



First Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

37 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan
Speaker*



VOL. XXXVII No. 62 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1988.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIBERAL
ANGUS, John	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BURRELL, Parker	Swan River	PC
CARR, James	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIBERAL
CHARLES, Gwen	Selkirk	LIBERAL
CHEEMA, Gulzar	Kildonan	LIBERAL
CHORNOPYSKI, William	Burrows	LIBERAL
CONNERY, Edward Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James Hon.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Emerson	PC
DRIEDGER, Herold, L.	Niakwa	LIBERAL
DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIBERAL
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Laurie	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
EVANS, Leonard	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen Hon.	Virden	PC
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Ellice	LIBERAL
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HEMPHILL, Maureen	Logan	NDP
KOZAK, Richard, J.	Transcona	LIBERAL
LAMOUREUX, Kevin, M.	Inkster	LIBERAL
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANDRAKE, Ed	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
McCRAE, James Hon.	Brandon West	PC
MINENKO, Mark	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
OLESON, Charlotte Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald Hon.	Pembina	PC
PANKRATZ, Helmut	La Verendrye	PC
PATTERSON, Allan	Radisson	LIBERAL
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Rhineland	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
ROCH, Gilles	Springfield	LIBERAL
ROSE, Bob	St. Vital	LIBERAL
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
TAYLOR, Harold	Wolseley	LIBERAL
URUSKI, Bill	Interlake	NDP
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
YEO, Iva	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, October 21, 1988.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupert's Land): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Paul McKay and Guy McPherson, Roy Harper and others calling upon the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) to consider the submission made by the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and others for funding to make presentations before the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report 1987-88 of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL NO. 36—THE CONSUMER PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT (2)

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 36, The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (2).

* (1005)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before I recognize the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I would like to remind Honourable Members of our Rule 85, where a Bill is introduced by a Member upon motion for leave. The mover of the motion may give such explanation as would enable the House to understand the purport of the Bill. But the question that this Bill be now read a first time shall be decided without amendment or debate. This rule is also reinforced by Beauchesne's 717 which reinforces our Rules at this stage. At this stage, it is not permissible to argue the Bill. Discussion of the Bill's merits may take place on the motion for the second reading. The Member is only permitted to explain the provisions of this Bill in order that the House will understand its purport. The Honourable Member with a brief statement.

Mr. Maloway: This second amendment to The Consumer Protection Act will limit the amount of deposits that businesses can take to 20 percent of the selling price of goods in any retail sale of goods in this province. Furthermore, all deposits in excess of \$500 per transaction must be held in a trust account. This will protect consumers of high-ticket items when the deposit exceeds \$500.00.

Tom and Elsie McLellan of 121 Margate Street, who are retired, were one of 16 homeowners who lost, in

their case, \$6,800 on a deposit when a sunroom builder, Omega Leisure Room, went bankrupt and did not build the room. The price of the sunroom was about \$12,000.00.

Mr. Victor Pagsuyuin of 38 Dzyndra lost \$6,500, his deposit on a \$15,500 sunroom.

Mr. Tom and Mavis Bleasdale of 3486 Henderson Highway lost \$4,200 on a \$12,200 sunroom. The legislation would have limited a deposit in the Bleasdale case to \$2,400 and—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member has made his brief statement.

It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), seconded by the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that leave be given to introduce Bill No. 36, The Consumer Protection Act (2); Loi No. 2 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur, and that the same be now received and read the first time. Agreed and so ordered.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MPIC

PUB Rate Setting

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). Mr. Speaker, the flip flop continues on MPIC. The Government twists one way and then it twists another. The Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) says one thing, the Premier says another, but the citizens of the Province of Manitoba feel betrayed. If we count just one Cabinet meeting a week, this Cabinet has met at least 27 times since May 9 and yet the Premier stated on CKY last evening, much to Manitoba's astonishment, that the Cabinet has not gotten around to the details of this particular issue. This Government was elected to ensure that MPIC rates would be set by the Public Utilities Board. When will this begin?

* (1010)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): It is quite evident that the Member does not know what goes on at Cabinet meetings. The Cabinet meetings are not a free-for-all in which people present things on an ad hoc basis. There is a responsibility for one Minister responsible for Crown corporation accountability to have a Bill prepared that will set the details of our accountability process.

I will say in very short form, as I did yesterday, that the Government's commitment to the people of Manitoba is to ensure that all Crown corporations come before the Public Utilities Board for approval of any applications for rate increases.

Legislation Request

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I am somewhat astonished that the primary issue of the election campaign could be referred to as an ad hoc issue. This Government has failed after three months of sitting in this House to introduce legislation making it possible for MPIC rates to be set by the PUB. When will they introduce that legislation?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the issue was an ad hoc issue. I said that people did not bring forward issues on an ad hoc basis. I said there was a plan whereby each Minister took responsibility for his area and sought about with his staff, with his advisors, with the legal draftsmen, to put together a Bill that carried through the commitments and the principles that the Government wants to embed in law. That is indeed what will happen, Mr. Speaker, and it will happen in due course.

Decision Consensus

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Premier said he would do everything in his power, and he repeated that today, to get the 1988-89 rates before the Public Utilities Board. The Deputy Premier said it was impossible. Who will make the final decision on this issue? Will it be made by the Premier or will it be made by the Deputy Premier? Who are the public to believe when the two of them cannot agree?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Firstly, Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with the 1988 rates as the Leader of the Opposition has said. Those rates were set for this year and have been in place for all of the 1988 year. What we are talking about is the 1989 rates, clearly a matter of The Crown Corporation Accountability Act, and the proposal to have applications for rate increases approved by the PUB will be a matter not decided by any one Member of Cabinet but by Cabinet itself. She should know that process, if she ever hopes to be in Government. I know that is becoming a more and more distant possibility each day that she appears in this House. That will be a decision of Cabinet.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, dream along, but this issue is a fascinating one for the people of Manitoba because it shows fundamentally that this Government are not the managers they pretended to be in the election campaign.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Management Non-Confidence

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba wisely voted to remove a Government who had betrayed their trust. They believed they elected a Government which would restore their trust. They believed they had elected a Government that would be a better manager. MPIC

was the issue, and the people of the province have been badly misled. My question to the First Minister is why has he broken faith with the people of this province?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, no one on this side has broken faith with the people of Manitoba. I say that if the Leader of the Opposition believes that MPIC was the only issue upon which people voted, then she is doing a disservice to the people of Manitoba because they considered many, many things.

She has indicated that she believes that this Government has not been acting in a proper management form. I think the people of Manitoba were misled when she put herself forward as somebody with competence, somebody with integrity, somebody of principle. We have seen many things with respect to her principles over the last few months, and people know what they can expect from the Leader of the Opposition. They are expecting from us that we will make calm, rational decisions and that we will make those decisions based on solid review and analysis of the situation. I can tell her that no decision has been made with respect to Autopac increases for this coming year, and none can be made until the corporation has its year-end and a full year of experience upon which to base its judgment for next year.

We still intend to ensure that all Crown corporations must go before the Public Utilities Board for any approval of rate increases. That is what the people of Manitoba can believe, and that is what they can count upon.

PUB Rate Setting

* (1015)

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the electorate is cynical, cynical because Governments have broken promises. The federal Conservatives broke faith by attempting to de-index senior citizens' pensions when they said in the campaign it was a sacred trust. Now we have a PC Government that says they too thought something was important enough to run an election on, developed a campaign issue on and now, too, are betraying the trust of the people of this province.

Will the Premier tell the people of Manitoba today that this Government has, too, like the former PC Government in Ottawa, changed its mind? Will they too announce today that they have changed their mind and unequivocally announce that the PUB will set the rates for 1989?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The people of Manitoba are cynical because they have seen the changes of position that the Liberal Party had before it ran for election, when it ran for election and now, since the complete 180 degree about-face they did on the day care issue, the complete 180 degree change that they have made with respect to the reduction of the deficit. They voted against a Budget that reduced the deficit by more than a third, that started to get some control

on the spending, that protected and preserved health care, community services and education. They voted against it, despite the fact those were all the things they said they wanted to see in a budget, and they voted against it.

The people of Manitoba are cynical and if she would read an editorial in Metro One, it said the only thing that the Liberals have been consistent in, in the Manitoba Legislature, has been that they oppose everything that the Government does. That is the only consistency that they have had. They have gone against their principles. They have gone against everything they advertised during the election campaign.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Mrs. Carstairs: My question and final question to the Premier, the Consumers' Association of Canada, the Manitoba Society of Seniors, the Manitoba Motor League, all want input on rate setting of the MPIC before the rates are announced. They want those rates to go before the Public Utilities Board this fall. Why is this Government denying them that opportunity?

Mr. Filmon: It is because we wanted to have this kind of open process that we made that commitment during the election campaign. We made that commitment two years ago when the Liberals did not even dream of getting involved with Crown corporations and ensuring their accountability. The Liberals had no knowledge of it. We made that commitment that Crown corporations would have to go before the Public Utilities Board to ensure that any application for rate increase would indeed be scrutinized and decided upon by the PUB. We still intend to do that.

General Insurance Division Privatization

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Yesterday, in the Committee of the Public Utilities, Members of the committee were led to believe that this Government was looking at all options with regard to general insurance. The fact is that the General Insurance Division has been turned around; it is profitable now. The chairman of the board, the Minister, led us to believe that we are looking at all options, including the possibility of continuing on as part of the MPIC. In the afternoon, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) contradicted the Minister and stated that privatization was still the objective. The options they were looking at were how to go about it, which option to follow to go about privatization.

In view of the fact that this uncertainty is bad for the policyholders, bad for small businesses in particular, and it is very bad for the employees, it is causing demoralization and, in fact, in my own constituency there are 55 workers with a \$1.5 million payroll wanting to know exactly what is going to happen. Are they going to man the barricades, take up petitions and march on this Legislature or what? In view of the growing unemployment in this province, 7,000 more; in view of the drought that is making things worse, will this Minister clearly now, clearly state the Government's

objectives in the general insurance field? Is it the Government's intention to privatize general insurance?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): The policy that this Government ran on during the election, and the statements that I have made regarding the fact that we are looking at all options for the corporation are quite compatible.

* (1020)

Mr. Speaker, the public is demanding that we stop the flow of red ink from the corporation. I am not going to make a decision and the board is not going to make a decision in a vacuum. I have said repeatedly that the corporation is providing the information to the board so that they can advise us on the best possible way of dealing with this corporation, and the general arm of the corporation. I would remind the Members opposite that the SRE section of this corporation has been carrying the freight.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, the Minister gets up and bafflebabs. We are no further enlightened on this matter. Will they privatize the general insurance corporation, the General Insurance Division or not? We left this Government with the turnaround situation. He gave us the report yesterday that shows the turnaround of \$9.5 million.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. Do I need my big gavel?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, our policy clearly stated that we wished to divest of the general insurance arm. The special risk extension is the only part of that corporation that has been making money. The personal lines continue to lose money.

Information Released

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Brandon East, with a supplementary question.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the rumour is right about various private insurance companies discussing the possibility of taking over the general insurance with MPIC: Canadian Northern Shield, which is the outfit that took over general insurance from ICBC; Laurentian Pacific has been mentioned; and Sovereign General has been mentioned. Can the Minister tell us whether he or senior staff of MPIC have had any discussions with these companies? Have there been any inquiries? Has any financial data been given by this Minister or the senior staff of MPIC to these companies, or indeed any others who may be inquiring about the takeover of the General Insurance Division?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): We answered this question yesterday in committee.

Obviously because of our policy statement, there have been corporations that have approached both myself and the Chairman. There have been no discussions and there certainly has been no sharing of confidential information.

Privatization Decision

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, given this Government's ideology of bias towards the privatization route, even though MPIC has served the people of this province extremely well over many years, a tribute to this province, has raised the standard of living here, can this Minister advise now whether it is the long-term policy of the Government to move towards privatization of MPIC in total, especially since they have hired a new president, Mr. Bardua, who has had extensive experience with ICBC in privatization? Are we going to see MPIC turned over to the private sector?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): No.

MPIC Rate Increase Announcement

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, since the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is fond of reciting from newspaper editorials, I am sure he will know that the Winnipeg Free Press this morning said that this Government was fumbling the ball on Autopac. The reason it is fumbling the ball on Autopac is the people of Manitoba do not know who the quarterback is. Is it the Deputy Premier who says one thing on Tuesday and another on Wednesday, or is it the Premier who contradicts him on Thursday? The Minister has been speculating aloud over the last couple of days on Autopac rate increases for 1989. The Premier says that there may not be any. The Minister says they may be modest, they may be cost of living. My question is to the Minister. Will there be any rate increases for 1989?

* (1025)

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): Mr. Speaker, there were never any announcements made by me regarding rates, and we at least know where the playing field is.

Public Accountability

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): The accountability of our Crowns is important in terms of keeping the public informed of what is happening in the corporation. Mr. Thompson, the Chairman of the Board, has said that he made reference to, in a speculative manner, whether or not there might be some need for an increase. Let us remember that the Third Quarter Report that we just brought out directs to the public's attention the fact that it is turning around very nicely in the Autopac area, that there is going to be, unless there is a disaster in the near future, a very

good bottom line for the coming year. The corporation has to make an assessment in relationship to its rates and in relationship to its expected cost and claim cost for the coming year before it can give a definitive statement regarding to rates.

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): The fact of the matter is that the Minister said there would be increases and the Premier said there may not be increases.-(Interjection)- They are very sensitive, are they not, this morning, Mr. Speaker?

Retroactive Rate Setting

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): My supplementary question to the Minister is that Manitobans are outraged at the confusion about MPIC at a time when confidence must be restored in the Public Insurance Corporation. We have heard the Premier talk about Public Utilities Board rate approvals this year and we have talked about the Minister who says retroactively this year. Who are we to believe? Is it retroactively or is it not?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The Member for Fort Rouge may have difficulty figuring out who the quarterback is over here. We have no difficulty figuring out who the water boy is over there.

These questions were just asked by his Leader but obviously he does not believe what answers his Leader was given. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, those rates will be set after we have the full year's operation at MPIC. The board will examine it. We could have a massive snow or ice storm over the next week. This is still part of the year. We do know what the results are; they do not know what the results are. They will make that determination and set the rates based on the full year's operation and then there will be something that will go before the PUB. I will repeat for him, the fact of the matter is that we have said and we are committed to ensure that rate increases in the future will go before the Public Utilities Board for approval and that is the situation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I remind the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon) we refer to all Honourable Members as Honourable Members.

Rate Setting Speculation

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): With a supplementary question to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (Mr. Cummings). In light of the fact that there have been three separate and serious contradictions between the Premier and Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) over the last three days, my question is simple. Did the Minister discuss with the Premier the issues of rate increases, PUB approval and privatization of the General Insurance Division before he made his statements over the last three days?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Again, the Liberal critic does not understand that the Member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings), in his capacity as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, was as

openly as possible answering questions to all Members of the Legislature at committee. He was answering on behalf of MPIC when he spoke with Members opposite, when he spoke with the members of the media. In so doing, he engaged in discussion on speculative matters: what will you do if? what might the rate increases be. He has to understand that we have not even had the year-end. We do not have all of the final claims figures on MPIC for this year. It is not possible for the rates to be increased. All that can be done is to speculate. On basis of that speculation he has indicated that there is a conflict. The conflict is that he is referring to speculation compared to the fact of the matter of what is Government policy. I have said what Government policy is and that is a decision that Cabinet has made and will continue to make, Mr. Speaker.

Native Justice Inquiry Funding Availability

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): On September 13, the Native Justice Inquiry Commission asked the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) to fund organizations unable to appear before them. All Manitobans want the truth from this inquiry. We want to hear full testimony of all people affected by our present justice system. But, Mr. Speaker, we now have a list of large organizations that will not be able to attend or appear because they have not the resources to make credible representation.

Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg Council of Treaty and Status Indians will not be testifying. The Assembly of Chiefs will not be testifying. The Manitoba Metis Federation will not be testifying. The Indigenous Women's Collective will not be testifying. My question is to the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae). Will he explain how we can have faith in the results of the inquiry when these many major Native organizations are not able to appear before the commission? Is the inquiry to be fully funded or will it be an incomplete study, thereby wasting not only the funds, but wasting the opportunity to seek full justice in our province?

* (1030)

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): As usual, I would have to check out the preamble of the Honourable Member's question, as it is becoming more and more apparent with all Members of the Liberal Party, preambles and suggestions put forward by them must be checked out before they can be properly responded to.

The various organizations referred to by the Honourable Member, the Honourable Member says they will not be testifying. I find that passing strange, when ordinary mainstream Manitoba Native people have been coming before the inquiry and are quite able to do that and make their cases and tell their stories. I am surprised that these organizations, which do have funding of one kind or another, are unable to. I find that astounding, as a matter of fact, and I would certainly want to check that out before I would respond to the Honourable Member's question.

The fact is that the inquiry, as I have said many, many times, is funded adequately to do the job. The judges

involved are very knowledgeable on the issues they are delving into. They are very committed to the task at hand and the Government is looking forward to a report that will help Native Manitobans in the future.

Funding Requests

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): I have a carbon copy that the Indigenous Women's Collective sent to me addressed to the Honourable James McCrae (Attorney-General). Will the Minister indicate whether he has received this letter which asks and indeed says that they will not be testifying unless they can have some money to fund their documentation of results that they wish to present to the inquiry?

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): I will have to refresh my memory on the letter as to whether it actually does make that threat. I recall, for the Honourable Member's information, that Chief Louis Stevenson of the Manitoba Assembly of Native Chiefs made the assertion that he would be boycotting the inquiry, but I was very pleased on opening day to see Chief Stevenson there in his Native attire—and I was there—and again yesterday. I really wonder about the threat that the Honourable Member implies in her question. This Government is not going to be operating as a result of threats made by people.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken what we think is a very responsible position on the Native inquiry in terms of the funding. Honourable Members in the New Democratic Party had an opportunity to fund organizations coming before the inquiry, too. They refused or did not do it, and that did not happen. In addition to that, the present Government is providing more than double the funding for the inquiry. A large component of that is for research. We do not want a lot of duplication of research effort either.

Women's Needs Funding Discrepancies

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): My final question is to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Oleson). Will the Minister explain why \$100,000 is available for Winnipeg women to travel the province to listen to women's needs and yet no funding is available to the Indigenous Women who want their request for justice to be heard?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): The Women's Initiative Committee is going to hear the problems of Native women as well, so I do not know what the Member is referring to, if she says it is not available to them.

MPIC General Insurance Programs

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). The day after his swearing into Cabinet he did indicate the Government's intention to privatize the General Insurance Division of the Public Insurance Corporation.

Indeed, I was in Brandon yesterday and there are a number of people asking the question, after six months in office, is it yes or is it no to the privatization of that enterprise which affects a number of people and their families in the community of Brandon?

Can the Minister please come clean so the people can sleep at night in terms of their employment and their families' security? After six months, you said you had a plan. Can you please tell the people of southwest Manitoba that are already hit with much higher unemployment with this Government's actions—can you please come clean—is it yes, or is it no, for the Public Insurance Corporation in the General Lines Division?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): From the reaction of the Member opposite, I find it a little difficult for him to try and build a linkage between this and the drought in southern Manitoba.

We have brought together information within the corporation. The board has asked for all the relevant facts and information on how any changes within the general arm of this corporation, what effects they will have, and when they have that information and are able to put it together and make recommendations from it? Then we will be coming forward with our program.

Mr. Doer: People in that community remain in limbo with the Minister's indecisive policies and the flip flops between the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) in this area.

Housing Programs Study Private versus Public

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Concordia, with a supplementary question.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). Indeed, housing starts and the economy, generally, are way down under the present administration. Can the Minister inform this House whether in fact his department or the Government is letting out a consulting contract to review the relationship between private sector and public sector housing in this Government, and can the Minister table the terms of reference of any study with this outside consulting company, and do any of those terms of reference include a move towards privatizing Government housing programs in this province?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and I will get back to the Member.

Mr. Doer: Well, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be confusion. The three Ministers are running around telling each other what to say on this question. I am surprised that the Minister of Housing would not know.

Business Development Programs Commitments

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): A further question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) in his capacity for dealing with employment in this province. Can the Minister inform this House that indeed there are going to be reviews of outside consulting contracts to review the programs of the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism, the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security and indeed the training programs at community colleges with a view again to privatize many of these needed Government programs, a move to the private sector, need public sector initiatives in this province?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister responsible for the administration of Crown Corporations): I have a feeling that what the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer) is referring to are components of the Phase 2 Accountability that we promised all the Manitobans in the election campaign of 1988.

I am planning to make a full statement to the House, Tuesday next, at which time I will be providing all the details associated with seven projects that are part of Phase 2, the second part of the \$500,000 commitment that we made to Manitobans to study into the effectiveness of certain programs and entities of Government.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Concordia, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Doer: Will the Minister, in those studies, please agree to table all the terms of reference, including the goal to privatize many of those needed public sector programs in this province?

* (1040)

Mr. Manness: The Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer) misses the mark by 10,000 miles. The effect is not on privatization. The effect is to study basically the effectiveness of certain programs and entities of Government, as indeed was our promise to the people of Manitoba during the recent election.

Provincial Credit Rating Dominion Bond Rating Service

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): A question for the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness). The Minister knows that the Liberal Party has no confidence in his Government's Budget plan. The Government has stated that the impartial verdict of the bond rating agencies would be positive. Mr. Speaker, the bubble has burst. The Dominion Bond Rating Service has refused to upgrade Manitoba's credit rating.

After six-and-a-half years in Opposition and after six months in Government, do the Conservatives have any plans at all to convince rating agencies of their competence?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I feel badly for the Member for Transcona because I know

he really did not want to phrase the question in that manner. I honestly believe that he preferred not to.

The Dominion Bond Rating Service yesterday confirmed the rating on Manitoba that they put in place last April, just before the election. What was evident and obvious in the report by Walter Schroeder of the Dominion Bond Rating are these facts: First of all, that he was impressed with the Government's attempts to reduce and control the spending; he was also very cognizant of our efforts in reducing a deficit to \$196 million; and, of course, our commitment to manage more efficiently. That is all within the report if the Member wishes to read it.

What is more obvious, or is at least as obvious, Mr. Speaker, is what is of concern to the Dominion Bond Rating Service, and that is the legacy left to us by the former administration. That includes the very high tax regime; it includes the very high health cost, which, of course, is at odds with the Members opposite who have been encouraging us to spend more on a daily basis. Of course, what is of concern to him are the interest costs of over \$500 million a year. They are laid out within the report.

Mr. Kozak: A supplementary for the Minister, I have to agree with the Minister, the rating has stabilized. What was a low rating remains a low rating under his Government—no improvement.

Upgrading Recommendations

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): Does the Minister have any confidence at all, following this rating, that any other bond rating agency will confirm his disproven view of this Government's competence, considering the fact that the Government continues to increase spending at a rate considerably above Manitoba's economic growth rate?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe the gall of the Member to bring out where we are in our spending stance. I cannot believe it when Members opposite are with him, are calling on us to spend more on a daily basis. It makes absolutely no sense. There has to be some demand for consistency from the Opposition benches.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. It appears there are numerous Ministers attempting to help the Honourable Minister of Finance who, I am quite sure, is quite capable of answering the question. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

Mr. Manness: Very capable. I cannot believe that the Finance critic has the gall to ask that question in that fashion.

To address his question, specifically, no, there is no indication at all from other major rating agencies, particularly Standard and Poor's and Mooney's, that there is any contemplation to reduce our rating. Indeed, as a matter of fact to take a positive approach, like

they have, having visited Manitoba just last week, that if we can as Walter Schroeder of the Dominion Bond Rating Services said, continue to reduce and control expenditure, continue to reduce the deficit, we feel very optimistic that our rating will be increased.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, Hear!

Pension Liabilities

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): A final supplementary for the Minister whose comments on Liberal policy are as off the mark as his Budget predictions. How can the Minister expect any bond rating agency to give his Government high marks for competence when he refuses to recognize on his books or to do anything about the province's billion dollars in unfunded pension liabilities which push our debt over the \$11 billion dollar mark?

I remind the Minister that Governments throughout the United States have successfully addressed this problem.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): This Honourable Member is destroying the little bit of credibility he has been able to develop over the period of the last few months by asking these questions. Firstly, he talks about the forecasted figures within the Budget. With respect to spending, with respect to revenue and deficit, that Budget is dead-on. As a matter of fact, if there is to be a surprise anywhere at this moment in time, if there is to be a surprise anywhere, the deficit may come in at a number lower than \$196 million. So he is far off the base.

With respect to the inclusion of the pension liabilities, Members of this side, this Government, have taken a leading role in Canada in trying to show the community at large that this is a liability, it has not been recognized in the past, and it should be. It has identified and made that recognition to Manitobans by way of the outside audit and it will continue to do so. It is not hiding it. It is attempting to present it to Manitobans in the problem sense that exists.

Native Justice Inquiry Chiefs Funding

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupert's Land): My question is for the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae). I have been travelling in many of the northern communities and there is a great concern as to whether the communities will be able to provide or present petitions to the Justice Inquiry. It is very important that the elders and the individuals in those communities understand the justice system itself and it is not possible for the Commission just to fly into the community and expect the people to respond.

The chiefs have made a presentation to the Attorney-General some time ago. Will he now consider funding directly to the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs which is supported by the commissioners?

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): First off, I would remind the Honourable Member that, as Minister

responsible for Native Affairs in the previous Government, he had an opportunity to turn his attention to this and to make commitments for funding, which he failed to do, either did not wish to do it or refused to. I am not sure which.

The Honourable Member really comes along a little late at this stage with such a request when he was not prepared to do it himself. In addition to that, he could have been there to ensure adequate funding for the Commission of Inquiry itself. He failed to do that, too. He did not speak up on behalf of Native Manitobans—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. On a point of order, the Member for Rupertsland.

Mr. McCrae: May I continue my answer?

Mr. Speaker: I just recognized the Honourable Member for Ruperstland.

Mr. McCrae: I was not finished my answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you were.

* (1050)

Direction Request

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): I find the Attorney-General's response offensive. We, as aboriginal people, have requested the Government to provide funding to the Justice Inquiry. Will the Attorney-General consider the funding to the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, so that the communities, the individuals can make presentations to that Justice Inquiry?

In addition, will he provide some direction to the commission that the money that has been allocated to the Commission, that part of that money may be directed to the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs since the Commission has said that the money that has been provided them directly from the Government is not available to the Chiefs.

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): I am really quite amazed that the Honourable Member does not understand the principle of the independence of this commission. Now he wants me to go and direct the commission to do this and do that. The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) wants me to go and direct certain things be done with relation to the Commission of Inquiry. Both Opposition Parties do not understand the principle of the independence of this Native inquiry.

The other point is the Honourable Member has now said that he wants me to direct funding to one organization and one organization only, if I understand his question properly. In my correspondence with the Honourable Member, I have asked him to let me know which groups he wants funded and which ones he does not want funded and that itself is a very dangerous thing once you get into that process because the allegation could then be made that we are funding only

those groups that we want to hear from. Now I do not think that that guarantees a fair, impartial and independent kind of inquiry. The Honourable Member and the Leader of the Opposition should get together and rethink their positions on this because they are coming very close to attempting to put this Commission of Inquiry off the rails which is not going to serve Manitoba's Natives well at all.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Orders of the Day, may I direct Honourable Members to the gallery where we have with us today the Rotary exchange students from Germany, Brazil and Mexico. These students are visiting the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles). On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this morning.

MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I move, seconded by the MLA for Logan (Mrs. Hemphill), that under Rule No. 27 the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the privatization of the General Insurance Division of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and the blatant contradictory statements between the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister responsible for MPIC (Mr. Cummings) which is resulting in uncertainty and in erosion of public confidence for potential customers and policyholders and the loss of jobs for employees in southwestern Manitoba, an area that is already hard hit by the drought and its effects.

An Honourable Member: You admit there is a drought here?

Mr. Leonard Evans: Sure there is a drought.

An Honourable Member: Good, tell your Leader.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Ask my son-in-law who farms out there. Ask him, he will tell you.

An Honourable Member: What does the insurance business got to do with your son-in-law's drought? The son-in-law's drought is his father-in-law—

Mr. Speaker: Before determining whether the motion meets the requirements of our Rule 27, the Honourable Member—order, please.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East will have five minutes to state his case for the urgency of this debate.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has a great importance not only in my area in terms of jobs for the people of the City of Brandon, in that area, Westman, but it is a matter that has an impact

throughout the province because we have a lot of small businesses that are dependent upon the General Insurance Division. It is unclear from statements made by the Minister (Mr. Cummings) even this morning, but certainly from yesterday in the committee, and by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) who contradicted him yesterday afternoon in the hallways as to exactly where the Government stands on this. It is an urgent situation bearing on the economy and on jobs.

We are into Bills now, Mr. Speaker, so we will not be able to debate it subsequently. The weekend is really too long to wait because there are people who are very concerned as to where the Government is going. I received a phone call just before the House convened this morning from a small business person who was in a state of panic as to what was going to happen, now that she has read the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) statement that, indeed, privatization was going to occur.

We spent two-and-a-half hours yesterday morning in the Public Utilities Committee quizzing the Minister, quizzing the Chairman of the Board with regard to the objectives in this respect. It was made clear to us at that time, we thought, that there were options that were being looked at. The Chairman of the Board said we are looking at all options. The Minister implied that options for continuation of the general insurance through MPIC was one of the options. Therefore, the Government may not privatize.

In the afternoon, we had the Premier (Mr. Filmon) stating to the press—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Honourable Members seem to be carrying on some private conversations when, indeed, the Honourable Member for Brandon East is attempting to make relevant why we should be proceeding with this urgent debate today.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your assistance. Shortly afterwards in the hallways, before the media, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) stated categorically that it was the Government's intention to continue to privatize the General Insurance Division, and that the options they were looking at were how to go about privatization. That is not what we were told by both the Minister and the Chairman of the Board of MPIC.

I say, Mr. Speaker, there is a contradiction. The public of Manitoba have a right to know; my constituents have a right to know; the policyholders have a right to know; the employees have a right to know. I am suggesting that particularly, in view of the fantastic turnaround, policies that were put in place within the last year, it has shown a very excellent situation in the General Insurance Division where they have a profit now of \$1.4 million as opposed to a loss of \$8.1 million the previous year. So there is reason for that organization to continue to serve this province of ours, to service its customers and to carry on. For those reasons, I believe this is a matter that should be discussed immediately.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Government House Leader will also have five minutes.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, may I say first that I appreciate the effort of the Honourable Member and his Party to get motions under our Rule No. 27 into conformity with what I suggest are the practices, the customary usages. I grant you, Mr. Speaker, there have been exceptions but I think the exceptions do not make the rule. The rule makes the rule and I am pleased to see that the Honourable Member has decided to choose the path of conformity. I appreciate that.

Unfortunately though, for the Honourable Member's case that he attempts to make today, I really cannot find myself in agreement with the position, that the issue he raises meets the test that is required for our Rule 27 in this House. The Honourable Member raises the question of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and the General Insurance Division of MPIC and the plans of the Government with regard to that division. The fact is that the situation which exists today is exactly the same situation that existed on July 21 when this House first began to meet. Why did not the Honourable Member raise this matter on July 21 or any day thereafter if indeed he tries to make the case that what we are talking about is an urgency that exists today that did not exist previously, which is a requirement of the Rule?

* (1100)

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Honourable Member is taking an issue that is timely in the sense that there has been some news coverage on the issue in the last few days, so the Honourable Member, obviously, is going to attempt to capitalize on that issue. I think a use of Rule 27 for that particular purpose, when none of the elements of the issue meet the requirements of our Rule 27, I think the Honourable Member can quickly be seen for what he is doing here. He is bringing forward a motion but it is not in compliance with the requirements of Rule 27 under any of the requirements.

Reference could be made to other opportunities. Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources has not concluded. It is a study of the Annual Report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. The Kopstein Report is coming soon. The Honourable Member will have an opportunity at that time and, of course, there are other opportunities as well. But the point is the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee is presently seized of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Annual Report and that would be the appropriate place and time to raise the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member talks about uncertainty. Can you imagine bringing forward such a suggestion just a few months after the resounding defeat of the Honourable Member's Party on April 26? It was the uncertainty caused by the Honourable Member's Party with respect to Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and a number of other Crown corporations and the Government, generally, in the Province of Manitoba, which brought about that election in the first place. His own colleague, Mr. Walding, I remind you, Mr. Speaker, helped in the sense of bringing Manitoba to the polls to put the NDP out of office.

Any uncertainty which still exists today is being addressed by Honourable Members on this side of the House—addressed in a responsible and competent way, and in a way which would be in accordance with the wishes of Manitobans as expressed during the election. The uncertainty that we have is caused by the Honourable Member's Party, and in no way does the Honourable Member's motion meet the requirements of our Rule No. 27. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you rule that the Honourable Member's request through his motion not be granted.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Opposition House Leader will also have five minutes.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader): There is an urgent issue here. The urgent issue is the reluctance and the inability of the Government to follow through on its campaign promises relative to Autopac. The urgency is of surrounding the question of why this Government is not bringing Autopac before the Public Utilities Board as it promised to do. The matter of general insurance, however, Mr. Speaker, while a serious and important issue, the Government has said is under review. There are further hearings of the standing committee; the Kopstein Report is coming forward.

We are prepared to debate this issue today, should you so rule, and we will await your ruling.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) did provide me with the required notice under our rule. As Honourable Members know, I have had some concerns respecting the format in which some motions on a matter of urgent public importance have been presented at this Session.

I am pleased to note that on this occasion the format used is in accordance with the practices invariably followed throughout the 32nd and 33rd Legislatures and, in my opinion, comply fully with the rules of this House.

I have listened with care to those Honourable Members who have spoken respecting the urgency of debating this matter today and I thank them for their advice. In order for such a debate to proceed, there are certain conditions and restrictions which apply.

* (1110)

This motion raises two topics: the privatization of the General Insurance Division of MPIC; and the contradictory statements between the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister responsible for MPIC (Mr. Cummings). Raising two topics in the same motion contravenes our Rule 27(5)(b).

The Annual Report of MPIC is currently before the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources. The Honourable Member, therefore, I believe, does have another reasonable and timely opportunity to address this matter.

Beauchesne's advises that for debate on a matter of urgent public importance to proceed, there must be

no other reasonable opportunity. Beauchesne's also advises that the matter must be so pressing that the public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention. I do not believe this applies in this case since the matter can be addressed in the committee.

I must therefore conclude, for the reasons I have indicated, that the Honourable Member's motion is out of order as a matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): With the greatest of respect, Mr. Speaker, I would challenge your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. All those in favour of the motion, will please say yea; all those opposed, will please say nay.

In my opinion, the yeas have it.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

YEAS

Burrell, Connery, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger (Emerson), Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Hammond, Helwer, Manness, McCrae, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Penner, Praznik, Alcock, Angus, Carr, Carstairs, Charles, Cheema, Chornopyski, Evans (Fort Garry), Gaudry, Gray, Kozak, Lamoureux, Mandrake, Minenko, Roch, Rose, Yeo.

NAYS

Cowan, Doer, Evans (Brandon East), Harper, Hemphill, Maloway, Plohman, Storie, Uruski, Wasylcyia-Leis.

Mr. Clerk, William Remnant: Yeas 40; Nays 10.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been sustained.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ORDERS FOR RETURN NO. 6

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): If you will call the Order for Return as listed in today's Order Paper, and then if you would be so kind as to call the Bills in the following order: Bill No. 9, Bill No. 15, Bill No. 23, Bill No. 10, Bill No. 21, Bill No. 34, Bill No. 8, Bill No. 11, Bill No. 27, Bill No. 30.

Mr. Speaker: Orders for Return—the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper).

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): I move, seconded by the Member for Fliin Flon (Mr. Storie), that an Order

Friday, October 21, 1988

of the House do issue for the return of the following information:

- (a) The amount of funding that the Ministers of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner) and Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) have directly allocated to the Manitoba trappers and aboriginal delegations to lobby against the European Parliament campaign to label fur; and
- (b) that funding approved by the Minister of Natural Resources to the Fur Institute of Canada for the current fiscal year; and
- (c) a copy of any correspondence between the Minister of Natural Resources and the British Parliament concerning its Bill to label fur introduced earlier this year; and
- (d) a copy of any correspondence between the Minister and Band organizations, detailing increased financial commitment to the Bands for trapper education and wildlife management programs; and
- (e) a list of new initiatives that the Minister has begun in order to increase awareness of the value of trapping to the Manitoba economy; and
- (f) a copy of the correspondence, between the Minister and the Fur Institute of Canada, detailing the Minister's commitment to the 12 point legislative program presented to the Wildlife Ministers' Conference in September; and
- (g) a list of the dates of implementation of a 12 point legislative program of the Fur Institute that the Minister has planned; and
- (h) a list of the dates and locations that the Minister has arranged to explain his proposed changes to the regulations governing trapping in this province; and
- (i) a list of aboriginal organizations, northern community organizations, and individuals that have written to the Minister requesting changes to the regulations governing trapping regulations; and
- (j) a list of aboriginal organizations and northern community groups that the Minister consulted with prior to announcing on September 29 that he will be changing the regulations concerning trapping; and
- (k) a list of the advertising copy that the Minister has authorized to counter advertising by fur label advocates, including the dates of the advertising, the name of the publication or media outlet, whether the work was tendered, and whether preparation of the advertising included participation by aboriginal groups or individuals; and
- (l) a list of the dates and forum that the Minister has used to inform the European Parliament of the Opposition of the Manitoba

Government to the labour proposal before the European Parliament; and

- (M) a copy of the new Wild Fur Policy announced by the Minister on October 14.

MOTION presented.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mark Minenko, in the Chair.)

* (1140)

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Order for Return in the name of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) is acceptable to the Government.

Question put, MOTION carried.

Mr. McCrae: The Bills that have been indicated that we want in order have been indicated to the Speaker, beginning with Bill No. 9.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will tell you again that this Order for Return is acceptable to the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? (Agreed)

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 9—STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (RE-ENACTED STATUTES) ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 9, The Statute Law Amendment (Re-enacted Statutes) Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak). (Stand)

BILL NO. 15—THE COOPERATIVE PROMOTION TRUST ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Acting Speaker, I am delighted to be able to rise in the Chamber today and join in the debate on Bill No. 15 in what I would consider to be a very significant debate around approaches to Government; around approaches to the economy; around progressive forward-looking, forward-thinking legislation and Government actions that are very important to Members on this end of the House, Members of the NDP caucus.

For us, Mr. Acting Speaker, any piece of legislation, any Bill, any Government program that deals with the promotion of the cooperative movement, that deals with enhancements to any cooperative effort in our society are absolutely critical for a province like Manitoba, and absolutely consistent with our historical traditions, our traditions in this province of building

around the cooperative thrust, of building to create a cooperative movement. There is without doubt, Mr. Acting Speaker, a need in this Chamber for that approach, for that thrust.

For too long Chambers like the Manitoba Legislative Assembly have been marked by competition, by mudslinging, by nasty comments back and forth, by - (Interjection)- Yes, I think, one of the Members of the Liberal caucus just suggested "aggression," that certainly has marked this Chamber over many years and no Party is exempt from the often apparent lack of cooperation in this Chamber. It is not a surprise to Members in this House to hear me again talk about this aspect of the Chamber and tie it into an important piece of legislation like The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act, but also to again make that very important linkage between cooperation—whether we are talking about cooperation in this Chamber or cooperation in our communities, cooperation in our economic institutions, or cooperation in our society as a whole—to make that very important link between the active participation of women in all aspects of our society, and significant movements forward in terms of a more cooperative, caring, trusting society.

It should come as no surprise to Members in this House, although it may come as a bit of a surprise to Members of this Conservative Government who have, of late, chosen to reveal their true colours when it comes to their approach to equality of women.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): You are getting close to slinging mud now.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Acting Speaker, the Minister of Finance suggests that this is coming close to slinging mud and I want to differ very strongly with those comments. He will note that I am addressing this Chamber in a most calm, compassionate way, not making personal attacks, as has been the case with Members opposite, on occasion, and not suggesting, by any stretch of the imagination, that there is a personal bias on the part of Members of the Conservative Government against true equality between women and men; but I am suggesting, Mr. Acting Speaker, and this is in true consistency with the high level of debate and high level of discussion that must go on in this place to address the fundamental policy issues, to address the fundamental policy differences between the Parties represented in this Chamber. It has been in the last couple of days that we have seen approaches from Members of the Conservative Government suggesting that the policy of the Conservative Government is not to address the issues of equality between the sexes with the highest of respect and in the most serious way. Mr. Acting Speaker, we have—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Finance, on a point of order.

* (1150)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I would ask that you ask the Member who is now speaking, to

speak in some relevant fashion to the principle of the Bill. If the Member is going to speak around the generic meaning of the word "cooperative," I think that is truly out of order. Indeed, you can talk about any point. I would ask that she talk to the relevant principle of the Bill. I think that is what the rules call for in second reading.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): On that point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker, I beg to differ with the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) comments. I am certainly speaking along the themes and issues contained in this Bill, Bill No. 15. I am addressing the issues of cooperation from the many aspects before us. It is certainly in the tradition of parliamentary debate. It is not diverting from the issues at hand, and if the Member will give me a chance, I will be pursuing all aspects of cooperation, including the general principles behind this Bill and the specific technicalities behind this Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to thank all Honourable Members for their advice on this matter. I would like to just remind the House that on second reading, the principle of the Bill is the subject for discussion and debate.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey), on a point of order?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope I did not hear the Member incorrectly but I think that one of the references she made was—and it was not a specific Member who was making personal attacks, or personal comments. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that she should either specifically name a Member, if that is in fact the case, so that it could be cleared up, or apologize to all the Members because I do not recall any particular reference made to any individual dealing with any particular issues of personal matters. I would ask that the Member either clarify the remarks and the accusations that she is making against some Member or, Mr. Deputy Speaker, apologize, because I think it is important to this House that we cannot leave a blanket statement against all Members dealing with personal attacks that she referred to in her comments, rather than speaking on the Bill.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not recall—on the same point of order—having heard anything in the comments by the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) that has not been said by many Members in this House on many occasions and, as a matter of fact, have not been reiterated and confirmed by the Speaker from time to time with respect to conduct in this House. So I do not think she said anything that is unusual, unsubstantiated, or unparliamentary.

If the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) is suggesting that she should stand up and accuse particular Members of certain actions, and impugn motives on

Friday, October 21, 1988

their part, then he is suggesting that she do something that is unparliamentary in this Chamber, and I am certain that you would not want her to do so and I would not, as House Leader, counsel her to do so.

So, if the Member for Arthur has a specific comment which he finds offensive, then let him stand up and clarify exactly what that specific comment is, and then we can determine as to whether or not the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) has said something that has offended the Rules of this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I will take the Honourable Minister's point of order under advisement to review Hansard when it is ready and return to the House with a ruling on the point of order.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker, I am pleased to resume debate on Bill No. 15. As I was mentioning when these points of orders were made by Members of the Conservative Government, I was in the process of paying tribute to the efforts on the part of the women's movement in this province and in this country, to women's organizations and individuals everywhere to enhance a cooperative approach to Government, to Legislatures and to economic and social institutions.

I was attempting at that point to indicate that there are many differences in this Chamber and one of those differences, as revealed in the last few days, centres around that approach, centres around our view of issues as fundamental as achieving equality between women and men. I want to put on the record our concern about any references made in this Chamber that Real Women's interests are being satisfied. I appreciated the remarks by the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) yesterday in her questions to the Premier, and I want to indicate, as part of this debate, that it is important for all of us, as Members in this Chamber, to address the contributions that feminists, that women activists everywhere in this country have made on behalf of a better society, higher quality of living and certainly a more cooperative approach in all aspects of our living and working arrangements.

Obviously, Mr. Acting Speaker, I have touched on a very sensitive spot based on the comments that keep coming from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), and I hope that he is prepared to look at the real meaning of what I am saying and recognize that we are certainly prepared to find ways to advance the cause of women's equality cooperatively. So I turn to Members in this House to make that case and to ask for their support. I know that Members opposite were awfully concerned—

Mr. Cowan: Embarrassed.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: —As my colleague, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) states, "embarrassed" by some of the comments that have been put on the record in the last couple of days, which fly in the face of true equality, our search for true equality and our hope for a cooperative thrust in Government.

I do not need to put on record what is already put on record. The Members of the Government will be

able to peruse Hansard, which is now out, and see for themselves the kinds of concerns that have been expressed on their part in the Estimates for the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson) and they very much do have a personal nature attached to those comments. It is certainly something that offended me and offended my belief in the fact that all Members of this Chamber are honourable and that we are all approaching our tasks and our work as legislators from the point of view of being policymakers, not from a personal point of view, but from a public policy point of view, and of trying to act in the most unselfish way possible.

So it is obviously something that I will raise at every opportunity, especially when we are talking about cooperative action in our political, social and economic institutions. It is obviously a concern to me when I see debate and comments made in this House, made in committee, in Estimates, reduced to very personalized attacks and what I would call an attack on all working women in the Province of Manitoba, an attack that questioned the very integrity of women in the workplace, questioned their motives for working and suggested that we should be in the business as legislators of judging why women work, what reasons inspire them to combine work and family responsibilities, and I find that offensive, Mr. Acting Speaker, and I want the record to show that I find that offensive.

* (1200)

I want to urge all of us to try to stick to the public policy debate on every issue, to deal with all issues from the point of view of public policy and not from the point of view of personal bias and personal innuendos against other Members in this House.

Now, having said that, Mr. Acting Speaker, I had hoped that we had moved beyond what I thought had left our thinking in our society at least 10 years ago, and that is any suggestion that women are not anything but secondary earners in our labour force, that they are not anything but working for pin money, that they are working for profit as has been put on the record by Members—and more than one Member I must say—of this Conservative Government. Certainly in that context it is important to note that the comments made by the Premier about Real Women have not been denied by the Premier and they stand for all the world to see and to know where this Government is coming from when they deal with the contribution that women have to make and the contribution of the cooperative approach that has characterized the women's movement for decade after decade in this province and this country.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this Bill must be addressed from those general principles without question. This Bill must also be addressed from the point of view of what this Government has done in very substantive, concrete terms around cooperative development in this province. The record of this Government is clear, and it makes it rather ironic that this Government has even chosen to introduce legislation that was in the works under the previous administration, this legislation, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act.

Given the fact, Mr. Acting Speaker, that this Government—

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): It is the Deputy Speaker, not the Acting Speaker.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Excuse me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have taken note of the important correction by the Minister of Health and I do appreciate the fact that you are the Deputy Speaker and not the Acting Speaker. I stand corrected, and I find it interesting to note that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard)—and it is not surprising—like many of his other colleagues, are more interested in correcting small technicalities on the record, but they are prepared to stand up in this House and suggest that women in this country are working for pin money, and they are prepared to suggest that it is the real women of this province that are happy, in their words, with the actions of this Government, and I find those words offensive, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), on a point of order.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) is persisting in rambling on women's issues, yet she was part of a Treasury and a Cabinet that cancelled River House, an alcoholism prevention and treatment program for the women of this province. I am offended at the double standards she brings to this House from Government, now to Opposition, when she was prepared and her colleagues were prepared to cut off women's services to alcoholism in Manitoba by cancelling River House. What a sense of dichotomies.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Second Opposition House Leader): On the same point of order, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), as he is wont to do from time to time, stands up and goes through some hysterics in the House and waves his arms and raises his voice and tries to deflect attention away from the miserable job that this Government is doing with respect to women's issues by constantly referring to what we call the first envelope, trying to blame the previous administration for everything that is wrong in this province.

If there is a double standard, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the double standard is that of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) who will stand in this House and talk about how he honours the Home Care workers and at the same time cuts back the Home Care Program. The double standard is with the Minister of Health on many other issues as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to thank all Honourable Members for their advice on the point of order raised by the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Order, please. I would again wish to advise all Honourable Members in the House that on debate, second reading to a Bill, that their comments should be directed within the parameters of the Bill that is being debated.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Deputy Speaker, first let me deal with the suggestions by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that I rise not knowing what this Bill is about. I resent that personal attack on my motives and my abilities, and I think that that is a matter of privilege in terms of treatment of Members in this House, and I would ask the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance to withdraw those remarks and not impute motives or make disparaging remarks about other Members in this Chamber.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): What we have here now is a result of the Member not being called to order to deal in a relevant fashion with the principle of the Bill. We are discussing sums of money that were left over from the Canadian Wheat Board in the 1930s that were to be directed in some fashion, as called out by the Bill, toward cooperative promotion within the province. That is the general principle in which we are discussing this Bill by the rules of the House. I have not heard, in 20 minutes of ambling and moving around by the Member opposite, one reference to any of the items I have just mentioned. It is my impression and my view that the Member opposite has not read the Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), to the point of order raised by the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis).

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): That is correct. I have attentively listened to my honourable New Democratic Party colleague in Opposition, attempting to determine what Bill she was speaking on. To my dismay, it is the Canadian Wheat Board Fund that is to go to cooperatives. To my dismay, I have not heard a single relevant comment to the legislation that she is debating, and that naturally stimulated me to speculate, and quite possibly in error, that a) she had not read the legislation to which she is speaking, and b) if she had, she did not understand it, because her comments certainly did not appear to me to be relative to the Bill to which she was attempting to speak.

* (1210)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to thank all Honourable Members for their advice. Again, I would advise the House that I will review the actual phrases and words used as they appear in Hansard and return and report to the House at the next opportunity.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be pleased to get on with my contribution to debate on Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act, and to clearly demonstrate to the Members of the Conservative Government that I am quite familiar with what this legislation is all about, but it is the points of orders and the concerns of the Members of that side of the House that keep digressing, causing digression from the pursuit of all aspects of this Bill.

As one prime example, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) will rise in this House and suggest that I should

be talking about River House. I will address the question since he raised that issue of River House and indicate to him that I share those concerns. I share the concerns of a cut to any organization like River House. But I am doubly incensed by the fact that this Government can, on the one hand, stand and raise one issue of consideration in terms of action by the previous administration and totally ignore the fact that it has already cut the Pay Equity Bureau; that it has already said, in the space of six months, that it is not prepared to move on legislation in the private sector; that it has cut the Affirmative Action coordinator; that it has made drastic changes to the day care program of this province; and now most recently it has put on record the most disparaging comments about the motives behind women working in the Province of Manitoba. Those are the issues we have to deal with.

If the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) really wants to get into the question of who has a demonstrated record around advancing the issues pertaining to equality between women and men, then those are the issues that we will debate.

But I will now proceed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to aspects of this Bill which I was, if the Minister of Health will recall, already referring to, already referring to the record of this Government when it comes to cooperatives, when it comes to advancing cooperatives in this province, because that is what this Bill is about.

Sure, the technicalities, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is wont to do and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) have to do, with the establishment under the Wheat Board money trust fund, as quoting from the first page of the Bill. But they cannot pull one over in terms of Members of this House and neglect the fact that this Bill is about broadening the objectives of the board, by expanding its activities to include all cooperatives, credit unions and caisses populaires. That is the critical issue of this Bill and that is why Members on this side of the House and certainly the NDP caucus are so interested in debating this Bill, because we have seen nothing but inaction when it comes to advancing cooperatives and advancing credit unions and caisses populaires in this province.

In the first six months of this Government, we only have to look at the elimination of the department, the Department of Cooperative Development, as the first and primary example of the kind of commitment this Government has, to enhancing and furthering cooperatives and the cooperative movement in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is important to point out and put on the record that the legislation we are dealing with that is before us, Bill 15, is the legislation that was developed by the previous administration, developed why? Developed because the NDP has historically had a commitment to enhancing and advancing the cause of cooperatives and the cooperative movement in this province and in this country, and has done more for this movement and for enhancing a cooperative approach in all of our institutions than this Government will ever do, even if it has 10 times the years in office that the NDP has had, and that of course is just a dream.-(Interjection)-

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) is getting a little uneasy about Members on this side of the House talking about the solid record of the NDP when it comes to cooperative developments. No Member on that side of the House has stood up to deny the fact that this legislation is here because the work was done by the previous administration, and that it was a part of our solid approach and record to enhancing cooperatives and the cooperative movement in the Province of Manitoba.

In every aspect of our economy we have examples of where that was being carried out and how it was being encouraged by Members on this side of the House in the NDP caucus room when we were the Government. It is an approach we certainly hope that Members of the Conservative Government will carry on. Let us start with some of those critical sectors and see where Members of the Government fall when it comes to enhancing cooperatives in those sectors and how committed they are to encouraging the cooperative movement to expand and grow in this province, and to become an incredible major force in terms of economic management and social programming in this province.

Nowhere is it more important to see that kind of approach than in an area like the day care movement. It was our hope certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Government would have, just as it is following in the traditions of the previous Government at least on paper, by introducing this legislation that they might have taken from that example and introduced programs, funds and assistance to help cooperatives in this province, cooperatives in the area, particularly of child care delivery services.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, all we have seen to date is evidence of the opposite. All we have seen to date from the Members of this Government is a commitment to putting taxpayers' money, Government resources, not into parent-run day cares, not into cooperative-run day cares.-(Interjection)- The Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson) says looking after children. It just so happens we, on this side of the House, and certainly most parents in Manitoba believe that care of children comes before profit-making endeavours of a few small enterprises. We feel very strongly that children must come first, and that is why we are promoting and enhancing and encouraging this Government to move in the direction of funds for cooperative day cares, for parent-run day cares, for community non-profit day cares.

It is, therefore, causing us enormous grief to see scarce dollars go in the direction of only profit-making day cares, to see such a change in policy in this field, that cooperative day cares and organizations hoping to establish cooperative day cares will not be able to proceed, will not be able to get the necessary start-up funds or the necessary space per diem funds to advance their cause, to advance the very important approach to providing day care in the Province of Manitoba, to ensure quality, non-profit care, either run on the basis of parent-run boards, non-profit community organizations or truly following the cooperative model that this Bill attempts to expand.

It broadens the objectives of the whole cooperative movement by including all activities, expanding activities, with respect to cooperatives, credit unions and caisses populaires. I think that is a significant piece of legislation, but it is a shame that Members of this Government are not prepared to put into action the words that are included in this Bill and prepared to live up to this Bill in every aspect of activity that Governments of the Day are involved in or should be involved in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another very important example of the close connections and the need for responsible action from the Government of the Day with respect to the cooperative movement is when it comes to the kind of co-op groups that were promoted through the Community Places Program.

What we have seen from this Government is instead of that encouragement by continuing the program as it was originally developed in a very careful and sensitive and thoughtful way, they have chosen instead to deny funds to those organizations most in need of assistance to expand a cooperative approach to providing services, to enhancing the quality of life, to managing the affairs of their communities in the best possible way, in a cooperative way.

The changes that this Government has made to that program have indeed gone some distance to, certainly, moving us in the opposite direction of the cooperative movement. It certainly has killed the efforts of many communities, particularly in the northern Native reserve communities where again a community, a people in our society, has a history of a cooperative approach to community living, to economic management, to the delivery of social programs. Yet this Government has chosen to come in the way of encouraging that spirit of finding ways to ensure that energy and that drive in those communities is not left to dwindle, is not dissipated, but in fact is encouraged to grow and to explore new horizons and develop new projects.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is absolutely disappointing to see developments that have occurred in the areas of the Department of Community Services when it comes to day care and the Department of Culture when it comes to Community Places, to see the initiatives of this Government being taken that fly in the face of the principles of this Bill, that fly in the face of the real essence of this Bill.

We implore Members of the Government not to let this Bill gather dust on the shelf somewhere, to apply it in terms of its technicalities, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is quite anxious to do, but to also apply it in terms of its general principles in every aspect of this Government's work, in every aspect of this province's life, because without that cooperative approach, this society is doomed to fail in the long run.

Nowhere is that central principle and theme more apparent than in this debate that we are all grappling with in this province and in this country as a whole than the Canada-U.S. trade deal. The fundamental concern with that trade deal is that it will link a province like Manitoba and the country of Canada with an economy that is very much founded on principles other

than the cooperative approach to living and working. It is founded on the basis of a living and working arrangement where a few control the wealth of the country, a few remain powerful in terms of decisions of the country, and where large corporations, large profit-making businesses, rule the day.

You do not have to be a historian or a political scientist to know that this country is built on different principles, has a different economic foundation than that of the United States. That is not to be disparaging about the American economy, but simply to say we are different. We have a different history, we have a different foundation and underpinning to the economic life in this province, in this country, and we do not want to lose it. We do not want to see our economy tied in a continentalist fashion to that economic approach of the Americans. We do not want to lose those fundamental principles that we cherish.

We do not want to lose our cooperative movement. We do not want to lose our universal health care and once, while it was hoped, our universal day care program, although the actions of the present Government leave much concern in that area. We do not want to lose a spirit of cooperation, of working together, of sharing our resources, of ensuring that the weakest members of our society are cared for, of ensuring that all benefit from the wealth of this province and of this country.

* (1220)

That is what this agreement and that is what some actions of this Conservative Government will take from us. That is the danger that is before us, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We certainly hope that there is time enough to change the minds of this Government, time enough to change this agreement that is very much imminent on the horizon between Canada and the United States.

We are determined to show to the Members of this Conservative Government the means by which they can withdraw with grace from their commitment to this Mulroney-Regan trade pact. We are determined to advance the cause of the cooperative movement, a cooperative approach to running our economy and our society as a whole, by asking Members of that side of the House to live up to the principles of Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act.

If the Members of that Government listen carefully to its own words of that Bill, they will start to think in different directions than taking money and putting it into profit day care, than dismantling the Department of Cooperative Development, than making incredibly destructive changes to the Community Places Program, than aligning themselves so quickly and without thought to the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal.

It is in that context, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I express some gratification of being able to participate in this debate and hope that through this process we will be able to move our society closer towards the cooperative model and closer to the sharing of wealth and resources that are a part of our province and towards putting people and people's needs ahead of the profit model and instead redirecting those energies towards the cooperative model, towards full cooperation.

Friday, October 21, 1988

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Interlake.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I had not intended on participating in this debate. As an active cooperative member in my area, I just could not sit in this House, and while I was out making one phone call, hear some of the disparaging remarks made by Members on the Government side towards my colleague. Having heard those kinds of comments, I just had to come in here and take some moments of the time—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the Member, but I again would like to remind all Members of the House to direct your comments with respect to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Uruski: I intend to do just that in terms of this Act which does bring about a consolidation of some Acts in principle and some other measures that are here and we are debating by this Act the whole principle of cooperativisms. We have a Government in power here whose record throughout the years in this province has in fact been marred by their lack of support for the cooperative movement.

Philosophically, how can a Conservative, whose philosophy is the market principle and basically in layman's language, dog eat dog, support the cooperative model? It just does not work in principle and that is in fact why in one quick move, as soon as they were elected, they did away with the Cooperative Department. They subsumed it. It is gone.

For all intents and purposes there is no cooperative department in this province. As well, their record with cooperatives is dismal to say the least. All that one has to do is look back in the Seventies and most of these faces were there, part of the Lyon administration,

when the numbers of cooperatives in this province nosedived virtually—it was not zero, it was not quite zero—down to one. In most years you could count the numbers on one hand as to the number of cooperatives that were established in this province—hundreds.

For one year, one? Four or five, something like the debate we had yesterday on packing houses. The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) wanted to revise history, revision is debate. This Bill, which in fact brings in the—it is called The Wheat Board Money Trust Act. I hear the Minister of Community Services and Corrections (Mrs. Oleson) talking about sticking to reality, when her own Government which she was a Member of, an MLA, did away with and removed the co-op promotion studies out of the curriculum. In fact we were about to bring it in so that all the schools in this province could have the option of providing—pardon me? No. I apologize to the Honourable Minister. She was not a Member of that Government. I hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) indicating that the cooperative studies in the curriculum was socialist dogma.

The Minister of Finance just confirmed my earlier statements that having a Conservative philosophy is a total antithesis of the cooperative movement. You cannot support the cooperative movement - (Interjection)- Well, we have the one of the Liberal-Conservative coalition here saying that he supports the cooperative movement. I would like to hear him today with the Conservatives—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member will have 35 minutes remaining.

The hour being 12:30 p.m., according to the rules, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday next.