets of our life as well. It will be surprising," says Lovell Clark, "if Canadians knowingly adopt such an option when they have built such a wonderful country through their own past experiences and practices."

Madam Speaker, it is in fact those who really have confidence in Canada who oppose the Mulroney deal. Because it takes confidence in Canada, it takes a knowledge of what Canadians have done for themselves against very difficult circumstances, first the colonial heritage, and the British influence in that sense, and then the pressure from the other side of the North Atlantic triangle, from the south, and indeed the giveaway of control of so much of our industry and resources under the Liberals, Louis St. Laurent, C.D. Howe, a price that we're still paying for, as their answer to the fact that after the Second World War, Britain, in the terms of the world economy had been weakened. So instead of turning to ourselves for the development of an economic policy, they turn south.

And now, and I say this advisedly, as the path to power, or as the path to re-election, Mulroney comes up with a trade deal which, Madam Speaker, has nothing to commend it. We were, through the instrumentality of GATT, developing and we will continue to develop as a nation a series of multilateral arrangements which are in the long-term interest of Canada.

I would again urge members opposite to in fact read that article by Lovell Clark and have some sense of what it means in the very real way to defend Canada as a nation, its uniqueness, and its abilities.

Madam Speaker, when the time comes that one way or another, I, as must all who enter political life must leave political life, I will leave - and this I know in my heart - with a feeling of pride that together with my colleagues I will have left Manitoba a better and a fairer place for my children and for all of the children of those wonderful people, ordinary Manitobans.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It's a pleasure to be able to speak today on the Throne Speech.

Madam Speaker, it would be remiss if I didn't start off by speaking about Autopac. Although it has been done over and over and over, I want to make sure that my constituents know that I'm speaking on their behalf as well as on behalf of the citizens of Manitoba because certainly the people who supported this government, the NDP, won't get much support from the people that they chose to elect to this government.

Autopac has been totally mismanaged. There is no way on earth that this government will be able to convince Manitobans that the loss of such huge amounts of money was not by total mismanagement. We have a government where you're answering your phone and people are telling you that if this was a private company the board would be fired. Well what has happened here certainly is Mr. Silver has been moved aside. They call it that he will be a consultant, but he's been given \$90,000.00. Ninety thousand dollars would go a long way to reducing rates. Even if they did it for seniors alone, it would be a help. People on fixed income, women who are on fixed incomes and on low-paying jobs. I know that certain people in the NDP, they think things are funny, but it's not a funny matter, and I know that they're finding that, Madam Speaker, in their constituencies.

Another fellow phoned me - and I'm just going to use a couple of examples - and he's got five merits. He's got a 1968 boat trailer that he uses twice a year. They moved that up from \$9 to \$20.00. Now \$20 I guess they figure isn't a great amount. That's over 100 percent. It's totally ridiculous that anything should be raised that amount, but they look at the little amounts. They do that in every part of this government, every fee they raise. They look and they say, oh \$5, nobody looks at \$5 anymore, we'll make it 20 because 20 is acceptable, and once we get it in they'll forget. We'll make sure that they don't forget any of this.

Manitobans's didn't have the opportunity to be consulted on this terrible increase. Then what happens is the government puts out an ad. We agree good drivers should get a break. Now that came out a few days after there was a massive rally at the Legislature. To think that they would have the nerve to take out ads for their self-serving needs after they had made a major error in judgment, thinking if we'd give it to them before Christmas no one's going to know, no one's going to remember. So many people are going to have to consider keeping their cars up on blocks, if they do that anymore, probably not, but they won't license their cars till the weather gets better. People who need transportation because, especially when you live in the suburbs, very often you aren't anywhere near a bus stop - (interjection) - Yes, absolutely in the North. I mean especially, I would think, in the North they would need their cars. What about the people on the farm who have not one car, they've got four or five vehicles? What are they going to do? This is money that is out of their pockets right now. They can only defer it. They have to pay half and then make two more installments.

It's a crying shame that this has happened and that we have a government that is so short of cash, so short of good managers, so interfering with government corporations, political interference, that it's caused what was a good corporation in people's minds, something

that could have been good - now what's happened is Manitobans, they're comparing as to Ontario and Alberta, Ottawa, and I think Calgary. Peter Warren did a show on that, and they were comparing it. So what we have are Manitobans paying as much for their Autopac insurance and we have a non-profit monopoly, compared to people who are buying their insurance from profit companies, who at least pay taxes to the government, who pay taxes on their buildings. The government in other provinces is getting money back from businesses. What I am suggesting, Madam Speaker, is that a government that can run a monopoly into the ground like this government has doesn't deserve to be in any kind of business and especially running a government.

If there was any issue other than health that is going to get rid of this government, it's going to be the Autopac issue because people had to pay it out of their pocket. It was an immediate thing. This wasn't something that was on paper and they'll get it at tax time and forget it. They're paying it this year, they'll pay it next year and they'll pay it the next year and afterwards. They are not going to forget. There are very few people who don't drive in this province.

Madam Speaker, I just am speaking on behalf of people in this province and in my constituency to tell them that just changing Ministers has not helped anything at all. What has happened is it's down in the roots and the rot is there. It's too late to get it back. Once you lose that kind of money, the interest rates kill you and you cannot get back.

I'd like to go on to deal with school funding because, in spite of what the Minister of Education says that no one should criticize the education system as a means of getting into government, when there are criticisms to be made, we'll certainly make them. Education is one area that needs looking into.

I'd like to speak a bit about the division that my constituency is in, and it's St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2. In three years, this division has received less than a .5 percent increase, no increase in two years and a .5 percent this year when everyone, they said, was getting an average. Some got 14 percent, I think some got a little bit higher in percentage. But the government looked at St. James and said, aha, low levy. This is low levy. These people aren't paying enough. We've got to hit them where they're not going to get any more money.

St. James in the last few years, because of declining enrolment and because of good management, has closed 10 schools. Name me one other division that has closed even one school or two schools - very few. No one is closing schools because, if you don't close schools and you spend lots of money, this government gives you lots more, so you can't be prudent and win with this government. This Minister is certainly going to hit us all the harder.

In my constituency alone, Columbus School, Woodhaven School, the English-track Robert Browning, Bedson School and Allard School were all closed. They tightened up. It would have been easy to have kept those schools open. That's what everyone else has said to do. Keep it open, let's pad the budget, we'll get more money. That isn't the way they chose to go, because we chose programs instead of buildings.

In energy alone - and it was the First Division that started energy conservation - \$342,000 annually is

saved. But this government looks at it and says: "They're saving money, their taxes are too low, let's hammer them!"

This is the kind of fiscal irresponsibility that we must get rid of. Every division must be treated the same. We must have a formula that treats them all the same and then, if there are programs that different divisions need - and we know they do because of rural and northern schools, because of the City of Winnipeg core area - they are going to need different grants to help those people. But you don't hammer a division into the ground or a community into the ground just because they've been fiscally responsible.

We have good managers, and that's something that this government does not understand. In fact, maybe we should put them on loan to this government and see if they could bring it into — (Interjection) — the Member for The Pas says, loan it to the Federal government. Madam Speaker, let's start at home first. Let's get this government in order. Then we'll look at the Federal Government. I represent a constituency in the Province of Manitoba. I don't represent a constituency - I see my red light's on, Madam Speaker, am I - oh, it's not flashing, pardon me.

I represent a constituency in the Province of Manitoba. I want this government to bring their funding in order. I don't want to be hit by an incompetent government who will do anything to stay in government, a government that promised 90 percent funding and instead is going the other way. It's closer to 70 percent.

In St. James-Assiniboia, in spite of the fact that we are being underfunded, they have brought in programs such as the International Baccalaureate and the Advanced Placement. These are programs that had to be brought in because this government, the Department of Education, pays no attention to students who are bright and need and want to do extra work. Nothing is in place from the department so that every high school in the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, can gear their children to a higher education. Everything is done for the lowest common denominator.

That is needed in the public school system but what we have is, instead of helping divisions to make things better, we have a watered-down Math and English course now. They're combining the 00 subjects and the 01 subjects. The former Minister of Education said that would make everybody higher. We know what will happen. It will be down to the lowest common denominator. If you have a big division, you're able to keep the 00 subjects and the 01 subjects separate - they won't be hurt - but what is going to happen is the small divisions are going to be hurt badly by this kind of a watered-down program. And I take exception to this, because every other province is going to get ahead of Manitoba because of this short-sightedness.

There are certain divisions that don't have enough children, so they should have a combined program, but to put it everywhere is mistaken, it's a terrible error, and I really do feel that this government is going to pay dearly for that, but more of what's going to happen are the children of this province, our students, are going to end up with watered-down subjects because we have a government that doesn't understand excellence. All they understand is the opposite.

Madam Speaker, I want to speak briefly about Osborne House and the Minister of Housing and the

Minister for Community Services and the fact that they have not, as yet, been able to do anything about that particular house. We have a program for battered women and yet we have got the worst possible circumstances to put them in.

When women who are battered enter Osborne House, if they were discouraged before, they certainly would be after they have been there. They do the best they can under impossible circumstances. I am urging the government - because I have to urge the male members of the NDP Government - to get in there and understand that they need to be allocating funds to this necessary service.

We had a crisis with the crisis lines where we had the volunteers quitting and having to fight with an agency of this government, the most ridiculous type of situation that has just been fixed now and it happened in December. This type of thing shouldn't have been allowed to happen at all, and when it did, the Minister should have stepped in quickly. I can't understand the thinking of this government and I can't understand the thinking of this present Minister.

The Member for Fort Rouge, the Minister of Education, was commenting that the Member for St. Norbert, on our side, had the nerve to ask about The Freedom of Information Act, that he hadn't done anything in four years of government to bring it in. Well, anybody can bring in a bill, but if it's never enacted, what on earth good is it if it just sits and lies there and nothing ever happens? We need that Freedom of Information Bill, but I don't think it will come in before this government is ready to go to the polls, because they don't dare have anybody delve into the files of this particular government.

So it's unbelievable that he could stand in his place and he had the gall to suggest "because we didn't bring it in." Well, anybody can bring in a bill, and if it's not acted on, there's not any great service for the people of Manitoba; and believe me, there are a number of people sitting out there ready with their questions and letters, waiting to get into the files of this government, but I imagine that the shredder has probably been working at great pace, so that's probably not going to happen.

There is just one item that I'd like to close with, Madam Speaker, and that's the issue of the casino and the gambling.

Manitoba has always been a great place to bring up children. I'd like to see it continue to be that way. And when I see the Minister looking at the question of a year-round casino and suggesting that the Downs may be a good spot for it because they brought it up, I will tell you that something has happened to our province and to this government - who will stay in at any cost - that they would consider bringing in year-round gambling to this province when you know that crime

and drugs go along with it. Yet they are so bereft of any moral values that this is the type of thing they're planning to bring into our province. I can hardly believe it. Money, power at any cost, and the casinos and gambling year-round, believe me, is not the way to go for our province.

Lotteries are another thing. Lotteries are bad enough, but when I think that they are going to start bringing in — (Interjection) — The Member for Inkster said, "What about bingo?" Well, sure, what about bingo? If he can relate bingo to casinos and big-time gambling, because that's what it is when you have everyday all-year gambling, then you start to have big-time crime and you'll have a drug situation in this province that was unheard of.

Now there's something wrong with a government that has so mismanaged the money of this province that this is the way they go to raise funds. Believe me, it is not the kind of Manitoba that we want and I ask you to reconsider this. It is ill-considered and dregs of society will be brought into this province through this kind of a policy.

We have a casino going at the Convention Centre, and when you look at what's happening at the Convention Centre, it's not a great place to be around anymore. I believe that even though when we were in government we had the Casino Days, to stay to what we have is all we should do. I don't want to see this broadened in any way because I think that this government is bringing into this province elements that they never dreamed of, and we don't need it.

So, Madam Speaker, I definitely will be supporting the amendment of the leader of our party, but I wish to say that it's time we had a change of government and it's time we went to the people and had an election.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes. I guess it's 12:30 p.m., Madam Speaker. I was rising to partake in debate, but it being 12:30 p.m., I wonder if the motion could stand in my name.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I was about to notify the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park that she had 19 minutes remaining. Are you . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: I thought she was finished.

MADAM SPEAKER: Okay. The debate then will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

The hour being 12:30 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 1:30 p.m. on Monday next.