

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 25 June, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, I'd like to present the Second Report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Tuesday, June 23, 1987 in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider Bills referred.

Your Committee heard representations on Bills as follows:

Bill No. 3 - The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Act; Loi sur le Conseil consultatif manitobain de la situation de la femme.

Ms. Joan Butcher, Provincial Council of Women of Manitoba;

Ms. Margaret Cogill, Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women.

Bill No. 29 - An Act to amend The Condominium Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les condominiums.

Mr. A. Thawni, private citizen;

Mr. Fred Breurkens, Winnipeg Condominium Corporation No. 6;

Written Submission: Winnipeg Condominium Corporation No. 71.

Bill No. 31 - An Act to amend The Community Child Day Care Standards Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les garderies d'enfants.

Mr. Abe Arnold, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties;

Ms. Rosemary Hnatiuk, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 3 - The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Act; Loi sur le Conseil consultatif manitobain de la situation de la femme;

Bill No. 11 - The Change of Name Act; Loi sur le changement de nom;

Bill No. 18 - An Act to amend The Securities Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les valeurs mobilières;

Bill No. 29 - An Act to amend The Condominium Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les condominiums;

Bill No. 45 - An Act to amend The Lotteries Foundation Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Fondation manitobaine des loteries;

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee also considered:

Bill No. 31 - An Act to amend The Community Child Day Care Standards Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les garderies d'enfants;

Bill No. 36 - An Act to amend The Religious Societies' Lands Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens-fonds des communautés religieuses;

Bill No. 44 - An Act to amend The Coat of Arms, Floral Emblem and Tartan Act; Loi modifiant la Loi concernant les armoiries, l'emblème floral et le tartan du Manitoba;

Bill No. 50 - An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members, first, to the gallery where we have 30 students from Grades 7, 8 and 9 from the Oakville Junior High School, under the direction of Ms. Rose Hilliker. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

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

May I also direct the attention of honourable members to the loge to my left, where we have Ms. Beatrice Anne Firth, who is a Progressive Conservative Member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly, and the Opposition critic for Education and Human Resources.

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

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: Also, before moving to Oral Questions, I have a ruling that I'd like to present to the House.

On Friday, June 19, 1987, the Deputy Speaker took under advisement a point of order raised by the Honourable Government House Leader respecting the words "messes caused by speakers in this House," allegedly spoken by the Honourable Member for

Pembina during debate on Bill 61, which constituted a reflection on the Chair.

By reviewing Hansard and listening to the recording tapes, I have determined that the Honourable Member for Pembina used the following words: "messes caused by speakers on his (meaning the Government House Leader's) side of the House."

Immediately prior to the matter being taken under advisement, the honourable member clarified that he had used the word "speakers" to refer to members speaking in debate. Beauchesne Citation 322 states, in part: "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted."

I have concluded, therefore, that the Honourable Member for Pembina was not reflecting on the Chair. Consequently, I must rule that there was no point of order.

I have another Ruling that I'd like to present, as well, this afternoon.

On June 22, 1987, the Honourable Minister of Government Services raised a point of order respecting the words, "The Minister is lying through his teeth" and "Now you're lying," uttered by the Honourable Member for Pembina on June 19.

As all members know, Beauchesne Citations 235, 237 and 323(2) prescribe that points of order must be raised at the time they occur and not afterwards. These Citations read:

235 - "The Speaker's attention must be directed to a breach of order at the proper moment, namely the moment it occurred."

237 - "A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place."

323(2) - "The proper time to raise such a point of order is when the words are used and not afterwards."

I have consistently applied them in the past and must therefore rule against the Honourable Minister's point of order.

The words spoken by the Honourable Member for Pembina on June 19 were blatantly unparliamentary as all members know. Had my attention been drawn to them at the time they were spoken, or had I been able to hear them over the noise level then prevailing in the House, I would have immediately insisted that the honourable member withdraw them.

I am sure the honourable member would not wish to leave unparliamentary language on the record. The House would, I am sure, welcome a voluntary withdrawal at this time.

Recently, I have noticed an increase in the use of unparliamentary language by members. Perhaps it is the summer heat; perhaps it's the length of the Session, or a combination of both.

In any event, I would caution all honourable members that comments made from their seats may be picked up by a neighbour's microphone, if it is open, or by the interject mike. If the words used are unparliamentary, they may then become a subject of a point of order.

I would urge all members to use care and discretion in their choice of language when speaking in debate or commenting from their seats.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, as you have so capably invited me to do, since the words - and I should pull out Hansard to make sure that they are right - I do admit to some intemperance in Friday's question period where we were attempting to clarify the veracity of an answer given by the Minister, the Honourable Mr. Harapiak, and as the record shows from my seat . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member, we don't use members' names.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'm sorry - the Member for The Pas.

I did, from my seat, Madam Speaker, indicate as is quoted in the Hansard on page 3236, indicating in strongly unparliamentary language that cannot be used, as you well know, in this Chamber, Madam Speaker; and I apologize to the House for using that unparliamentary language in such an intemperate way from my seat.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MPIC - preference that \$12.3 million be reported in financial stmt - was Premier informed

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

My question is for the Deputy Premier acting on behalf of the Premier, Madam Speaker.

The Auditor this morning has indicated, Madam Speaker, that when the question of the non-reporting of \$12.3 million of losses at MPIC was referred to senior accounting staff in the Department of Finance in the late fall of 1984 by the then Minister of Finance, the Member for Rossmere, that senior staff indicated a clear preference that the \$12.3 million IBNR be reported in the financial statement, contrary to the decision that was taken at that time by the Minister responsible for MPIC.

Did the Minister of Finance report that to the Premier at that time?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take that question under advisement.

MPIC - non-reporting of IBNR reinsurance losses in financial stmts of 1984

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance.

I wonder if the Minister of Finance would consider tabling the opinion of the senior accounting officials in his department that was contained in a communication from his predecessor, the Minister of Finance, to the Minister responsible for MPIC which, according to the Minister of MPIC this morning, was sent on the 15th of January, 1985. It was with respect to the non-reporting of \$12.3 million IBNR reinsurance losses in the financial statements of 1984 of MPIC.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

I was not in committee this morning so I don't know precisely what responses were provided by the Provincial Auditor with respect to questioning on his report.

But, as I understand it, the Provincial Auditor has indicated that he has reviewed all documentation, has discussed all matters pertaining to his report, and is satisfied that he had access to all information, and has based his report on that.

So I do not see that there is any need for documentation that flows between Ministers to be made public. Obviously, the Provincial Auditor has reviewed that and has found nothing untoward in that.

MPIC - opinion of senior accounting officials re not reporting

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in fact, he has found a great deal untoward in that the senior officials of the Department of Finance indicated a clear preference that the \$12 million be reported, not as the political decision was made by the Minister.

Madam Speaker, among other things this morning, the Provincial Auditor indicated that he had not communicated with the senior departmental officials who the Minister's predecessor indicated gave that opinion.

So I wonder if the Minister would table that opinion of the senior accounting officials in the Department of Finance with respect to the appropriateness of not reporting the \$12.3 million IBNR reinsurance losses in the fall of 1984.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Again, I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that it was the government that requested the very intensive review and audit by the Provincial Auditor with respect to all matters regarding reinsurance.

The Provincial Auditor did have an extensive study into the matter, did have access to all documentation that he requested, had access to any and all staff or other people that he felt was necessary for the purpose of concluding his report. He has provided to the government a very detailed comprehensive report with respect to the reinsurance issues and other issues regarding the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

The government has provided that information to the Opposition, to the public, so that all can be informed as to the Auditor's observation. The Auditor obviously was satisfied with the degree of documentation and the degree of his investigation.

The member is suggesting an inference with respect to the Auditor's comments, which I do not believe are the inference that the Auditor put on them in committee this morning.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I won't criticize the Minister for indicating that he disagrees with what he says is an inference. But I was at the committee and the Auditor clearly said that the Finance Department's preference was that that 12.3 million be shown.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: It's exactly what he said; it's exactly what he said.

MADAM SPEAKER: The committee is the time for debate. Question period is not a time for debate.

MR. G. FILMON: Further, the Auditor indicated that he did not talk to the Finance Department officials and so, therefore, he has not obtained the analysis that they did.

MPIC - tabling of opinion of senior accounting officials

MR. G. FILMON: My question to the Minister of Finance is: Will he table the documentation as to the opinion or the recommendation that was made by those senior accounting officials in the Department of Finance with respect to the non-reporting of that 12.3 million of reinsurance losses at MPIC in the fall of 1984?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Again, I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is providing information which isn't full and accurate, in terms of what was said in committee this morning. The advice that was provided was that there was a variety of ways of looking at those losses, and that none of them were necessarily inappropriate.

The other point that should be made is that information was communicated sometime after the decisions were made with respect to those annual reports. Again though, Madam Speaker, the Provincial Auditor has the authority, under an act of this Legislature, has the ability to carry out whatever investigations that he deems are necessary.

He was given direction by the government to do a comprehensive special audit into Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. He had access to all and any information that he requested. He had access to all and any staff or others that he felt was necessary for the purpose of him concluding a report. He has filed a report to the government which he believes is comprehensive and concludes his activities in this area. It's obvious, Madam Speaker, he is satisfied with the degree of investigation and access that he had.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the Auditor said that the qualification that they placed on the opinion was that if the premiums earned and the claimed losses could not be balanced in the near future, then obviously they couldn't deal with the matter, and the fact of the matter was . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . they were dealing with a report that said that they would not be balanced even up until 1989, that the losses would by far exceed the premiums.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Therefore, they said clearly the way to go was to report the losses.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Does the honourable member have a question? Please place it.

MR. G. FILMON: My question to the Minister of Finance is: What does he have to hide? Why will he not provide that information to the House on the opinion of the senior accounting officials in his Department of Finance?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: This government has nothing to hide, Madam Speaker. This government has consistently not only in this matter, but in other matters, provided full and complete documentation to the Provincial Auditor, where he found it necessary, for purposes of his reviews to members of the Legislature when we've been dealing with matters in committee, or indeed in this House.

In fact, I would suggest to you, Madam Speaker, there has been far more information provided by this government than any other government in the history of this province in terms of ensuring that people have access to information.

But your main point, I think, in terms of the question of the Leader of the Opposition, and I think he admits it himself that there were a variety of options and ways of dealing with those losses, and that's confirmed by his very question, Madam Speaker.

The Freedom of Information Act - proclamation of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, a question following to the Minister of Finance.

If, indeed, as he indicates, this government has nothing to hide, why are we still waiting on The Freedom of Information Act to be proclaimed if you have nothing to hide?

MPIC - tabling of opinion of senior accounting officials

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, the question I'd like to ask of the Finance Minister is given that yesterday the former Minister of Finance indicated clearly that the opinion he sought from the Finance Department staff on the three options given by the Minister responsible were reviewed by Finance department staff and all were found acceptable, would the Minister of Finance, since he does nothing but confirm what his former colleague has said, not be prepared to table that opinion from senior finance department staff, giving an acceptable standard to those three options that the Minister put to his staff?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, in terms of a date for the proclamation of The Freedom of Information Act, I would suggest that that question should be properly put to the Minister responsible, but I would

again remind the member that it was this government that brought in that legislation, and the Member from Brandon West may not be aware of that, but it was this government that brought that legislation in and it is this government that is working to have it as an effective vehicle to provide information to the public, and it will be proclaimed, and it will be effective during the time that members on this side are in government.

In terms of the question, again, I repeat the answer that has been provided previously: The Provincial Auditor did an extensive review of all documentation, had access to any documentation, whether it was Cabinet material, whether it was other material, with regard to his audit, his review. He had access to individuals that he felt were necessary for the purpose of concluding his report. He has concluded his report; he indicates that is his final report and he is satisfied with the degree of cooperation, the degree of information, and he adds that documentation in his review.

So, Madam Speaker, he has been satisfied. I don't know why members opposite aren't satisfied.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, given that the Provincial Auditor this morning at committee indicated that he did not speak or review the opinions offered by those officials in the Finance Department, given that he didn't make that review, why would the Minister - (Interjection)- Well, the former Minister of Finance says it's irrelevant.

If it's so irrelevant, why are you hiding it from the Opposition?

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Why will you not provide those opinions, if they're so irrelevant, to the members of the Opposition? What are you hiding?

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

MPIC - provision of accounting analysis given to Min. of Finance

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, given that on page 20 of the Provincial Auditor's Report, wherein the Provincial Auditor indicated that the method of covering up the losses - and the "covering up" are my words, not the Provincial Auditor's words - as recommended by the former Minister of Finance, does not meet acceptable accounting practices; and given that the former Minister of Finance has said his departmental staff agreed with not only the option he chose, but all presented as acceptable accounting practices, surely the Minister of Finance would want to clear the professional reputation of members in his staff . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . and provide us with the analysis they gave to the Minister of Finance which the Auditor has said was not according to general accounting principles?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, again, the Member for Pembina is attempting to reflect, or put words on behalf of the Provincial Auditor. If the Provincial Auditor had any concerns about the professional capabilities of staff in the Department of Finance, or in other areas that pertained to his report, he would have brought those matters to either our attention directly, or, if he thought that they were matters that should be included in his report, they would have been included in his report.

Those matters were not in his report, Madam Speaker. For the member opposite to suggest that is the case is simply doing damage to the Provincial Auditor and to his report.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I regret that the Minister of Finance does not read and adhere to what the Provincial Auditor said on page 20.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Given that the Minister responsible for MPIC, and the former Minister of Finance, elected to choose a political option of not reporting losses, thereby my words "cover them up from the people of Manitoba," is the Minister of Finance satisfied, and does he believe that the proper reporting procedures were followed by his Minister when the Provincial Auditor has said they were not?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

As the honourable member well knows, words like "satisfied" and "believe" ask for opinions.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, Madam Speaker. I'll just change the wording then to something suitable.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is it the policy that the Minister of Finance now endorses, tolerates, whatever word he wishes, that Crown corporations will report financial losses according to the Provincial Auditor, not in compliance with generally accepted accounting principles? Is that the policy that this Minister of Finance is now putting to all Crown corporations?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, the Member for Pembina asks whether or not I have read the Provincial Auditor's Report. The answer is, yes, in its entirety, not simply looking at specific sections, but looking at all aspects of his report.

I remind the member for him to do that and to look at what the Provincial Auditor is saying with respect to all matter regarding reinsurance. He indicates that it is a very complex matter, that there's a lot of difficulties with it, that there has been a lot of inappropriate procedures in place over a number of years with respect to reinsurance. He has suggested some specific action for the government, for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation to take, and the government is acting on it.

In fact, indeed, in his report, he indicates that much progress has been made with respect to dealing with these losses, dealing with the situation of reinsurance at a time when the Minister responsible for MPIC was the one who was involved and responsible for taking those corrective actions.

I can tell the member that we will continue to do whatever is necessary to improve the operations of all Crown corporations in all government with respect to financial and with respect to other matters; and that is why we asked for the Provincial Auditor's advice in this, and that is why we will respond positively to his recommendations.

MR. D. ORCHARD: If the Minister of Finance were truly pursuing that, he'd ask the Member for Gimli, the Minister of MPIC to resign.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: That would bring control to Crown corporations . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MPIC - contact made with Mr. Sigurdson or Rev. Malinowski re investigation

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier.

Madam Speaker, can the Deputy Premier indicate to the House whether any member of the government, or any of their staff in their employ, contacted the former chairman of the Board of MPIC, Mr. Sigurdson, or indeed the former member of the board, Reverend Malinowski, regarding the investigation into the MPIC and the cover-up by the Minister responsible?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I reject the assumptions in the question, but I will, in the absence of the Premier, take those questions, if such they can be dignified, under advisement.

MPIC - discussions with Mr. Labossiere

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, whilst the Deputy Premier is taking that question as notice, would she also take as notice whether any member of the government, or any of their staff, including staff in the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, discussed, prior or during the Auditor's review, any of the implications of the loss cover-up with Mr. Labossiere, board member of MPIC?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, once again, I reject the assumptions made in the question by the member.

Once again, apologies, Madam Speaker; I will take that alleged question again under advisement.

MACC - Interest Rate Reduction Program number of farmers accepting

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

Madam Speaker, MACC clients have been offered an Interest Rate Reduction Program with several options to buy-down their interest rates.

Myself and other members on this side have received numerous phone calls from frustrated farmers who usually have two complaints. Firstly, Madam Speaker, they can't afford additional money right now to buy down their interest rate; and, secondly, they really call it a rip-off when their accountants look at what it's going to cost them relative to the mortgage, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we all know that farmers cannot

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, we all know the farmers cannot pay additional money right now.

I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, since he sent out the information on April 28th, how many farmers have sent in their election form indicating that they will accept any option in this program?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I know that most farmers read and understand better than the Member for Virden.

There are five options in the program.-(Interjection)- Obviously, the member himself has not read the document very well. The honourable member alleges that the program is a rip-off. The program is a buy-down from interest rates as high as 13 percent down to 8 percent, and there is a cost to buy that interest rate down.

Madam Speaker, the fifth option does not require any immediate payment. In fact, it can be financed for a minimum of 10, to a length of 15 years, and results in a saving to those farmers, provided of course, as I've indicated, that the interest rate is substantial, that the length of mortgage is at least 10 years or longer, and that will result in a saving.

The original option, the first option is one for immediate cash payment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: I'll take the other portion of the question as notice, Madam Speaker.

MACC - has Min. considered major changes to Interest Rate Reduction Program

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, given that the Minister recognizes the farmers have to pay a lot of

money up front for the first four options, and they cannot afford it, has he considered some major changes to the program, such as, I will recommend to him that the interest reduction fee be charged to the farmer at some time later in the mortgage, say, three or five years down the road, or even added on to the end of the mortgage when farmers are much more able to pay this additional cost?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I find suggestions - and I like the suggestion that we can consider from the honourable member - but I want to tell him that it was his party, his group sitting on the other side that supported the federal Liberals that interest rates of this country should remain high. And now we have Conservative members in this House standing up here saying interest rates are too high.

Madam Speaker, at least now one member on the opposite side has, in fact, repudiated the stand taken by his former leader, his present leader and members on that side who were on Executive Council when they were in office between '77 and '81.

MACC - interest rate reduction - how calculated

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, I would like to tell the Minister that I am genuinely concerned about Manitoba farmers today and I'm not worried about the past.

Madam Speaker, this Minister took as notice, some three weeks or more ago, questions that I raised in this House and he still has not given me the answer.

I asked him if he was sending a second letter to the MACC clients to tell them how the interest rate reduction fee was actually calculated, because they're phoning me and asking me how is this fee calculated?

Has the Minister ever sent that letter, and has he answered other questions like, is it income tax deductible? Has he got those answers yet?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I want to tell my honourable friend that the Minister of Finance answered that question about the income tax matter that was posed by himself and the Member for Morris some time ago.

But I want to tell my honourable friend who says he doesn't care what happened in the past. Madam Speaker, unless we know the past and we know the reasons why thousands of Canadian farmers are in financial difficulty are as a result of the monetary policies of Liberal and Conservative Federal administrations, that have thousands of Canadian farmers in financial difficulty and on the verge of losing their farms.

That's the past, Madam Speaker. They want to forget that past and I won't let them forget that past. It's a result of those insane high interest rate policies supported by colleagues on the opposite side that thousands of Canadian farmers are losing their farms, Madam Speaker.

Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Board - why purge without consultation

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health with regard to the purge of the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation's Board.

Madam Speaker, the Minister abruptly dismissed seven out of the nine members of that board, making it the single-largest turnover in 57 years, and it was done without consultation with the chairman of the board or with the chief executive officer.

Why did the Minister feel such a massive purge was necessary at this particular time, and why without any consultation with the officials involved?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, first of all, it certainly wasn't a purge because nobody was dismissed. Some members were not automatically reappointed, that's a big difference.-(Interjection)- You don't see any difference in there? Well, that's odd.

A MEMBER: Explain it to them, Larry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I'll explain because I don't think that they'd understand. We have many boards, by law, that cannot serve more than two terms. We've had some of the people on that board that have been sitting there for up to 15 years. We felt that we needed new blood, other people -(Interjection)- That's right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: They should get rid of you.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Anytime they want to get rid of me, they can. I go every four years, and I'm not automatically reappointed. I only serve one term, then I have to be reappointed, not automatically.

Madam Speaker, I want to say also that I had long discussions with the present chairman, who is a very responsible and very well respected and I'm talking about Dr. MacDiarmid. This is something that I would have preferred to keep in the department quietly, but things are not all that rosy.

Things are not all that rosy in that department. There has been some problems between the chemotherapists and the radiotherapists, and we are getting to the bottom of that and there has been a meeting, just a couple of days ago, with the executive director and the new chairman and I think that we've got things back on track.

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

Given the fact that the foundation was fiscally responsible and that the patient care is generally recognized as exemplary, and that the doctors are among the best trained in the continent, and that there is a research capacity which again is exemplary for all of North America, why did the Minister choose this way to do it, instead of the gradual removal and new appointments of board members which would have made for a carryover of experience?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, there has been, there are still members that were there. There

is continuity. There has been improvement on some of the members. Other members - they have changed. For instance, Cam McLean, who I felt would be a good person to chair that committee, had been approved by the three levels of government to chair the East Yard group. There has been conflict of interest with people who have received new positions and we felt that it is a very good board. We have also, and we're not going to hide from that, we also have a policy that we want people who work with the Cancer Foundation to be represented on the board. That has been done. We have also tried to have more women on the board. That has been done which was in the case before. So I do not apologize for that all.

Now, my honourable friend said that everything was going fine. Everything was not going fine according to some of the members and some of the doctors themselves. There have been problems. There have been problems between chemotherapists and radiotherapists and we're trying to get to the bottom of that. We must have people who can give us the advice and we feel that now with the chairman, with the discussions we have had with the executive director, fine. I don't want to be receiving a phone call every night by either the wife of a doctor or somebody who is accusing a member, either the executive director or somebody, I feel that they have to answer that and I think that this board will.

Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation - assurance of quality of treatment

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: With a final supplementary to the same Minister.

With such a large removal, Madam Speaker, of seven out of the nine members, what measures will this Minister put into place to ensure that the quality of treatment remains at the high and exemplary level that it has been to date?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: In fact, I will want to ensure that it will be improved, the quality of treatment be improved. I've set up a committee to know exactly where the new equipment should be going. There have been some recommendations that some people didn't approve with. We've tried to get the best people on that committee, where everything is brought in the open and this will be done and we'll increase the facilities, the equipment that is needed. We're spending, as I say, 92 percent more in that than was spent in 1981 when we took over and as I say with the quality of Dr. MacDiarmid, the executive director and so on, we're satisfied that we're going to get the best service available for Manitobans.

Med-Stop Medical Clinics - can quality of care be assured

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, my question also is to the Minister of Health.

On Tuesday, I noted an ad in the paper advertising for physicians which says, "Med-Stop Medical Clinics,

a Calgary based organization, in conjunction with Real Canadian Superstores, is pleased to announce the opening of a first in-store medical centre to be located on McPhillips St. and Stardust Ave.," at the SuperValu store in my constituency. I wonder whether they're going to put the physicians between pabulum and poultry.

My concern is, Madam Speaker - my question to the Minister of Health is: Are the College of Physicians and Surgeons going to be looking at the quality of care and continuity provided by this clinic?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It will probably be between washers and windows because we're talking about walk-in clinics, but, Madam Speaker, this is something that concerns all of us, I'm sure, for many of us. I know that it concerns the medical profession also.

I have met with five different groups representing the medical profession in Manitoba; that is the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Faculty of Medicine at the university, the MMA, the medical students, the interns and residents. We were looking at the main question of the surplus of doctors in Manitoba for one thing. There has been cooperation, especially with the university in that, they've reduced the number of students in the first year.

Still, I have concerns with the walk-in clinics. It seems that there is very little we can do. It was suggested that there be no advertising. I don't think that would do that much, but we're very concerned about the ad that you're talking about. I hear that they might have - every one of these stores will have a walk-in clinic, come around September or November, and I think that would be a disaster.

Unfortunately, we haven't got all the information. The impact that this will do - we're studying that at this time. We hope that we would be ready with some kind of legislation, to prevent that at least for the next Session, and to get the information, the report on the impact on the care of health and so on of these walk-in clinics.

I might say, Madam Speaker, that one of the concerns that . . . You seemed so interested that I thought I'd give you a little more. Madam Speaker, I might say that there's quite a concern on health. Just yesterday I heard again that somebody took one of the doctors to task, because he felt that they should have tests and so on; they should make sure that there's at least . . .

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

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Kildonan with a supplementary.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of order.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I clearly heard the Member for Ellice tell members on this side to sober up. I would like to know who he's referring to?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Yes. I was basically referring to the whole Opposition of the Conservatives on that side of the House for being so noisy and not treating it seriously. In my outlook, sober means to be serious. They took it the wrong way.

Med-Stop Medical Clinic - medical profession to control

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

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
I'm pleased to see the Minister and his department is looking into this.

One of the things that concerns me, Madam Speaker, is up to now all walk-in clinics that I'm aware of, having been in that business of being a clinic director for some time, have been doctor-owned and operated.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. M. DOLIN: Yes, Madam Speaker.
Med-Stop, I am not aware is doctor-owned and operated. So it is not physicians, to my knowledge, who are running this clinic.

Will the Minister ensure that there's a policy decision made on that basis to ensure the medical profession controls, if we are going to continue walk-in clinics, that they control the walk-in clinics rather than private entrepreneurs?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That, Madam Speaker, is very difficult because first of all there is no - we don't know of any correct definition of a walk-in clinic. We know where they are; I know that they are called that or there might be other names. The situation that we can't prevent a doctor from doing is opening a clinic near a shopping centre, nor can we prevent them from saying, we're going to be open two or three hours at night. So that is the impact that we're saying we're looking at. The quality, we're a little concerned about the quality, as I mentioned, but we're looking into that - trying to get as much information as possible.

MACC - re-examination of computer printouts re interest rates

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

He's quite proud of the Interest Rate Buy-down Program, and maintains that there are no problems in it.

I wonder if he will instruct MACC to re-examine their computer printouts so that those farmers who have paid their arrears since November 1 are not now being rebilled at the previous level on the offer that they're being given for their interest rate buy-down?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I want to indicate to my honourable friend that the program that we announced is one of a number that we have, in our limited way, to try and assist Manitoba farmers. We have called in the past for other institutions to lower their interest rates, and we have written down interest rates in the past. We now are attempting to provide in as meaningful a way as we can - without taxpayer infusion into subsidies - by this Buy-Down Program.

If there are any difficulties that the honourable member points out about a computer program that somehow we are now charging for arrears that we ought not to, I would hope that the honourable member would draw the specific cases to my attention. I'll be pleased to investigate that matter because if there are some errors in terms of some of the cases that arrears may be outstanding on a portfolio and someone is taking advantage of this program, and there is some problem there, I'd like it drawn to my attention. I'd be very pleased to take it under advisement and investigate it.

MACC - how many are awaiting report re lease-back of land

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the whole program is one big computer "glitch." But I wonder if the Minister would inform this House how many people now - how many clients of MACC - are presently waiting for a report from MACC regarding lease-back and possible purchase-back of some of their lands that they are in fact losing at this point.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, there is no doubt - and I think during our Estimates I spoke about clients who were in arrears, and I believe, and I say this from memory - over 20 percent of our clients would be in arrears in MACC and some of those would be in stages of negotiation either through the federal mediation board or the provincial mediation board, and of course, the quitclaim with lease-back is an option that we have put out through MACC.

As well, we are attempting to encourage private financial institutions and of course the Federal Farm Credit Corporation to do likewise. I understand they are doing likewise but they're as well placing farmers through the process of the mediation board which ought not to be necessary, in fact quitclaims and lease-backs could be offered on a negotiated basis.

MACC - farmers awaiting answer re Debt Review Board

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, previously the Minister had taken as notice a question about how many farmers are waiting for an answer from MACC after appearing before Farm Debt Review Panels. I have not received that answer yet, and it appears that there still is a backlog of responses to these farmers who have had negotiations that were fruitful with FCC, with the private institutions.

There is a backlog there that the Minister is not prepared to give us a number on and I wonder if he

would commit today to talking to the directors of MACC and ask them to put in place a single desk through which could be coordinated those files where people have gone before debt review panels or where they are asking for an opportunity to use the quitclaim system and then buy back part of their property; if he would be prepared to ask them to give these people a priority so they can clean up their affairs, so they can start over again and so they do not lose the benefits of the negotiations that went on before the panels.

HON. B. URUSKI: It appears that the honourable members opposite wish to put in place a negotiation position on behalf of whoever appears to the board, that MACC should have - when it comes before any panel, whether it be provincial, federal - its final position right at that point in time.

Madam Speaker, that will not occur. It will not occur either by MACC nor will it occur with the private institutions. I want to tell my honourable friend that I have had discussions with the general manager and the assistant general manager of MACC on this very matter; and, in fact, financial institutions have told the Federal Debt Review Board, which he makes reference to, that if they want decisions made relatively quickly to the Federal Debt Review Board, whether it be MACC or the private institutions, they'd better have the hearings in the City of Winnipeg where, in fact, decisions can be made very quickly.

The alleged hold-back or non-decision-making on MACC, Madam Speaker, is not accurate. All institutions are in fact not making their final positions on the one time that they appear before the board.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, would he then instruct MACC, when they hold the mortgage to the land, to have their appraisals done when they go before the boards?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I know that, in terms of negotiations, there are a number of matters that have to be cleared up. I certainly do not want undue delay in terms of holding up any settlements or any agreed upon settlements, and I will certainly take that portion of his question under advisement.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Could I have leave to make a non-political statement?

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

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, at lunch time today, the Premier and I attended a 91st birthday party for Mr. Tom Hillhouse who was a long-term member of this Assembly from the Town of Selkirk.

Tom is now a resident of the nursing section of the Seven Oaks Hospital, and I'm sure all honourable members would join with me in wishing him a very Happy Birthday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY
HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I believe there is an inclination on the part of all members to have Private Members' Hour today, just so that be noted.

In the meanwhile, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTERS OF GRIEVANCE

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Madam Speaker, I rise today on a grievance.

I'd like to grieve on behalf of all the people of Manitoba, but especially on behalf of the many different groups in our society who have been misled by this government who pretend to know all and be all to all of them.

Madam Speaker, I get tired, I get fed up hearing comments from members opposite, especially the Minister of so-called Culture, Heritage and Recreation, who keeps referring to members on this side, when we debate other issues . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member to address all honourable members by their proper title in this House.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Madam Speaker, when we debate other issues, I don't like it when the Member for St. Johns refers to us as racist, whether it be in the press as being against women, as being against Natives, as being against the disabled.

Madam Speaker, there has never been any member on this side who has ever said anything against the disabled in Manitoba, and that is a fact. No member on this side is racist, is against women, is against the disabled. I do not like it.

The Minister of Highways is shooting off something from his seat, but he's a lightweight so it's of little importance in any case.

Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that every time a different issue comes up that the Minister and members opposite generally try to lump other groups into the debate, groups which are not relevant to that particular debate or issue. I refer specifically, when we refer to homosexuals or other matters, somehow to divert attention away from the issue, this Minister and other members always have to lump in Natives, minority groups and the disabled.

The Minister once said in a Free Press article of May 2, 1987, that we have demeaned Natives and women

in past questions. Madam Speaker, in going through back issues of Hansard, I cannot find anywhere where members on this side of the House have demeaned Natives or women. I quote from the Free Press's infamous article that this same Minister said, "She later said she has no written record of the Conservatives' intolerance towards certain individuals and minorities but has noticed it through their line of questioning on subjects, their behaviour and heckling." That is being rather presumptuous, I would say.

I think it's the old fascist tactic, Madam Speaker, that if you repeat a lie often enough, people will come to believe it. I believe that is the tactic that is being used.

Madam Speaker, I did not accuse anybody of lying.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I do hope that the honourable member was not accusing anyone of lying.

MR. G. ROCH: Pardon me?

MADAM SPEAKER: I do hope the honourable member - I'm sorry. With all the noise, I couldn't hear . . .

MR. G. ROCH: I did not accuse anybody of lying, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I would like to hear the Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: No, Madam Speaker, I did not accuse anyone of lying. I accused them of using certain tactics to try and get a statement or answers which we have not done across to the public. By repeating and repeating and repeating certain statements, they hope that the public will come to believe it.

Madam Speaker, those tactics were used years ago with dire consequences.- (Interjection)- Madam Speaker, they'd like to try and take credit for the Advisory Council on the Status of Women when it's a fact that it was during Tory years that such an advisory committee was set up.

(Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, C. Baker, in the Chair.)

If one would peruse Hansard, one would know that it was the then-Minister, the Honourable Ken MacMaster, here from the Hansard of March 6, 1981, when the ministerial statement was made. He indicated, "I would be negligent, Mr. Chairman, if I did not mention the Advisory Council on the Status of Women which our government established last fall. Members of this House will recall that a variety of women's groups and organizations had recommended the council be formed as far back as 1972; yet it took a Conservative Minister and a Conservative Government to appoint an Advisory Council to the Minister on the Status of Women." That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact.

When it comes to The Family Maintenance Act, Mr. Deputy Speaker, here again, it was the Progressive Conservative Government that brought in this legislation. Women's groups were pushing him to do it, and so it should be; but a Conservative Government deserves the credit for The Family Maintenance Act

and I have to give credit to the women of Manitoba for pushing it.

But again, I want to point out that whenever they like to take credit for all these programs, they conveniently forget that many of the initiatives took place during Conservative years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as well, when it comes to shelters, when did it start? Osborne House, for example, was bought in the Conservative years. What condition is it in today? It's not in the best of condition. Apparently, people say it's dingy; it's dark; you've got two, three families in one bedroom; it's crowded; there's no private space for anyone anymore - a far cry from during the Conservative years when there was a 30-bed emergency shelter for women and children who were victims of family violence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the record speaks for itself. It goes on to say that there are insufficient bathroom facilities for 20 people, let alone 30. Madam Speaker - sorry, force of habit. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it comes to other groups, the handicapped, for example, it says, "There is not room for the handicapped in that particular area." There are no services for the handicapped and this is a government who talked about the handicapped; yet they're allowing people on their side to say that women who are handicapped are not abused. That contradicts the facts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've heard far too often from members on the other side about what a terrible bunch we are. I'd like to point out that the first woman Speaker in the Canadian Legislature was the Honourable Mrs. Thelma Forbes, appointed by a Conservative Government; the first black Cabinet Minister was the Honourable Lincoln Alexander, appointed by a Conservative Government; the first black Lieutenant-Governor in this country, again the same Lincoln Alexander, was appointed by a Conservative Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gets to a point when you've heard it once, twice, thrice, you hear it all the time, you just get fed up with hearing it, because this government likes to think that it has a monopoly on minority groups. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me point out that many of the new Canadians - the immigrant people - are not their national constituency. They maybe voted for them now at times, because if they go out and campaign with those people the same way that they campaigned in Manitoba, generally, a campaign of deceit, not telling everything the way it is, maybe they can fool them.

Abraham Lincoln once said: You can fool all the people some of the time, you can fool some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these people, many of whom have fled from socialism in many cases, are very family oriented, very church oriented, very enterprising people. They will not be fooled for long. You can only fool them for so long before they wake up and they realize that this government is not a friend like they try to pretend they are; that this government, if you compare socialist governments throughout the world, in fact, try to take over by dividing - and I'm going by socialist governments the world over - rather than encouraging them to hold down to their cultures and languages, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They have in fact forced them to

assimilate, not to be confused with economic assimilation, which is what many new Canadians want to do. They want to become part of mainstream Canada, economically, socially and otherwise, and there's nothing wrong with that. They also want a common bond with other Canadians. Therefore, they get together as multi-ethnic groups.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have met many different groups both before and since I've been appointed critic for Cultural Affairs, and it's amazing how many of them, maybe because in some cases of the background and the types of government they have in their country, it's amazing how many of them don't know the real reason for being of this particular party.

The reason for being of this particular party is to bring into this country, slowly but surely, what they have run away from. We see it through the introduction of some things, such as Bill 47, which will do nothing else than contribute to the breakdown of society which is already breaking down. We see it as deliberate deficit financing, the whole purpose of which is to break down the economic system. Mr. Deputy Speaker, not all members there are there for that reason. They may think that perhaps they are there for a bona fide social purpose, but in fact the people behind this party have ulterior motives and we see it coming slowly, slowly, slowly, what used to be referred to as creeping socialism.

A MEMBER: Galloping.

MR. G. ROCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's not creeping any more. As my colleague has said, it's starting to gallop.

It saddens me when I heard the Member for St. Boniface the other day somehow justify - to himself I suppose - voting for a piece of legislation that in his heart he knows is wrong, completely wrong. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side also believe it is wrong, and because of that, we get accused of being racist. Never will I buy that argument, never - not now, not in a thousand years.

What? What was that, Harry? The Member for The Pas says things from his chair, but he dares not repeat them into the mike. Maybe if we're lucky, it's been picked up by Hansard and we can read about it tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there have been a lot of items done and not done by this government in the past. There are so many, I don't know where to start. One of the best examples I can see of this government talking out of both sides of their mouth, especially when it comes, for example, to visible minorities, on the one hand saying how much we are for you, how much we'll do for you, but then we recall not too long ago when there was a certain issue of the telephone book that came out what happened. Of all the people on that cover of that issue, none were black, none were East Indian, and yet they go out to these communities and they say, "We're on your side." This is just one of the examples.

Mr. Deputy Speaker - the Minister says, "Am I lost?" No, I'm not lost. There's so much on this government that I don't think there's enough for 40 minutes.

But the fact is that Mr. Wade Williams once said, and I've got it quoted here somewhere, who is a former

member of the Liberal Party and not a member of our party, who once said that the best hope for minorities in this province was through the Conservative Party. Instead of being paternalistic and patronizing, they should be treated like people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, day in and day out, the members like to make out as if - I point out the example of Mrs. Thelma Forbes, Mr. Lincoln Alexander, then there was Dr. Joseph Du, who is a member of our party and who was awarded the Order of Canada. He was, I believe, the first non-white Canadian to be awarded such an order. Again, this was done by a Conservative Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to set the record straight, what is our party's policy? What are the statements we've made in the past in regard to the various minority groups in society? We have said that Manitoba employers will be consulted to develop greater fairness in employment practices for handicapped persons; women will be encouraged to participate more fully in the government decision-making process; child care services will be expanded to provide women and single parents with realistic opportunities to seek employment; a clear strategy will be developed to deal with family violence; crisis centres in residential shelters for battered women and children will be more fully funded; homemaker pensions will be introduced as part of a program of pension reform.

For populations at risk, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have said, in the case of Native people, pre-natal and neonatal service will be developed for Native mothers and children. Leaders of the Native communities allowing professionals from the health and related areas will be consulted in the development of projects to provide a coordinated approach to Natives in our province. These, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are all on the record.

When it comes to our multicultural mosaic, what have we, as a party, we, as individuals, said in the past? We have said in regard to multiculturalism, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when we talk about future prosperity we must remember the traditional and historic commitment of this party to those people who made the future possible. We have said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We've also said statements both during and after and prior to elections that this is a Manitoba where everyone has their day in ensuring fairness in employment practices, in working with our employers in this province to ensure that fairness. That is why we are committing ourselves to a program of encouraging broader participation by women in government and by all sectors of society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our leader once said in an address that Manitoba's great strength is her people. Manitobans represent the broadest cultural and ethnic mosaic in Canada, and it is the quality and strength of our people that has built this province's economy and its institutions.

Despite our different backgrounds and heritage, we all share a number of fundamental goals: first and foremost, a desire for better economic and social opportunities; opportunities to work and live in a free and tolerant society; opportunities to live in a house and live comfortably; opportunities to have children educated; opportunities to have access to a modern, comprehensive health care system; an opportunity to work hard and prosper. What's happening in this province is the opportunities are not happening.

I have said it before, other members have said it here, and our leader has said it, too, in the past that our goal is to ensure that new Canadians are integrated as quickly as possible into the mainstream of our province and can participate fully in the opportunities available to them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems that one of the largest barriers for some new Canadians is to be fluent in the English language. Therefore, one of our first priorities has to be able to expand and improve English as a second language program. This doesn't seem to be happening or not happening as fast as it could be happening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the problems with the programs that now exist is that they often assume - often correctly but not all the time - that the head of a household is male and, therefore, that person right away gets into the program, whereas the women in those families do not have the ability or the opportunity right away to have the program at their disposal; and yet, although it is their right to have it, because of some of the countries they come from, they dare not ask for it. Assuming that governments, as they have known them, to be all powerful, they dare not ask.

We, as a party, have said that we would encourage them to go out and seek what is rightfully theirs. I don't see this happening right now, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, visible minorities currently make up less than 2 percent of the Civil Service. We, as a party, are on record as being committed to doubling that participation; not have them included because they are visible minorities, but have them included because they are qualified, employable, visible minorities. Unlike the government opposite, we don't believe in tokenism; we believe in using the people's abilities to the best of their ability. That is the significant difference.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it comes to maintaining cultural backgrounds and heritage languages, let us not forget it was us, as a Conservative Government, that introduced the heritage language programs to ensure that those different groups had the opportunity to maintain their languages.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government said, in its Throne Speech, that it would also promote, in reference to their multicultural policy, would also promote equal access and participation by them in the workplace, but it seems that they have not brought this around to reality.

On Tuesday of May 21, 1985, the then-Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation said that Manitoba took a unique step in the formation of the Manitoba Intercultural Council, the majority of whose members are elected by the ethnocultural community, brought in to form a government as they are in other provinces.

He went on to say that the council is truly representative of the community in forms of partnership with government in developing initiatives to strengthen the position of ethnocultural groups to ensure the full participation in the political, social and economic life of our province.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is the reality in the province today? It has been reported in the media that Manitoba has a higher concentration of visible minorities and Native Indians in low-paying unskilled jobs than any other province, and this is according to federal statistics.

Therefore, the goals and objectives, or at least the stated goals just prior to elections - the objectives of this New Democratic Party - a party which is neither new nor democratic, and certainly not the party of Ed Schreyer or J.S. Woodsworth - those stated objectives have certainly not been achieved. Those same statistics prove that the province has the worst record in Canada for non-whites and Natives stuck in the unskilled labour pool.

This was said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by Vivian Renault of the Federal Employment Equity Division, an employee of the Federal Government. She went on to say that the Canadian average for visible minorities in unskilled work is 20 percent compared to a Manitoba rate of 32.6 percent - the highest concentration in the country. This was as of the end of last year, 1986.

Similarly, the national average of Native people working in unskilled jobs is 26 percent and in Manitoba it's 32 percent, according to the latest census figures. This would mean that over one-third of the people are concentrated there as opposed to one-quarter nationally. I'm talking about the unskilled work force.

A past chairman of Winnipeg's Race Relations Committee, Mr. Osmond Anderson, said he can't explain how Manitoba, with a government that claims to have affirmative action high on its agenda, could be trailing so far behind other provinces. Anderson said although the NDP Government has taken some legislative steps towards affirmative action and pay equity, resistance to those concepts has made it timid. He said they think of the ballot box first and morals and ethics later.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, yet when the Member for Sturgeon Creek attacks them for their morals and ethics, they often hoot and holler back all kinds of insults at him. Here we have a person, a non-partisan person, saying the exact same things.

HON. L. EVANS: I wonder if the member would submit to a question on his last statement regarding Mr. Anderson.

MR. G. ROCH: I'm sorry; I didn't hear the first part of the question.

HON. L. EVANS: If the honourable member would agree to answer a question with regard to a quotation by Mr. Anderson.

MR. G. ROCH: I didn't hear the first part by the time I got the earphone on.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. I wonder if the honourable member would accept a question now with regard to the quotation he utilized, related to Mr. Anderson, regarding the matters of employment opportunities for minority groups.

MR. G. ROCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I most certainly will at the end of my grievance if there's time permitting, or with leave, whichever may be the case.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this dismal record happens to be in the province with the only NDP Government in Canada, and yet we are subjected, day after day - not day after day - hour after hour, one might say, at times - it feels like minute

after minute - to all kinds of diatribes from the other side. And yet the best records for hiring the minorities of women, of Natives, happens to be in non-socialist provinces, most of whom are ruled by Conservative Governments. According to federal statistics, it's a fact. - (Interjection)- The Member for Thompson doesn't like to hear that.

MR. S. ASHTON: I don't like to hear it because I saw what you guys said about the Native farmers in Thompson in the last election.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

MR. G. ROCH: Madam Speaker, need I remind this member that he was part of the government who stirred up all kinds of controversies in 1983 and '84, who turned neighbour against neighbour, brother against brother, sister against sister, in trying to force upon the people of Manitoba something which they did not want. You tore the province apart and you know it, and your Minister who was in charge went down to defeat because of it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: Thank the Lord. But he's got 60 grand now, so he doesn't feel too badly . . .

MR. G. ROCH: Don't forget your record.

Well, Madam Speaker, the Member for The Pas says that the people of Springfield are disappointed. I'm sure that many people are disappointed that someone who is unable to obtain employment anywhere in the private sector, whom no municipal government wishes to hire, gets appointed as a flunky, but has no qualifications, at a \$60,000-a-year job. Yes, I would agree with the Member for The Pas that the people in Springfield are disappointed as are probably most Manitobans.

The Member for St. Johns once said, in reference to the Conservative Club of Greater Winnipeg, that it was a shame that in this day and age that they would exclude women. She conveniently forgot to mention that the federal P.C. Women's Caucus excludes men. So they seem to be quite selective in their interpretation.

But the fact is that there are many different clubs and organizations which, for various reasons, exclude people of one gender or another. Big Brothers of Winnipeg, for example; would we expect them to have women as Big Brothers? Well, of course not; it's not a reality.

But right now, as we all know, the main concern of Big Brothers of Winnipeg is not that they be forced to have women. They're concerned that they'd be forced to have another group of people whom this government considers to be a bona fide minority, and this is where I disagree with them.

Madam Speaker, my basic grievance is that this government always has a holier-than-thou attitude. This government is always out there trying to preach. They think that they are the end all and be all to all minority groups.

Madam Speaker, the fact is that they are better at using public funds to throw out propaganda to all these groups, to use grants, to divide, to conquer than we

are. Maybe we're more concerned about being able to govern once we win the election. Maybe we're more concerned about having policies in place. Maybe that's our problem, rather than using the public payroll to hire hacks and flacks. Maybe that's our concern, that's our main problem.

But, Madam Speaker, the fact remains, based on our record, whether one goes through Hansard, whether one goes through election promises, whether one goes through the appointments of previous provincial and federal Tory Governments and present ones, there is no legitimate way that this government, its members, or any of its Ministers can accuse us of being racist.

I have been personally accused of being racist, and I will not name the member who said it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation on a point of order.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes, Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

The Member for Springfield has continually suggested that I called him racist. I've never in my life used the word "racist," either in the House or outside the House, in reference to any member opposite.

MR. G. ROCH: Is that a point of order, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Pardon?

MR. G. ROCH: Was that a point of order?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I can't hear the Honourable Member for Springfield.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Yes, I'm just wondering if I can continue or if that was a point of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Yes, Madam Speaker, I was just asking if I could continue. I was just wondering if that was a point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have a point of order. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

MR. G. ROCH: Madam Speaker, I never said who accused me of being that. If anyone in this House feels guilty about it and if the shoe fits, wear it. It's as simple as that.

Madam Speaker, I would like members opposite, instead of always hurling these insults, making these allegations, making these false accusations against us, I would like them to point out examples, specific cases of what they accuse us of. It never happens, the Minister admits in press interviews. Other members admit too,

well it's not really on the record. They say it from their seats, they sit and they're heckling, this and that.

The facts are, Madam Speaker, more often than not, the heckles and the barbs which are sent across this House are picked up by Hansard. The reason they cannot be found is because they have not been said. With the maybe allegations, innuendo, they keep repeating it and repeating it and hopefully people will come to believe it.

But, Madam Speaker, there was a song many years ago that said: "The times, they are a-changing," and they are. Many more people out there in the multicultural community are starting to know what kind of government we have here in Manitoba, a government that attacks the very moral fibre of this society, its religious roots, its family roots; a government that introduces a piece of legislation that says Bill No. 47 that will not go over well with many people; governments which run up record deficits. These people can start a new life and, after a while, they'll see that they have come here to raise a family.- (Interjection)- What kind of a reference did the Member for Ellice make to blacks? Would the Member for Ellice care to stand up and repeat the remark that he made about blacks?

A MEMBER: Black sheep.

MR. G. ROCH: That's not what he said, and you know it. Madam Speaker, I see my light is flashing and my time is almost up.

I'd like to conclude my remarks by saying that the reason I got up to grieve - I'll reiterate - I will no longer put up with any of the members opposite constantly accusing us of being racist, being against women, being against Natives, being against the disabled, because it is simply not true. If anything, people who live in glass houses should never, ever throw stones.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services on a point of order.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, I believe the honourable member agreed to answer a question at the end of his speech if he had time. I don't know whether he has time or not.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes left on his time.

HON. L. EVANS: The member was quoting a person by the name of Mr. Anderson, I think O.T. Anderson, and I believe Mr. Anderson did make a statement with regard to lack of employment opportunities for certain minority groups and so on.

I recall this because I recall reading it in the paper, and I want to ask the honourable member if he could verify the period of time that Mr. Anderson was talking about, because my recollection is the period of time preceded the election of this Pawley administration in November of '81. The statistics they were using were the year 1981, which is before this government became elected.

MR. G. ROCH: Madam Speaker, the period I was referring to was during 1985.

HON. L. EVANS: Excuse me, Madam Speaker. My question was with regard to the quotation of Mr. Anderson because Mr. Anderson did make a public statement, and I remember writing a letter to the editor about the matter. I do recall - and I'm asking if the Member for Springfield could verify this therefore - that Mr. Anderson's reference to this problem actually related to data from the 1981 Census, which of course took place prior to the election of this government.

MR. G. ROCH: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker. I didn't hear the whole question. I was trying to locate the quote. Could the Minister please repeat the question?

HON. L. EVANS: My question is, Madam Speaker: Could the Honourable Member for Springfield advise the House with regard to the quotation he made from Mr. Anderson about the lack of employment opportunities for minority groups, etc., could he verify that Mr. Anderson's statement related to the 1981 Census which took place before the election of the Pawley administration?

MR. G. ROCH: Madam Speaker, I'll go through my notes and I will certainly verify it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Ellice on a point of order.

MR. H. SMITH: No, I was rising, Madam Speaker, with a grievance speech.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone caught my attention first.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
I rise today to exercise my right as a member of this Assembly, namely, to use my grievance time in this House.

Madam Speaker, I grieve today for the taxpayers of Manitoba. Those taxpayers, Madam Speaker, are not receiving value for the money that they pay to this province. The taxpayers in this province pay, pay and pay again. Ever-increasing taxes and ever-decreasing services and benefits are given to them in this province.

This government continues to spend, spend and spend, ever mindful of their own agenda, and caring little for the very real needs of the people of this province. People are becoming increasingly cynical and distrusting of their government, and they're giving up hope of any change in the attitudes and the actions of this NDP Government.

Several examples come to mind, Madam Speaker, and I'll mention some of them. During the debate on the Estimates of the Employment Services and Economic Security Department, we discussed the fact that there are ever-increasing administrative costs in every area of that department. While the administration costs are rising, Madam Speaker, are we seeing an increase in services to the people? Are we seeing

massive decreases in welfare rolls because of the programs that this department administers? No, we are not.

Madam Speaker, the Employment Services and Economic Security Department of this government spends the taxpayers' hard-earned money on training and job creation programs, as well as on social assistance. These job creation and training programs, funded by Provincial and Federal Governments and administered by the Manitoba Government, are supposedly designed to get people off welfare rolls and into the work force. Are they working? Are these programs really working? Madam Speaker, if they are, we cannot see any marked effect on the welfare rolls of this province, for one example.

Instead, we see increased numbers every year. Madam Speaker, in the year, 1981, the monthly caseload of those on provincial welfare was 19,057. In 1986, the number was 22,665, an increase of 18.9 percent. This year the prediction is the caseloads will increase by some 13 percent. This is appalling. In 1981, Madam Speaker, the monthly average number of recipients of municipal social assistance was 7,183; in 1985-86, the number was 16,097, an increase from 1981 to 1986 of 124 percent - 124 percent. The municipal rolls are predicted to increase by 10 percent or over 10 percent this year, for 1987.

Where are the results of the training programs? These expensive training programs that are supposedly taking place throughout the province, why are they not working? The Minister tells us that these programs are continually being monitored and studied, but what is the result of all this studying and monitoring? We are not privy to that information of course, Madam Speaker, we in the Opposition. We can only assume, from the burgeoning unemployment rolls and welfare rolls, that the millions of dollars spent on training and job creation are simply not working. They're not effective.

I mentioned to the Minister during Estimates this fact, when we did the Estimates of his department, and he had no explanation. Well he did, in a way. He had an explanation that the welfare rolls were increasing because of single parents and this sort of thing, and because of the Welcome Home Program but, Madam Speaker, the Welcome Home Program would only account for a very small number of those people who would be considered in this category under social assistance.

While we're speaking of unemployment, Madam Speaker, let's look at one of the programs funded by this government. The Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security speaks glowingly of the unemployed help centres in the province. There are two of them in Manitoba, one in Winnipeg here and one in Brandon. The Minister talks of the great work done by the offices in obtaining unemployment insurance payments for unemployed workers, and I'm sure that they do, in many cases, help people to gain their unemployment benefits. In fact, a person in my constituency had occasion to get some help from the Brandon office. But I am sure that, if those same people were to seek help from the Federal Government, from the offices, or speak to their member of Parliament, they could get that same help. I have sought that kind of help many times and received help.

It seems to me that we should not be setting up an expensive bureaucracy in this province to offset some

perceived problem with a government department of the Federal Government. It just seems ridiculous. If they're having problems collecting unemployment insurance, then if this Minister thinks it's that serious, then perhaps he would go and speak to, telephone, telex, write or whatever to the Federal Minister and say, look we have a problem here. We do not wish to spend all this money seeking unemployment insurance. You're not efficient, if that is the case, tell them so and let's get something done about it, but don't use provincial taxpayers' money to fund something in order to get federal taxpayers' money. The whole thing becomes ridiculous.

The Minister brags about the good unemployment picture in Manitoba in relation to other provinces and then has the nerve to tell us that Manitoba gets the short end of the stick in unemployment insurance benefits. Now, the whole thing becomes ridiculous. Really, Madam Speaker, what is he trying to tell us? He's trying to have it both ways. He wants lots of unemployment insurance money in this province but he doesn't want any unemployment in this province. Well, let's try and figure out the logic of that if you can.

From my questions to the Minister I've really been unable to discover any function that these unemployment help centres do in gaining people employment. Now, that seems strange to me, an unemployed help centre by name implies that you would help people get employment. In fact, on page 39 of the Supplementary Estimates put out for the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security, there are a list of several major objectives of the Division of Unemployment Insurance, on page 39. Major objectives of this division are: (a) to improve efficiency in the working of the labour market, (b) to minimize the level of unemployment, (c) to increase the skill levels of workers in relation to the job market demands of Manitoba employers, and there are a couple of others.

So, Madam Speaker, we have a Minister of Employment Services bragging about an agency which keeps people unemployed. So, we wonder and I think we have every right to wonder at the logic of this sort of situation. There's something wrong, Madam Speaker, with something like that. There's something wrong with the whole system of employment and unemployment and social assistance and I'm afraid that it is a matter of attitude. The attitude of most of us is that everyone wants to work. Some cannot - of course, for obvious reasons cannot work.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: A point of order being raised.

HON. L. EVANS: I thought I heard the member, and if not, perhaps you could correct me, that I was bragging about these centres, encouraging people to be unemployed. Was that the statement made by the honourable member? I trust she didn't make that and if she did that is a totally incorrect observation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I did say that the Minister, he's very proud - if you want to call it some other word than bragging, fine - but he's very proud of those centres which in turn encourage people, they get unemployment insurance for people because as he says, we are net loser in unemployment insurance. Do you want more unemployment insurance because if you want more unemployment insurance in this province, it would mean that there are more people unemployed. That follows, as sure as night follows day.

HON. L. EVANS: . . . deals with the workers - (inaudible) . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Disagreements about ideas are not a point of order.

MRS. C. OLESON: As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a problem, I think, of attitudes. Some of us, most of us, I think, as I said expect that everyone will want to work. That to me is a given. Some people cannot work and that is a given. They have a disability, there are many reasons, but everyone in their heart wants to have a job to be able to provide for their own needs and for the needs of their family.

So I wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this government, through their social assistance programs and their social tinkering, are they fostering the type of attitude that makes people want to work? Or are they fostering the type of attitude where people throw up their hands and say, well, the government will look after me; I don't need to worry about it; I don't need to work.

It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government creates, by its actions and its attitudes, a dependence on the state and, of course, if you control people through their livelihood, you can control them in other ways too.

I've been told of young women - this has not been said to me myself - but I have been told of young women who say they can't wait to get pregnant and have a baby so that they can go on social assistance and have their own apartment. Well, you know, this is a sad state of affairs if we have gotten to this sort of thinking amongst our young people. What a shocking statement for a teenager to make - that is their ambition in life. How are we as a society, as a government, or whomever, how are we fostering this idea and are we doing anything about it to change it? (Interjection)- It is not typical but it is happening.

What sort of values are we fostering in society if that's the sort of ambition, the main ambition in the minds of some people, is to go on welfare? And I have no reason to believe that the story I have reiterated is not true. We must be making it too easy perhaps.

Where does this government's social assistance department place the parents of these young people in this whole scenario, for instance, of getting pregnant and going on welfare? Do the parents not feel any responsibility? Are they not requested to have any responsibility in looking after these young people? There's something wrong here if they're not being encouraged, firmly encouraged, to look after their own children if they possibly can. Of course, one of the problems which immediately comes to mind is that their parents are also on welfare.

But it seems to me a sad state of affairs if we are going to automatically look after all single parents. In this province, they are classified as unemployable. I, as a young mother, would find that insulting to be classed as unemployable. I would like to feel that I could earn my way. There are times, of course, when maybe it wouldn't be possible, but I don't think they should automatically be considered an unemployable person because you have a child.

I think if the government really truly believes this sort of thing and that young people should be treated in this way, then I think we have a deeper problem than we have really been seeing. We are building for the future generations of dependent people, dependent on the state.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services has a point of order?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. I wonder if the Member for Gladstone - she makes some very serious comments here about mothers with children on welfare - I wonder if she would submit to a question on this very important point.

MRS. C. OLESON: I will entertain a question after I'm finished, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

As I was saying, we seem to be, by our attitudes, building generation upon generation of dependency on welfare. So that is one reason the welfare rolls are burgeoning, continually going up. I realize it is difficult for people who have been on welfare for many years to get off the welfare rolls and to go out into the work force. I know of women who find it very, very, very difficult to leave their home and look for a job when they have been for years on the welfare rolls, and I understand that sort of thing.

But we must realize that social assistance is a last-resort measure and the taxpayers who are obliged to pay for this are beginning to wonder: Where will it end? How much are they going to have to pay? As I say, I am not, for a minute, saying there are people who cannot work. I know there are people who cannot work and I'm not asking them to go to work, but I am suggesting that we should be encouraging the people who are able to go.

A moment ago I mentioned young people. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a municipal responsibility to provide social assistance to unemployed employables or people who are able to work. In the City of Winnipeg, I'm told that 67 percent of the people on social assistance in April '87 were between the ages of 18 and 25.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's an absolutely shocking number, absolutely shocking. That figure has risen from 41 percent in April of 1983. Winnipeg of course also has training programs in their social assistance department and they make an attempt to get these people working instead of on assistance. They are dealing, of course, with unemployed employables; so they are attempting to deal with the problem.

But other municipal jurisdictions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have very little opportunity to plug into work creation or work training and job creation programs. The numbers on their rolls are very small; they couldn't possibly put in, in their municipality or small town or

city, a work program, so there's no help for them. And as I say, they can't get into the provincial programs too easily. Also, when you rate people as employable or unemployable in the municipal setting in rural Manitoba, the fact that there are no jobs - or very few jobs - does not enter into the picture. It's whether or not they have the ability to work.

So the municipalities are left with paying the bills from an already overburdened tax base, and they are telling me it is difficult for them. It's difficult for them administratively to deal with it; it's difficult for them to handle the cost because there is a great deal of discrepancy from municipality to municipality in the cost of social assistance.

Meanwhile the Minister in charge answers questions from his backbenchers at every opportunity, telling us how great the unemployment rate is in Manitoba. When you compare it to other provinces, the unemployment rate in Manitoba is not too bad, but it must be cold comfort to the thousands and thousands of people who are, for one reason and another, unemployed.

There are those who fall into the category of those on unemployment insurance. They are unemployed, obviously, but there are many that are not counted in the unemployment statistics. We have people on provincial welfare; we have people on municipal welfare; we have treaty Indians - about 8,000 of them - on federal social assistance; and also we have people who are on disability pensions through the Workers Compensation. So we have all these people who are, in some form or another, on assistance and cannot work or cannot find a job.

There are people - and I would suspect that the figures I gave you about the numbers in Winnipeg, those 18-25 year olds, some of them will never have had a job. If you can't ever find a job, you cannot qualify for unemployment insurance, and if you haven't been able to get a job and you're 24 or 25 years old, you go to apply for a job and the employer, of course, immediately wants a resume of where you have worked before, what's your experience? They say, they're not able to give a resume of experience, so we have a sad situation.

What we have, of course, also, is what we could term as the working poor. We have people who are underemployed, people who have part-time jobs, and they have the same needs as the rest of us. They are, in many ways, worse off than the people who are on welfare because they have their dental and medical costs paid, whereas the working poor, as we would call them, the people on part-time and minimum wage, don't have that, they have to pay their own. So, in some senses, it's far more of a struggle for those people than it is for the people who are on social assistance. Some of these people have a very, very great difficult time getting just the mere basic needs for their families, but they're trying.

Then this government says they care. They're the sharing, caring government. They're telling us, you know you can't really blame a Minister for getting up and gloating about, heaven only knows, in this government. If you have an opportunity to brag about something, I don't blame them, because there are so few opportunities. But it must really gall the people who are on assistance and having such a difficulty to hear how great unemployment is in the Province of Manitoba when they haven't had a job in years. They seem to

be the most urgent care - involved in caring is convincing people that they should vote for them for the next election. Their idea of sharing is to share this massive debt load that we have in this province.

In spite of what the Minister of Finance tells us, everyone is sharing in the debt load of this province, rich and poor alike. He tries to tell us that it's just the rich, oh yes, our tax program and all our taxes and licences and fees, etc., will not affect the poor. They do; of course they do.

So why are we in such massive debt and still are not supplying the need for some of these people? It's hard to understand. You would think, if we were in a massive debt, that everything would be swimming and the people that are on welfare would be getting a terrific deal and everybody would be happy. You'd think that would be the result of spending and spending and spending, but it's not. So somewhere something is wrong.

I see in the department and the entire government some mismanagement. There's some mismanagement in every department of this government, and I also see some problem with spending priorities. There are a litany of examples which have been cited in this House many times about the spending priorities of this government.

One example I'll use is here we have an NDP Government who will fund the Gay and Lesbian Film Festival but they won't fund a project in a Conservative constituency to have a job creation program that would put a new roof on a rink. They won't put in enough Careerstart people in the Western Manitoba Agricultural Museum so that they can keep their programs going properly. This is the sort of thing. They don't look at the overall picture and see what they're doing.

Here we have a government which set up a separate department to serve social assistance needs and has one of its stated priorities as job creation and employment, and yet funds an agency which helps people get unemployment insurance.

A couple of years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government set up an agency called the Workplace Innovation Centre whose function is to study the effects of technology on the work force. That centre is receiving funds amounting to \$400,000 a year. They have a board and they have a staff in place and they're receiving their funding, I believe for three years they're receiving their funding.

Now I asked in the Estimates if they had any contracts, any studies, and the Minister said, no, they didn't. Here they are all set up and ready to go. He said that they had contacts with - I believe he said they had contacts with various businesses.

Just a moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker. On page 2743 of Hansard, the Minister is quoted as saying, "I don't believe that it had any contracts thus far. I know they've had a lot of contacts with businesses, all kinds of planned contacts, but there have been no contracts, no agreements to provide services."

Well, what are these people doing? And how long are they going to be doing what they're not doing?

This centre is supposed to be self-sufficient in three years. Well, it makes one wonder - if they haven't got any contracts, no evidence of activity yet, and it's been in existence for two years - just what on earth is going to happen? It is under legislation. Will it continue to

exist if it is not doing anything? We'd like to know why there is no activity and what will happen after three years? Anyone want to guess what happens after three years? Knowing this government, they'll continue to put money into that project whether or not they're doing anything, and whether or not there are any results. We hope they take a good look at it because there is some money there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to have used my grievance opportunity to speak on things in my constituency, and there are many problems in my constituency. For example, the Minister of Agriculture announced with great fanfare an opportunity for farmers to have loans with MACC to buy down their loans to a lower interest rate. Big deal! It would cost a young man in my constituency \$25,000 which he would have to borrow to buy down his MACC loan.

Now, another large loan is not what a young farmer needs, or any farmer needs these days, when they're saddled with high input costs and low grain prices. So the fact that the Minister brags about this, he doesn't cease to tell us that this is helping farmers, but we have yet to see anyone helped by it and today's question period did not provide us with any information on how many people have even applied for help through it. People inquire, I know, because this young farmer in my constituency did. He inquired and this is what he found out. So \$25,000 - you know, it wasn't just laying around the house. He would even find it difficult, probably, borrowing it.

So I can't see that this is a great help. This was, I believe, announced in the Throne Speech if I'm not mistaken. It was one of the major thrusts of the government's agriculture policy, and helping no one.

Now, a short while ago, I sent out to my constituency an information bulletin on the budget. I don't think I've ever had so many responses to a brochure before. I'd like to read you one which is fairly typical of the responses I received. The writer expresses so clearly what the opinions of many people are when he says as follows, and I'll quote, "It is time that someone put a stop to the squandering of money by our government. Government has no business in business. Leave that to the private sector. It has been proven over and over again that mismanagement and losses are the government's system. The sooner the government starts running our affairs like a business and not a game, the better we will all be."

I think that's a very telling statement. Those are not my words. They are words of a constituent who is fed up with the way the provincial government is operating and wants an end to the way it is operating.

Several people in their responses said that they either wished they could leave the province, or they were going to leave the province. Isn't that a sad statement when a person who has lived all their life in a province, their loved ones, their friends, their family are there, and they want to move away because they can see no future in this their home province.

Most people like to stay fairly close to the place in which they were born. They like to work in that area, live in that area, and raise their families. But many people are expressing the thought, "What's the use of staying here?"

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had another letter which expressed very clearly the pain and frustration of the

person who wrote it. I'll read it to the House as it's an eloquent appeal by a person who obviously would prefer not to be on social assistance, but for whatever reason has to be. The saddest part of this letter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that it was not signed. So I have no way of knowing who that person was or how I can help them. I've no way to phone them up and say, we do care about you, we'll listen to you. But I'll read you the letter. It says:

"I realize our problems do not apply to tax, but we desperately need help and perhaps you'll give this message a little thought please. My comments are that Canadians who are ill and unable to work are left to starve on \$100 for food per month from welfare. We're looked down upon, our children are made fun of at school and anywhere we go in general. We're given a number, like a prison, which we must show in order to receive medical cards. We're given \$150 per year for special needs such as furniture, appliances, etc., and we are not even trusted to handle this \$150.00. To humiliate us even more, why don't they put us all (welfare bums, as we are called) in prison. At least, we might be treated more like humans.

"Welfare workers receive top wages, etc., and are allowed to barge in on us whenever they want. They sit in our home for hours pretending to help us, but they end up humiliating us. We are constantly being watched to make sure we don't earn an extra 50 cents. We are not allowed to wear new clothes as no extra money is provided for such luxury. We have to wear dirty clothes from the Salvation Army. We are worse off than animals; as animals have freedoms, we don't. "Thank you for reading this. Just a welfare bum with a number."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is one of the saddest letters I have ever received. As I said, the saddest part is I can't answer it, but perhaps by mentioning it in this House that person may someday know that we care.

We are, you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even though this province pays millions for welfare programs every year, Manitoba pays the lowest or next to the lowest welfare of the four Western Provinces in many categories.

The Minister in charge is quick to point a finger and say, how mean Alberta or Saskatchewan are. I heard from the opposite bench, as I knew I would, remarks about Saskatchewan - and what are you going to do, and what about the debt? I told you earlier in my speech, if you had been listening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the record speaks for itself. Manitoba is not a good province to live if you have to be on social assistance. If the Minister would reorganize his priorities and cut his administration costs, maybe things could be better.

Another item I would mention before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the subject of wife abuse shelters in this province. The Minister made an announcement regarding per diem payments for victims of abuse just this week. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is aware that not only does Manitoba have a poor record in the Western Provinces with regard to social assistance, it also has an extremely poor record regarding wife abuse centres and their funding.

I'll give you some figures to support this statement. In Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$1,862,850 is spent on funding for women's shelters. That includes

women's shelters, safe homes and second-stage housing. That taken into comparison by population, is \$18,400 for each 10,000 of population.

In Alberta, they spend \$3,723,705 on the same categories of wife abuse centres or women's shelters, which, when you figure it as a per 10,000 population, it's \$15,677.00.

Then we come to Manitoba, and there's listed here - and of course it may increase with the Minister's statement. This was taken from Stats Canada of 1986, and it may not be exactly on now, but \$1 million, which translates into \$9,335 for per 10,000 population, so comparing it population-wise, we are the lowest of the provinces in Canada when it comes women's shelters. I think that is appalling when you consider the talk, the rhetoric, the caring and sharing we hear from this other side of the House. You'd think they were the only people in this wide world who ever had a shelter for women or ever did anything about it.

The Member for Springfield, I won't go into all what he said about it.- (Interjection)- What are you giving? The Member for Springfield eloquently stated the remarks passed by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, and reiterated to you, which we've said many times, but you obviously do not believe and do not hear that when the Conservatives were in power in Manitoba we did something about it; and you were building on that, but we started it. And we're not saying you're not building on it, but don't take all the credit for ever having a thought in this world. That is what I'm saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The NDP party like to try to convince people that they're the only people in the world who care. Well, there's a little more to caring than just standing up and wringing your hands and saying you care. Action is what you want.

I would rather have a person who never let on they cared, doing something, than a person who is continually wringing their hands and saying, we care, and doing nothing.

These figures are hard to comprehend when we think of how this government has been acting with regard to wife abuse shelters and the like, and the speeches made to them during the election about how they were talking to the ordinary people and, as I've said before, the sharing and caring.

In closing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to again state my dismay for what has happened to this province and to the people. I grieve for the young men and women who cannot find a job, but are still expected to pay that \$9,500 per person debt which this government has heaped on their head, and the head of every citizen of this province.

The people of Manitoba deserve much, much better than what they're getting.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I believe the honourable member agreed to answer a question or two at the end of her speech. I would like to ask her specifically, because she referred to the problem of young mothers, young women with children,

that there was sort of easy access to welfare, that they seemed to want to have children to go on to welfare and so on, and she was rather critical of the present situation, the present policy.

I'd like to know specifically whether the Member for Gladstone is advocating the elimination of mothers' allowances as a category in our social assistance program as occurred under the Social Credit Government in B.C. two years ago. Are you advocating therefore the elimination of mothers' allowances as a category?

MRS. C. OLESON: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker - through you to the Minister - I'm not advocating that because there are some mothers who cannot work, and perhaps their child is ill. Children are much better raised in a home, we all know that; that's a given. Maybe you don't know that, but I know that.

The way I understand it, in this province young parents are automatically placed on the unemployable list, and that to me is an insult. - (Interjection) - Well, then, certainly, they shouldn't eliminate the category, no, but you should use it with a little more care and encourage people to go to work.

HON. L. EVANS: I just have a second question.

The honourable member, I might say, is contradicting herself because the Mothers' Allowances category states that if you are a mother with a child - and this has been around for decades, since God knows when, since the First World War in Manitoba - if you are a mother, a young woman or an old woman with children dependent on you and no other source of income, you will automatically qualify for welfare, and she seems to be suggesting that shouldn't be automatic. So that's why I ask, do you want to eliminate Mothers' Allowances as a category, because in B.C. you have to look for work before you get welfare, even if you have a dozen kids.

My question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that - and I agreed with the honourable member's description of some of the difficulties that the municipal welfare governments are having in administration and in handling cases and also even offering them training programs.

What I'd like to know very specifically from the member, because it's a very fundamental policy question, is the member saying that she is in favour of eliminating the two-tier system and therefore introducing the one-tier system into Manitoba?

MRS. C. OLESON: I won't categorically say that I approve of the one-tier system till I saw exactly what it would cost. And I would say to the Minister as I said to him in Estimates, no matter what system you use, it can be improved.

You can improve delivery of service to the municipalities, to the problems that I stated to you and I read to you and I listed to you in Estimates, you can help them with those problems with the system you're on, if it is too expensive to go to the other system.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a grievance today.

You know we heard from the Member for Springfield and he actually challenged us to come out with a number of instances, specific instances, that would prove that some of them on that side are sexist as well as racist. So I have a few specific quotes to prove our case, not that the Conservative Party is sexist or racist, but that some Conservatives are sexists and racists, and that party seems to attract this type of person. - (Interjection) -

So for example, I'm only going to give quotes about existing members in this House but as well existing members in the federal House, to prove the case. But you had the Member for Springfield get up and he really pretended that these were all sort of false charges, that they welcomed people and they did not show any signs of being racist whatsoever.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me just refer to a few years ago, the Member for Minnedosa in committee talking about university funding, referred to chinks and niggers. I mean, that's clearcut. And then a few years after that I have a press story from the Globe and Mail . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order being raised by the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: It was not a reference in committee; it was an aside remark to one of my colleagues.

MR. H. SMITH: Well, an aside remark to one of his colleagues, but he still said it. Then a few years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: Have you ever heard of Archie Bunker?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A disagreement as to facts is not a point of order.

MR. H. SMITH: A few years ago as well, an article I'm quoting from is the Globe and Mail, May 15, 1984, and this same Member for Minnedosa even went further and amplified his attitude, which I think is clearly racist, in talking about apartheid in South Africa, he said, they even let them on the buses now. And you know at that time his leader, you had the Member for Tuxedo, did not repudiate, did not kick him out of the party. He still sits to this day as a Conservative member in this Legislature. So it's that type of comment.

Now let's deal with a few on the sexist side. Just recently we all heard this. We had the Member for Pembina referring to the Minister of Culture. He said that sexist, sleazy little girl. We heard it on this side of the House. It did not get into Hansard, but he definitely said it.

Then, on May 26, '87, we had this from the Member for Sturgeon Creek . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: If she acts like a child, she should be treated like one.

MR. H. SMITH: He said this, "If you were my daughter, I'd spank you." This is said to a woman who is certainly in her middle thirties.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You're damned right.

A MEMBER: Now he said, "You're damned right."

MR. H. SMITH: Now he just said that statement was "damn right." Now the fact is this shows the sexist nature of the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You should be spanked, too, because you're acting like a baby.

MR. H. SMITH: Now it's not just the Member for Sturgeon Creek, Mr. Deputy Speaker. How about the Member for Pembina, when talking about the fact, asking about if there was not a playpen in the Minister's office? He said, "She must be a high-priced babysitter." That also outlines the attitude of the Conservatives across the way.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Anybody that thinks my remark is sexist is a dirty old man; that's what you are.

MR. H. SMITH: Well, it's very, very clear.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You've always been a dirty old man.

MR. H. SMITH: Now you notice all the reaction. Make it clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all the Conservative Party has these attitudes. I'm saying there is a fair number of Conservatives who have these attitudes, not the whole party, because that party is an honourable, historical party in Canada, and I don't want to blacken their whole party.

I want to just refer to those people who do so, and who still are accepting it within their midst; that I think is the deplorable part. Their present leader has not repudiated, has not set the record straight and I think that is bad. Now it's not just the provincial party, it's the federal party as well.

I mean another Winnipeg federal member, Mr. Dan McKenzie, you can all remember when he was talking about a visit that was paid for, by the way, by the South African Government. He went down to South Africa and he came back here and he said that the blacks can't rule themselves, they're not fit for certain jobs, they're not suitable, they haven't learnt enough. It's a serious problem for that country.

I am only referring to things that are on the record. We also had recently the whole question of the leader of the Conservative Party provincially, the Member for Tuxedo, who has a membership in a squash club, and it's for men only. We had Barbara McDougall. (Interjection)- The fact is you have . . .

A MEMBER: You should be ashamed . . .

MR. H. SMITH: Look, I am not ashamed because there are Conservatives - now here we have other Conservatives echoing in support for that position.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: What about the men's section of the Deer Lodge Curling Club?

MR. H. SMITH: They're proving my case even clearer, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The fact is the Conservative Party attracts - the Member for Virden is supporting the same sort of comments.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they don't like to hear the truth. They don't like to go ahead and have it on the record clear-cut that they have - some of them, I wouldn't describe all of them as I said before with that attitude - but some of them are sexist and some of them are racist, very clear-cut, and I think we proved the case by the quotes I've already given.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member has just made the accusation that some of the Conservatives are racists and some of them are sexist; and this is a point of order. I would ask him to name those that are that way, please.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the member raising . . .

MR. H. SMITH: I should say this, they utter statements that are racist and sexist, and I would assume that they are from their statements.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Name them, name them.

MR. H. SMITH: The two that I would . . .

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

MR. H. SMITH: I was just going to name them.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the member who made those statements, will he attribute them to specific should say this, they utter statements that are racist and sexist, and I would assume that they are from their statements.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Name them, name them.

MR. H. SMITH: The two that I would . . .

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

MR. H. SMITH: I was just going to name them.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the member who made those statements, will he attribute them to specific people on this side? If he can't do that, then I would ask him to withdraw.

MR. H. SMITH: I've already done that, we know the dates and instances.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact is the Conservatives on the opposite side of the House are not very consistent thinkers and are not willing to stand up for things that are really worthwhile. For example, now they are in effect controlled by polling companies.

Now the latest and perhaps the most tragic example of this is the current Bill C-55 which will stop perhaps as many as 80 percent of refugees from being able to apply for citizenship.

Canada is a nation of immigrants, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and most times in our history we have prided ourselves on our record as a country that takes in

refugees and immigrants from around the world. Our record is far from perfect. Four weeks ago, a coalition of over 100 organizations and citizens from across the country was formed to combat aspects of the current federal Bill C-55.

In June of 1939, 930 Jewish refugees on the ship, St. Louis, fleeing from Nazi Germany, were rejected in Havana, the United States and in Canada. The boat was forced to return to Germany and the refugees were interned in concentration camps where they died.

No one denies that a portion of current immigrants who claim refugee status are not political refugees. Over the last two years, there have been three well-publicized incidents where would-be immigrants pretended to be refugees. These happenings in themselves are no excuse for legislation that will threaten the security of genuine refugees, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The current Bill C-55 is far too wide-sweeping, and will likely cause up to 80 percent of the refugees coming to our border to be turned away without a hearing. That is a mistake of this present Federal Conservative Government. It is my hope that, if enough people speak out saying this law must be amended, the Federal Government will have to respond to our concerns. Today, the bill comes up for a Second Reading in the House of Commons. Last night it was reported the United Nations Committee on Refugees has asked the Federal Government to amend or withdraw this bill.

The harsh measure of the new bill violates the standards set down by the United Nations High Commission on Refugees. It also likely violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

There are more than 100,000 homeless in this country at the moment. What is needed more than limits on immigration and refugees are policies that fairly distribute the wealth of this country. Manitobans recall all too well the way the CF-18 project was announced last year. If regional inequality is to be eliminated and a serious attempt made at reducing unemployment, then the Federal Government must change its priorities. I call upon Ottawa to treat all regions of this country fairly.

There is a consensus that Canada needs a new refugees' determination process, but the current legislation will not accomplish that. We need a fair fast procedure, open to all claimants, and consistent with the principles of fundamental justice. We must not betray Canada's tradition of compassion. Arguably . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order being raised by the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder if the member could tell us what publication he is reading from.

MR. H. SMITH: I didn't hear the question. You continue to mumble.

MR. D. BLAKE: I just wondered if you could tell the House what publication you are reading from.

MR. H. SMITH: I am not reading from a publication.

MR. D. BLAKE: What are you reading from?

MR. H. SMITH: I have my notes just like the two previous members, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

They tend to - well, I sort of compare them to turkeys. Have you ever visited a turkey farm? All the turkeys rush up and go "gobble gobble," and that's what the Conservatives across the way seem to sound to me at this moment.- (Interjection)- I'd like to continue my speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Like those members of a high-profile church delegation who sought to meet with the Federal Conservative Party Caucus, I am sadly disappointed with the poor attendance of the Conservatives at this meeting. Only 10 Tory M.P.'s deigned to appear to consider amendments to this extremely ill-considered legislative initiative. It appears that the Federal Government has already determined not to amend Bill C-55. I could give them the benefit of the doubt and assume that if they understood fully the implications of this bill, they would reject it immediately. Regrettably, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that both Provincial and Federal Conservatives are only too aware that Bill C-55 is discriminatory and makes a mockery of the Nasson (phonetic) Award which the people of Canada received for our previous progressive and humanitarian approach to providing sanctuary for those escaping persecution in their country of origin.

Actually, I am not surprised by the Federal Government's approach to refugee determination. One needs only look at the process by which persons were appointed to certain Human Rights Commissions. Out of 57 appointees, 48 have as their common qualification to sit in judgment at a salary of \$300 a day the fact that they were loyal Conservative workers or that they contributed more than \$1,000 to the federal Tory coffers.

It's important to have good people on Human Rights Commissions, because Human Rights Commissions were set up to combat the kind of prejudice and bigotry that ordinary courts don't deal with very well, and there is plenty of bigotry abroad, as well as in the Conservative caucus.

In fact, not long ago, officials in the Federal Department of Employment and Immigration began a hunt for people who were cheating on unemployment insurance. They picked out ethnic names to investigate. In fact, fewer people with ethnic backgrounds cheat than do WASP's. The people being investigated objected and took their case to the Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission. Nicholas Cliche, who heard the case, didn't think singling out people with foreign names did any harm.

Bill C-55 should, if the members opposite are indeed concerned with human rights and civil liberties, be vilified and condemned by all members of Her Majesty's faithful, obedient and subservient Opposition. The Federal Government should not turn its back on refugees, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Canada must remain open to refugees and should not take the regressive step of tightening access for all, just because there may be abuses by a few. I wonder if the Canadian government is considering doing more to prevent the creation of refugees. We have to work from both ends.

We need to object strenuously and to act more vigorously against the intervention of both superpowers in the affairs of developing nations. Such interventions hamper the struggle for justice and peace. Left to themselves, these countries could more quickly establish their own futures.

In Central America, it is the Reagan administration's policy that has had much to do with causing the flood of refugees out of the country but, because the U.S. is not prepared to admit this, it is not accepting any responsibility for them. Canada should be loudly protesting the terrorism of the American-backed Contras. Just today, it was reported that another Contra raid yesterday in the middle of the night at a farmhouse killed three children and several sleeping adults. The Canadian response to this terrorism must be better. Most Canadians are looking to the government to put justice before self-interest when disagreeing with the Reagan policy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I look across at the members opposite, I have to wonder how much longer some of them will be here. It is now clear that the Member for Sturgeon Creek, for example, will never be appointed to the Senate despite his long record as the red Tory in that Caucus. The Federal Government probably has no more loyal support in Manitoba than the Member for Sturgeon Creek, and yet he has never been appointed to the Senate or to the Board of Directors of Petro-Canada.

Similarly, the Member for Arthur, who was unceremoniously dropped as critic for Agriculture, will likely decide not to run again, rather than risk being dropped as Native Affairs critic and relegated to the backbench.

I grieve for the members of the Opposition who, in their slavish devotion to polls, have forced all members to oppose all measures taken in this Legislature. The Conservatives are being forced, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to oppose standing up for s of Petro-Canada.

Similarly, the Member for Arthur, who was unceremoniously dropped as critic for Agriculture, will likely decide not to run again, rather than risk being dropped as Native Affairs critic and relegated to the backbench.

I grieve for the members of the Opposition who, in their slavish devotion to polls, have forced all members to oppose all measures taken in this Legislature. The Conservatives are being forced, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to oppose standing up for fair prices for natural gas, for example. I am shocked and outraged, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has threatened to drop the Member for Lakeside from the front bench because he supports the principle of fair prices for natural gas.

A MEMBER: Over the front bench, or . . . ?

MR. H. SMITH: No, I don't think he'll throw him over the front bench. He'll just drop him like a hot potato.

MR. G. FINDLAY: What about a fair price for milk, Harvey?

MR. H. SMITH: Well, he talks about a fair price for milk. Their policy, once again, says they want high prices for milk. They want high prices for milk because they want, in effect, to allow the big operators to lower the price and to attract the business and then to be able to have all the business and be able to raise the price up again to having the highest prices of any area in Canada.

But let us not get distracted by the rantings of the Member for Virden. I notice, by the way, they keep on coming with my comment where I used it well today. I treat that as a compliment rather than as an attack. But let me go on with my speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Where is the respect for freedom of conscience among members opposite? Why can't the members opposite have a free vote on the issue of natural gas? Is the Member for Tuxedo worried that other members would support us?

The Member for Charleswood, who hasn't been able to afford membership in the PC Canada 500 Club for two years, would probably want to support this bill. I know that he, like many of his colleagues, feel that 24 Sussex Drive needs new wallpaper and carpets. They want to save money on their natural gas bill, so they can donate money to their federal party and get more refurbishing done at the Prime Minister's residence. I know that Garry Brazzell and Duncan Jessiman are very anxious to see members opposite contribute to the important refinishing project at 24 Sussex and 23 Kennedy.

Why did the Member for Tuxedo not tell his colleagues that the PC caucus room has air conditioning, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Was he afraid that they wanted to know about the sauna, hot tub and Jacuzzi in Room 172?

Where does the Member for Turtle Mountain stand on federal patronage and waste, Mr. Deputy Speaker? On Monday, he stood up in this House and boasted about the amount of toilet soap being purchased in this province by the Federal Government. Does he really believe Dan McKenzie when that famous Tory MP says that the reason that federal spending has dropped from 3.7 percent to only 2.4 percent was because Manitoba's businesses don't sharpen their pencils enough? Does the Member for Turtle Mountain think that an order for toilet soap of 11,000 is equivalent to the order for the CF-18 contract, or is that what he is told to say?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Federal Government cannot absolve itself of its responsibilities merely by ordering toilet soap. Regional development is not allocating 11,000 soap orders to Manitoba and a CF-18 maintenance contract to Montreal. I think the members opposite also should stand together and condemn the Federal Government for their faulty spending priorities.

The Member for Niakwa would likely support this bill if he was allowed to, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Member for Niakwa could expand his greenhouse and grow pineapples, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as he suggested last year in Estimates.

The Member for Kirkfield Park also probably has great misgivings about the federal plan to spend untold billions on nuclear submarines. No doubt she, with many others opposite, winced when it was revealed that the submarines will cost double the alleged figure that was tabled by the Minister of Defence. No doubt she, like the federal Cabinet Minister, Mrs. Vezina, thinks that Perrin Beatty is too young to be in the Cabinet. The Member for Sturgeon Creek would probably call Beatty a silly, little smart aleck and promise to spank him if he got near him. - (Interjection)- Do you agree? I gather he agrees. The Member for Kirkfield Park would probably want that money spent on day cares, women's crisis centres, community clinics, if she was allowed to speak out on the issue.

The Member for Pembina, no doubt, has already phoned the Federal Cabinet and asked them to shelve the defence paper and spend the money on new hospital beds. It's a pity that his leader will not allow him to say this publicly.

The Member for Minnedosa, who expected to be named a Citizen Court judge or at least to the Immigration Board by now, probably wishes he could be allowed to speak out. I am sure he wonders why Dan McKenzie still has not been named an ambassador or a Supreme Court judge.

The Member for Portage probably is very uneasy about opposing fair prices for natural gas. I understand several of his constituents have contacted him, asking him to support fair prices for such natural gas takeover.

The Member for Brandon West, no doubt, wishes he could publicly agree with his Member of Parliament, Lee Clark, that the Conservatives have too many MP's in their caucus and want to lose seats. Has the Opposition Leader forbidden the Member for Brandon West from announcing his new name for the Provincial Conservative Party, now that he has received many good suggestions on what to call the party, and not all of them were four-letter words? Why won't the Member for Tuxedo announce the winning names?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the two main supporters of Senate reform, the Member for Springfield and River Heights, no doubt, wish they could speak out on many issues. The Member for River Heights, whose own father was a Senator and whose party controls the Senate, has been forced to pretend that changing the Senate would somehow in itself change regional development. She knows all too well that her party has controlled the Senate for decades, and to pretend the crop of hacks and bagmen appointed since 1984 is any different is ludicrous.

A MEMBER: I like the way you say that with feeling, Harvey.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

MR. H. SMITH: What are her real views on the leadership of John Turner? Madam Speaker, why won't the Liberal Party allow her to state her views on the state of the Official Opposition in Ottawa today? Where does the Member for River Heights stand on the division in her federal party?

The Member for Springfield, not a Liberal but one of those rotten Conservatives, finds his Federal Government embarrassing and even went as a delegate to the Western Reform Party Convention in Vancouver a few weeks back. Why doesn't the Opposition party let the Member for Springfield express his views here in the House?

The Member for Morris opposes a progressive income tax, Madam Speaker. He wants taxes to be levied on all goods and people to pay taxes solely on consumption. Why doesn't the Leader of the Opposition state whether this is now the party's policy? What is he afraid of? Have they taken another poll, Madam Speaker?

Small wonder, Madam Speaker, that a group of high school students who visited this Chamber recently wrote to complain that the members opposite are all over the map, all over the floor, not very consistent with

their viewpoint ideologically, as they yell and scream and try to misuse the rules to hide their lack of substance. Such is the sad state of affairs we see today in the Legislature, Madam Speaker, that I felt I had to be compelled to get up, especially after the Member for Springfield uttered his utter rubbish. I had to respond to the comments, the challenge that he posed, and I've done so today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to have the opportunity to grieve this afternoon.

I must confess that after listening to the verbal diarrhea from the last speaker, I have become a little bit more motivated to stand up and speak to the subjects that I had jotted down.

Unfortunately or fortunately for the members opposite, I hope I won't need to read from a printed text. I feel strongly enough about the issues that I want to put forward today that I think we can address them without having to have someone in the backroom write them out for me.

Madam Speaker, we've just finished listening to a member who rather startled me that he had such an uneasy truce with the truth and with honesty and with the dignity of this Chamber. We hear comments about the fact that we are consistently being depicted as racist members in this House. I truly resent that remark. I notice that the member either forgot or avoided mentioning my name personally, but I have some considerable concern when the governing party in this province stands up and talks about racism when, at the same time, they would stoop so low as to pull the stunts that have been pulled on the Native people in my community and in my constituency.

I find it dismaying that they have been able to do things like going into Sandy Bay and, for three consecutive elections, promise that they will do something about the deplorable state of the road going into their reserve, and they conveniently forget till the next election. Then they go back with a handful of Chicken Delight vouchers and expect that people should vote for them again. It's an absolute insult to the intelligence of people who don't become deeply involved in the political process, but who would believe those who would mislead them and deliberately sabotage their right to make a clear and honest decision about who they want to represent them in the constituency when you have that kind of an attitude.

And as I previously raised in this House, it is also exemplified where they would go into the reserve at Ebb and Flow and offer them one-quarter of a million on the eve of the election. To think that they would treat the respect and the intelligence of those people in that manner, that they believe them, they trusted them and now they've conveniently forgotten them until the next election. That, Madam Speaker, is true racism. That's what comes from that side of the House; that is the background of the Member of Ellice and his party when they stand up and call us racist. He hasn't got the guts to stand up and withdraw that kind of action

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: . . . from those people and apologize for his party.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: He hasn't got the intestinal fortitude, Madam Speaker.

MR. H. SMITH: I didn't say that. Some of the members on the opposite side are racists.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose used the term, "hasn't got the guts." I want to make sure that he has changed his wording and withdrawn those words that are unparliamentary.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Absolutely, Madam Speaker, absolutely.

MADAM SPEAKER: I'd also caution honourable members on both sides of the House that we're getting very close to accusations that are not parliamentary as well.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Well, Madam Speaker, it certainly is below the standard of parliamentary representation that the people in this province, and the Native people in this province, should expect from their government leaders to pull stunts such as I just delineated.

Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the issues that I originally rose to speak on. I want to talk about MACC and the programs that they have introduced recently. The program that is being so gaily presented to the farmers of Manitoba, the Interest Rate Buy-Down Program, whereby the program put forward says that the farmers of this province can, through the generosity of the present administration, have the opportunity to buy down interest costs on the loans that they presently hold with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

Madam Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt in my mind or the mind of any other farmer in Manitoba, that MACC along with FCC, along with all the banking institutions, along with the government, provincially and federally, along with the farm community, has to cooperate to see the agricultural community of this province through the present depressed state of affairs. But it does little good, Madam Speaker, for this government to point east and say that's where the problem is and ignore what I consider their responsibility in this province. It does very little good because what it does is deflect the harsh light of reality from the programs that this government is putting forward.

While it may be not a very pleasant suggestion on my part, there are times when I wonder if the way of demonstrating that we have an NDP Government in this province, demonstrating to the public that they are running this province and that their only defence is to point to Ottawa, that perhaps we should give the Golden Boy a quarter turn because that's about the only defence that they have when it comes to the agricultural programs that are being put forward.

Madam Speaker, the MACC Program is a program that was put forward with a fair amount of fanfare. The

Minister of Agriculture has said to me, no, we didn't publicize it, it hasn't got an undue amount of publicity. Well, it seems to me that we have now got a government that is so acclimatized to publicizing and making use of every potential facet of public relations to sell their programs that they don't realize how much public education they are trying to put in place through their advertising programs.- (Interjection)- That's correct. Propaganda is probably a better way to refer to it, because there's a difference between propaganda and advertisement.

Propaganda is when you overstate a position, when you put forward a position that is not clearly delineated in order to achieve a mind-set in the public sphere that says, well, we'll have to accept this because nobody else can do any better, and this is the absolute epitome of good programs that could be brought in.

This program to which I am referring, Madam Speaker, was put forward as a potential to save costs to the agricultural borrowers in this province. Three options were put forward and the Minister has hotly denied on several occasions that this program has up-front costs to it. He says, all you have to do is choose another option.

Well, that's interesting. You can choose one of five options. You can choose one of six options I suppose, because you can leave your loan as it is. Because when you look at the options that are put forward by this program, quite simply, the results are not what was put forward in the sales job that was attached to this program.

The Minister has said that there were three criteria that would indicate when and if this program would be of value to the MACC plan. He says it has to be a large loan. He says it has to be a loan of significant length and it has to be a loan of a reasonably high interest rate, or a higher interest rate. Well, Madam Speaker, I can concur with that criteria, that should indicate whereby there would be an opportunity to buy down and make a saving that would be of a significant amount. But the Minister says that we, on this side, don't know how to read an amortization schedule.

As I've said before, and I say again, there are probably more people on this side of the House who read an amortization schedule because of the business they're in than there certainly is on that side of the House.

Madam Speaker, undeniably, on very many of the loans that are being offered, the first four options require additional expenditures in the early part of the loan. The savings on the fifth option in many instances - and I'm beginning to believe the majority of instances - are so insignificant that this again is a situation that is an affront to the intelligence of those farmers out there who are looking at trying to save a dollar in every possible way.

Now the Minister has clearly said that if we are looking for a subsidy program, forget it. There isn't any money. Well, if that's the case, then I suggest the priorities of this government are not too sharp. The Minister has said, if we want to look at the bottom line on how much money can be saved with this program, then we are wrong. The Minister can show, and many of the payment schedules will show, that after using the Interest Rate Buy-Down Program which is being offered, that after 14 or 15 or 20 years, the total amount paid against the loan will be reduced - and that is correct.

But who in his right mind thinks that the agricultural sector is prepared to cough up additional money or borrow additional money at this point? Because what has happened is that this program has replaced a program where we had a genuine interest rate reduction, albeit on a yearly basis, but that program worked for the MACC clients. They saw a direct and absolute reduction in their annual cost through that interest rate reduction. But that only lasted until the election, Madam Speaker. Once the election was over, all of a sudden that wasn't so important to have a direct and actual impact on the yearly interest costs of the MACC clients. I hope that the farmers out there have a long memory, and I hope that they relate it to when the last election was called.

Twenty-nine million dollars is attached to this program, Madam Speaker. That is being put forward to the general public as \$29 million that's going into the agricultural sector. But \$29 million that is being borrowed by the province to go into MACC to be re-lent out to the farmers is not part of the capital debt of this province because it is considered a loan that will be repaid.

So the actual money that's going into the agricultural economy is zippo. And to add insult to injury, there was \$12 million that was earmarked to go into the agricultural economy last year for the FarmStart Program and for The Family Farm Protection Act. I have yet to see any of it, in either one of those two programs, be implemented or had any money spent from them. So in other words, \$12 million that was put forward as the saving grace of the agricultural economy of Manitoba last year wasn't even spent - a hypocritical attitude if ever I saw one.

Madam Speaker, I can only ask why. Why are we being given these kind of programs? The answer can only be that this government has not been prepared to put money or put priority or put strong planning into the agricultural community. Certainly, we could talk about many other areas, but I'd like to zero in on this one area for a few moments, Madam Speaker.

The Member for Virden brought up a very good point today and one which has been brought up many times from the clients who have called us on this side and asked us to explain to them how this program was supposed to be of assistance. They have clearly asked: Can an amortization schedule not be rewritten in such a way that the final payments become the larger rather than the beginning ones? And that can be done. It, however, can be done an awful lot easier if there was some money attached to help reduce the total indebtedness. But we can, if we really wanted to do something about the MACC borrowers in this province, make it so that the savings at the start of the program are real. We can extend the amortization program. We can extend the length of their debt and we can accomplish that end with those means.

I would like to put on the record the facts where a loan still does not meet the needs of the person who holds the loan, even though it meets the criteria that the Minister put forward - a loan of \$92,000 which I think should qualify as a loan of some amount, of some considerable size; a loan that accrues a 14 percent interest rate - again I would suggest it meets the criteria of a high interest rate, a loan that extends over a balance that has 14 years left against it, and apparently that is where it fails to meet the criteria.

This young farmer took on a loan and he wanted to keep it, using the same principle that is implied in this interest rate reduction program. He saw that if he kept his term short he would pay less in the end than he would if he had a long-term loan. But his annual payments were higher. He took that risk. But now, with this program, he still cannot achieve the savings that the program was sold on the basis of, because the only way to now save the costs, or to help in this type of a situation, is to extend the loan while at the same time reducing the interest costs.

Madam Speaker, we simply have not met the problems of the agricultural community through MACC. The Minister says that he has told MACC to be a business-like corporation; that if they appear before any of the Farm Debt Review Panels, they will be treated exactly the same as any other lender.

The disappointing part that we have brought forward several times in this House is that, in fact, there have been numerous occasions when MACC has not acted as a sound corporate citizen in my opinion.

Some of those questions were sloughed off by the Minister. He said, if you've got facts, bring them to me; don't give me vague allegations, because you're hurting good people. And there's no way that I want to damage those people who work at MACC who are the good, solid employees who are trying to do their job. But if you're working with a policy that is short-sighted, there's not much you can do in terms of delivering.

I do not intend to spend any time talking about some of the individual actions that have occurred except to put on the record that the information is coming in, that the information is solid, and that we will be able to substantiate the charges that were made in this House. I'd like to take a look for a minute at some of the legislation that the government has brought in, and while I know that this is not the place to talk about the legislation, perhaps I can talk about what is not in the legislation.

It seems to me that this Minister of Transportation who has three bills before the Legislature at this time should have had enough guts to bring in legislation that would cover the sale of all vehicles to be safe. - (Interjection)- Madam Speaker, I apologize. He did not have the intestinal fortitude to bring forward the legislation that would have required all vehicles to produce a safe motor vehicle certificate when they go for registration.

A MEMBER: He wasn't gutsy enough!

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, we spend thousands, we spend millions of dollars in this country and in this province to put forward legislation that would improve the safety on our roads. I think that we have to have the commitment to go far enough in our legislation to put the emphasis on the vehicles that are being brought forward for registration, to be able to prove that they are, in fact, safe to go on the road.

We call vehicles in for intermittent inspection. We call vehicles in if they're inspected at random on the road, if it's found they are not safe. We spend time and money in many areas and this would be one of the simplest ways to control vehicles being put back into circulation which are not, in fact, safe. I refer not

only to the salvage vehicles; I refer to those vehicles that are being sold by private vendors.

I want to speak for a minute about the changing of the minimum wage that is being introduced into this province, and when we see that we have now put those underage workers at par with more senior and experienced workers when they apply for that first job, I suggest that we have done a disservice to the young people of this province who want to get that first job. When we see young high school students who want to go out and get a job in a restaurant, who want to get a job pumping gas, who want to get a job in any one of the service industries, and thousands of them have found jobs there and they will continue to find jobs there, but I suggest that this government is sorely misled when it suggests that there is not some advantages for both the young and for the employer to keep a differential.

I have a family that will want to apply for jobs in the very near future and when they go to the manager of the local fast food operation and say that we would like to work after four, for four hours, six hours, whatever hours he's got available for them, we want to work, we want the responsibility of having a job. And he has to say to them, well, I can hire your aunt down the road because she's worked for 10 years in this industry and she's got the experience and she wants a part-time job and she's willing to work for the same wage, who do you think is going to get the job? It's going to short-change some young people in this province.

It makes great press to say that now we have raised the wage level. There are repercussions out there that are going to hurt some ambitious young people who want to have a chance to get that first job, to get it on the record that they can work, that they can show up on time, that they can handle funds, that they're reliable. That's where many young people will get that first opportunity in the service industries and many of them now will not get that opportunity because those jobs will not be available to the same extent. More senior people will hang on to those jobs now, and unfortunately no one across the way seems to be prepared to address that problem.

I'd like to refer to the concern that we have in rural Manitoba where we look at the type of telephone services that we have. We constantly see the members opposite pointing to Ottawa and talking about the phone service - not talking about the phone service, talking about the postal service - they wouldn't want to talk about the phone service because that's the problem we've got in Manitoba, the postal service. They quickly point to Ottawa and say Ottawa's got to clean up its act, let's get something done. Let's not remove postal service. At the same time a service that is equally vital to those of us in rural Manitoba, as bad as the telephones, is not being given the same attention that it deserves.

I know that the Minister says he's going to do a review and that he will be making significant changes and, as a matter of fact, I have a meeting that I hope to have an opportunity to have some of my constituents talk directly to the Minister about their problems. But it points out to me, again, the hypocrisy that we see coming from this government. We see telephone service in small towns and villages where they cannot have more than 150 subscribers, where every call outside

of their own dialing directory is long distance. Every business call that they make is long distance. I think I've got a fairly large phone bill, living in the directory that I do, but when I see the phone bills of the farmers who live in the directories out in Alonsa and Amaranth and McCreary and Rorketon and Toutes Aides, I realize that they have a higher operating cost. You know the answer that the Telephone System has been prepared to give? They say, well, we've got to have revenue areas. We've got to have revenue areas.

I can accept that the Telephone System needs revenues and that they cannot constantly be cross-subsidizing. But I think that by perpetuating these dialing pockets of poverty that we have perpetuated on a small number of people the costs that are very unfair for them to have to absorb, and that they reserve a delivery that would allow them a larger area - and it's very simply done through the communication system that telephones use now - whereby the area that the business flows to in the greatest percentage becomes part of their dialing area.

We have examples right now of leapfrogging, where a community 30 miles away from a centre can dial to that centre toll free but cannot dial to the centre in-between toll free. But for business purposes, the telephone company has made this change and that's the kind of changes that have helped those business people and those people who require the phone a great deal and have to talk to the centre of business and activity, where they need to be in consistent contact.

That's an example of where I hope this government will take some action and move rather quickly. Yet we know that Manitoba Telephone System has gone beyond what we consider its mandate where they get involved in offshore investments, where they get involved in business dealings, that have been proven time and time again to have been foolish investments.

Madam Speaker, the issue of telephone service in rural Manitoba is only one of many issues that are distinctly rural, and I hope that you and the members opposite will indulge me when I talk about rural concerns, and I unabashedly am proud to say that rural concerns are what I want to zero in on.

We have an infrastructure problem that is looming in this province, but I don't believe this government has been willing to deal with - and I won't call them gutless this time, Madam Speaker - but I will call them deceptive, because we've got a problem in rural Manitoba that was given some direction or indication of direction through the Main Street Manitoba Program. What we have now, of course, we still have the Community Places Program, but we're headed towards - and I'm not sure if the Minister of Natural Resources or the Minister of Highways or if anyone on that side is aware of the problems that may be down the road.

But I hold here in my hand, Madam Speaker, a brochure from the local watershed conservation district, a water conservation district that has done an enormous amount of good and is now going to be faced with enormous problems. If their problems are in any way indicative of municipalities and conservation districts and the concerns that they're going to be facing across this province - and I believe they are indicative - then we have got a situation building in this province, as is probably building in many other provinces in this country, and that is that the infrastructure is going to

deteriorate rapidly in the next decade and we are going to need massive amounts of resources to deal with it.

You know, there's the obvious infrastructure. There are the roads and the bridges and the highways and the airports, the drainage ditches, but when we now reach a situation where some jurisdictions are going to have to close roads because they don't see where they're ever going to be able to achieve the funds to deal with the replacement problems that they have, then we are only hiding our head in the sand if we do not strongly address this problem on a long-term plan. I'm challenging the government to put forward some kind of a plan to deal with this problem. If they are aware of the problem, then they had better be trying to develop a plan or, when we become government, the problem is going to be even bigger because the next few years is when we are going to see a rapid deterioration of this infrastructure.

Frankly, the promises that were made in the last election were veiled promises to the elected local officials that this government would do a great deal towards addressing this problem. I would like to see if they have made any progress because, from what we have seen of any reports that have been brought forward from Mr. Anstett, it does not indicate that they truly grasp the problem that's out there.

Madam Speaker, I had occasion to sit and talk to town mayors and councillors of some of the rural towns in my constituency. They are concerned about how they are going to be able to face the replacement costs of their sewage infrastructure. They've got a beautiful looking street that has been redone under the program, Main Street Program, that may very well have to be torn up now to replace the sewage system that's underneath it because it's still the old wooden-stave system. I wonder what help they can expect from the province. I wonder what kind of planning they can expect to see to help them develop a program, a long-range plan to deal with this. I'm afraid it will be absolutely nothing. I'm concerned that these municipalities and these towns may be left to their own resources, left to their own devices as to how they will deal with this.

I can tell you how they'll deal with it. They will raise local taxes as much as they can afford. They will do what they can at the local level, but they may very well be faced with long-term problems and the deterioration of the infrastructure that they will not be able to deal with. Then what will happen? Will they have to close down parts of it? That would be the worst-case scenario but, unless this province has a long-term plan, it might become a reality. I hope that none of us in this Chamber are in government if that becomes a reality, because we have got to be sure that we can address these problems and not wait until they manifest themselves before us.

Madam Speaker, I really want to emphasize, in the infrastructure concerns that I'm trying to put before the Legislature today, that so many people feel that, if it's buried and it's out of sight and you can't see it, it's not a problem. That's what's wrong with some of the programs that we've seen brought forth from this government.

They have been able to bring forward the ones where the big signs go up, Main Street Manitoba, Jobs Fund sign, big signs that are stuck out everywhere, Premier Howard Pawley plastered across them.

At the same time, how are you going to put a sign like that up beside a sewage project? Somebody's liable to write something indiscreet on the sign or whatever. It's not the kind of project that is a high-profile sign campaign, and that's the problem that I have, Madam Speaker. I look, and I hope that the Minister responsible for Energy will take a moment and share it with us and look at these letters and brochures that are going out, very well done, promoting the nationalization of natural gas, being sent out to the senior citizens of this province, preying on those who are concerned about their day-to-day living costs, telling them how they will save them from damaging, increasing costs.

Madam Speaker, what concerns me is that this is just another example of the type of program that went out with the MACC Interest Rate Buy-Down Program. I'd be very interested to see the Minister of Agriculture tell us how many people take up on the Interest Rate Buy-Down Program, because I would wonder if we won't find that it's going to cost several hundred dollars per client to get a sign up after we've paid for the advertising costs.

What we're seeing here in this project is a propaganda project to try and sell a government project that has not yet worked its way through this Legislature, has not yet had the facts and the figures put forward to clearly delineate to this Legislature what the program and the future intentions of the plan is. Clearly, Madam Speaker, I resent having these types of brochures sent to the senior citizens in rural Manitoba and, while there is nothing in here that is frightening, there is nothing in here that is threatening, the very fact of the outline of the concerns that are put in here and the manner in which it is presented tends to raise concerns in the minds of those out there who are least able to defend themselves, raise concerns that, gee, maybe there's a problem here that I didn't know about and the government is sending me these nice letters. This is the second in a series of letters that have come out to the senior citizens in my home community within two weeks from the office of the Premier.

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't mind a little publicity. I don't mind a little promotion, but I really do become concerned when I see the citizens of this province being bought with their own money and being given, what I consider, a sell job on a piece of government policy that has not yet been willing to put forward enough facts to prove itself. It has not been willing to put forward all of the intentions behind this move. Madam Speaker, I believe that what I see is another example of where we are buying the people of this province with their own money.

It's a deception that concerns me. It's a deception that the people of this province deserve better. I would hope that, when the next election comes, Madam Speaker, we are still able to point to these types of brochures and ask the people of Manitoba, is this what you really want? Do you want more government intervention? Do you want more government dollars washed down the drain in another ill-conceived Crown corporation? No thank you, Madam Speaker.

When we have the example of the management that this government has been unable to apply to our Crown corporations, it's no wonder that, when we address certain Ministers, we address them as the irresponsible Minister for MTS or the irresponsible Minister for MPIC.

Thursday, 25 June, 1987

We're all honourable members in this House, Madam Speaker, but some of us are rather irresponsible.

Madam Speaker, there's one message that I want to leave on the record today with my grievance and that is that I want honest, fair, forthcoming government and we're not getting it.

A MEMBER: Not from you guys.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Agreed? The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Since there is a mood in the House to call it five o'clock as opposed to going to Committee of Supply at this point . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I believe that can be accommodated in terms of moving into Private Members' Hour at this time if there are no other speakers.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I wonder if the members would have any consideration for calling it six o'clock.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock?
The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I don't think there's any - I mean if they're not going to speak. - (Interjection) - No.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: No, Madam Speaker, we're not prepared to call it six o'clock. There is at least one of our members who wants to introduce a bill under the Private Members' Bill portion.

After that, if there is no other business, we might consider it then.

MADAM SPEAKER: So it's the will of the House to call it five? (Agreed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 5:00 p.m. then, Private Members' Business, Debate on Second Reading, Public Bill No. 17, the Honourable Member for Kildonan has seven minutes remaining. (Stand)

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 54 - AN ACT TO VALIDATE BY-LAW NO. 3678 OF THE RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF ST. ANDREWS

MR. C. BAKER presented Bill No. 54, An Act to Validate By-Law No. 3678 of The Rural Municipality of St. Andrews, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. C. BAKER: Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise this afternoon to speak to the bill that I've just read the second time. What we've heard all afternoon, Madam Speaker, I suppose didn't make the pleasantest listening, but I think this bill perhaps will make our day and perhaps finish it off in a good tone.

Madam Speaker, it's not too often that a municipality comes into the kind of a gift that this bill will give the Municipality of St. Andrews. Back at the beginning of the century, a family moved into the R.M. of St. Andrews and settled on a piece of land near the River Road. For some of you people, if you don't know where the River Road is, it's just from Parkdale off up along the Red River and then continues on to Lockport. It's a beautiful piece of land. It was owned by a pioneer family, a family who you will see have done a lot for the community and, even at the end of their days, still want to do more. I'm talking about the Larter family of Parkdale in the Municipality of St. Andrews.

As I said earlier, the Larter family came here at the beginning of the century and settled on a piece of river land, stretching for some three-and-a-half miles from the river eastward, and farmed it all their lives. Mr. Larter, the name was Free Larter - it's not too often you hear a name like Free Larter, but that was his name - served as Reeve of the Municipality of St. Andrews for 20 years.

The family was somewhat unique in the fact that they did not always subscribe to the theory that bigger was better. They made a living out of the property that they had and quite often, when people would talk about the Larter family, they would refer to them as the nature boys because they would often say, when there was a rainy spell or when there was some bad weather, that was nature's way, that was nature's behaviour.

This family, Madam Speaker, is now survived by two people, and they've seen fit to bequeath the Municipality of St. Andrews with some 70 acres of land on the terms that the municipality would keep it as a green area to be used for family picnics, for perhaps a golf course some time in the future, for nature trails, sporting grounds and sporting activities. The property, Madam Speaker, is probably worth about .75 million, so I think it's commendable that somebody should want to give that kind of a bonanza to a municipality.

I also think that we should be commending the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews because they too are accepting quite a responsibility, because that piece of land will not be developed by itself. It will not be cared for by itself. So the municipality and the council there, Reeve Peter Ducheck and his council have taken on, I think, a sizeable task in tending to that land.

I think, Madam Speaker, that it's not very often that we have a chance when all sides of the House can appreciate and be grateful for the kind of a gift that the Larters are giving to the Municipality of St. Andrews.

It's not just to the Municipality of St. Andrews, Madam Speaker. You know, with the close proximity that it is to Winnipeg, I'm sure it will be enjoyed by many people from the City of Winnipeg and from all of that area lying west of the Red River up to Selkirk, and maybe even beyond.

So with that, Madam Speaker, I would like to again commend the Larter family and the Municipality of St. Andrews for taking part in this kind of a venture. I would recommend that this House unanimously support this resolution.

Thank you very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Virden, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 30 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE "PINE RIDGE GOLF CLUB"

MADAM SPEAKER: Debate on Second Reading, Private Bill No. 30, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Debate on Second Reading, private Bill No. 55, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed)

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS RES. NO. 2 - FREE TRADE

MADAM SPEAKER: On proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has seven minutes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie asked me to relate to you that he had finished his remarks when he last spoke.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

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

I'm very pleased, Madam Speaker, to be able to participate in this very important debate on Canada-U.S. trade negotiations.

Madam Speaker, this is an incredibly significant policy matter and I doubt that anyone in this House will question that the current bilateral trade negotiations between Canada and the United States could have very

significant implications for the future of our nation, both economically and politically.

Madam Speaker, this debate and this resolution of the Member for Kildonan are very critical in our view because we're talking about shaping Canada's future. However, Madam Speaker, we're talking about such a major decision in the context of a great deal of uncertainty, in the context of many mixed messages, in the context of considerable confusion.

Madam Speaker, no one knows what this perspective trade deal will contain - let me re-emphasize - no one, not even the Honourable Pat Carney, not Simon Reisman, not the Prime Minister, not even Ronald Reagan. I think it follows, Madam Speaker, that anyone currently trying to sell any one of us on a free trade deal with the United States is trying to sell us a product that is not even off the drawing board, and obviously in such circumstances it's necessary to be cautious of such sales promotions.

So, Madam Speaker, this resolution becomes very critical in that context. It's important that all members of this House become aware of the issues before us and work very actively to put together proposals and suggestions that will benefit Canada. Madam Speaker, the kind of negotiations that we are dealing with are taking us into basically uncharted waters. If these negotiations are successful, Madam Speaker, it will be the first international trade agreement of its kind dealing primarily with non-tariff issues; non-tariff issues like services, like intellectual property, like regional development subsidies, like government purchases, like patents. No one knows, Madam Speaker, what position the Federal Government is exactly taking and whether or not Canada's interests are being protected or whether the Federal Government is poised to make major concessions to the United States.

Manitoba is very concerned in that context. Colleagues, at least on this side of the House, are very concerned about that kind of a scenario and as a consequence, the Government of Manitoba has refused to endorse or reject a trade deal which we have not yet seen. I don't think any of us are prepared to write a blank cheque until we have a better idea of what these negotiations mean. It's critical in that context to have adequate public consultation and debate on the substance of these negotiations. As Jim Laxer has written in his recent book on trade negotiations: It's no exaggeration to say that the fate of this undertaking will have more to do with determining the shape of Canada for decades to come than any other decision we have made as a nation in the 20th Century.

Madam Speaker, we have many concerns on this side of the House. We are concerned that the agreement might restrict supply and management practices in agriculture. Madam Speaker, we are concerned that investment policies may be included in these negotiations. Madam Speaker, we are concerned about the impact on service industries and totally opposed to the notion of unrestricted competition with the United States in trucking and telecommunications.

Madam Speaker, above all, we are concerned that there have been no guarantees and no clear statements, no unqualified statements, that there will be nothing in the final agreement that will interfere with our ability to protect, promote and ensure growth in the Canadian culture and the Canadian cultural industries. It is this

matter, this matter of the threat to our culture from U.S.-Canada trade negotiations, that I'd like to particularly focus on today, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, Canada has always had a tradition of development through a mix of private and public sector involvement in the economy, a tradition and a history that is very different from the way the United States was developed. Without this mix, Madam Speaker, we would not have built our airlines, our railways, our telecommunication links, our health and post-secondary education services, the Trans-Canada Highway or the St. Lawrence Seaway, and, Madam Speaker, we would not have established cultural institutions, such as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Film Board to interpret our society to itself and the world. It is this matter of the threat to our culture from Canada-U.S. trade negotiations that should cause us all a great deal of concern.

Madam Speaker, when I speak of Canadian culture, I'm not speaking solely about institutions, such as the CBC or the National Film Board or about industries such as publishing or recording, I'm talking about culture in its broadest definition. Culture as defined by authors like John Hutchison, who wrote, "A culture is a way of doing things and a way of reflecting on what we do; a culture is a shared life, because individual experiences can only be shared with others in cultural terms."

Much of our culture is so apparently natural and so inherently a part of our lives that it requires no specialized production. It is spontaneously taught and learned.

Or let me rely, Madam Speaker, on another definition of culture by the Actors-Writers Guild. That statement goes: Every society has its own culture, a set of shared meanings and understandings, norms, values and beliefs that shape the action of its members. These shared understandings are what make societies different from one another, what makes Canada different from Britain, from France, from the United States. Our behaviour as individual members of a society, as well as our economic, social, political and artistic concerns as a society, are reflections of this culture.

Regrettably, Madam Speaker, there are those who will argue that Canadians do not have a unique and distinct culture. Madam Speaker, as well there are those who will tell us that free trade will give us huge access to the American market, but unfortunately that's not the issue for our cultural workers and our cultural industries. The issue, and I think all members in this Chamber should never forget this, the issue is access to our own domestic market. That's particularly important to acknowledge and to act upon in the context of a situation and a country where the mass media are more massively dominated by American imports than any other in the world.

Eighty percent of the English language book market makes profits for foreign publishers and their branch plants in Canada, which incidentally publish less than 30 percent of the books by Canadian writers. Seventy-five percent of all programs on English television are American, 98 percent of all dramas, sit-coms and movies. And in the meantime down at your local Famous Players or Cineplex, home grown films get access to the silver screen about 3 percent of the time.

That kind of an analysis has been well documented and described by authors and writers across Canada, such as Susan Crean who has been predominantly focused on this issue of trade and the bilateral trade negotiations. And through all of that it is clear that despite this overwhelming domination by American multinationals, it must be recognized that Canada's cultural industries make a substantial and growing contribution to the national economy.

In fact, I think we all have to remember that culture is Canada's largest industrial employer. It employs 4 percent of the labour force, more than the Government of Canada and its Crown corporations. It is Canada's sixth largest industry in terms of wages and salaries and eleventh in terms of revenue, some \$7 billion annually. It is labour intensive, 66 percent of expenditures go to labour compared to 20 percent for manufacturing.

And finally, Madam Speaker, cultural industries pay more in taxes than they receive in grants. None of this happened without tremendous input from the Canadian public sector. The Federal and Provincial Governments support cultural industries directly or indirectly through a wide range of mechanisms. Mechanisms that include grants, subsidies, taxation policies such as tax breaks to Canadian film makers and income tax law that favours advertising and Canadian magazines and on our Canadian TV stations, and mechanisms such as legislation and regulations, as an example, Canadian content regulations in TV and radio.

Madam Speaker, a 1985 comparative international study of public and private arts and support in that field, shows that art industries in the United States depend on government support for about 5 percent of their income. In contrast, Canadian arts enterprises derive more than 50 percent of their total income from government sources. So we obviously have here in Canada, as ACTRA in Saskatchewan has said, a delicate balancing act which sustains our cultural industries, and which points, again, to the critical nature of the Canada-U.S. trade negotiations.

ACTRA Saskatchewan said it this way, "The infrastructure that supports the Canadian cultural community contains many parts, start tampering with one and the entire system is in danger of collapse. Bargain away Telefilm Canada and film production withers putting hundreds of actors, writers, directors, technicians, designers and musicians out of work." It will seriously undermine the CBC's efforts to produce Canadian products for prime time. Loss of film or television production in any community means a loss of employment in other spheres, as well.

Madam Speaker, I see that my time is running out. Let me say that it is in that context, and that tradition in Canada for sustaining and supporting culture in arts that we enter into Canada-U.S. negotiations with some hope but, Madam Speaker, with a great deal of skepticism about future developments for Canada about the very future of Canada.

I would urge all members to enter this debate to speak on behalf of this resolution and to send a clear message to Prime Minister Mulroney to ensure that the culture of this country of this province is protected and allowed to grow for decades and decades to come.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

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

I am certainly pleased to take the Minister of Cultural Affairs up on her offer that each member of this Assembly should participate in what is an extremely important debate.

But, before I start my comments today, Madam Speaker, dealing with the substance of the resolution, I want to compliment the Prime Minister of Canada and the Minister of the Canadian Wheat Board for their efforts in placing before the highest trading tribunal and the highest trading courts of the world, the Geneva talks, the concern that they have about the international trade war in agriculture products.

I believe, ladies and gentlemen, members of this Assembly, that's truly leadership, it's truly leadership. It's not going out into uncharted waters; it's not going out and upsetting the whole Canadian system, Madam Speaker; but it is taking a leadership role, on behalf of the farm community, on behalf of all the people of Canada. I think that the Minister would have been far better to stand in her place, rather than criticizing the Federal Government, once in her life compliment them.

Madam Speaker, so I want the record to clearly show that the leadership that is shown by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, when it comes to trade and looking after this country, are head and shoulders above anything we've ever seen come from a New Democratic Party, or a Liberal Party in Ottawa.

Madam Speaker, you know one has to really, again, with this resolution, put it in perspective. This really, when you go through it, this really is another NDP fearmongering resolution, and there's one word in this resolution that has the New Democrats and the Socialists upset, and I'll deal with it directly, and that's the word "free." Any time they see the word "free" it's a terrible, terrible thing. Free is almost treated like profit with them; it's the worst word you could ever see. It means horror; it means horror to the people of Canada; it means horror to the people of Manitoba. That's what free means to them, Madam Speaker, to the socialists; that's what it means to them.

Free means to me, Madam Speaker, that we have a system, a country that operates with the least legislation possible, with the least regulation on people's lives possible . . .

A MEMBER: Intervention.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . and intervention, as my colleague from Roblin-Russell says. Let the people's wishes and wills dictate for the best interests of the people and the nation, Madam Speaker. And I will deal clause by clause with this, what I would call fearmongering resolution, Madam Speaker. Let's deal with it. Of course, we have to take into account who introduced the resolution and we do not want to get into personalities or backgrounds, and I won't.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Why not?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, my colleague from Sturgeon Creek says, "Why not?" Madam Speaker, I do not want to get into that in the debate.

But I do want to deal with this, the first "WHEREAS": "WHEREAS a comprehensive, bilateral, free trade

agreement with the United States is not an appropriate solution . . . "It may not be a total solution, but it's a start to a solution of the problems that we have as far as expanding the markets and assuring long-term markets for the labour people of this country, the people who are needing new jobs, Madam Speaker.

There is no substantiation; there hasn't been any substantiation that that's a true statement they're putting forward, that it's not an appropriate solution to overcome the transitory problems of U.S. protectionism.

Well, what is their solution, Madam Speaker? What is their solution if they say the one that's being presented by the Prime Minister in the House on Commons in the Government of Canada today, what is their recommendation? We have nothing but a bunch of negativisms across the way, a bunch of negative people. Yes, Madam Speaker, they have nothing positive to enter into debate and put in this Legislative Assembly.

Let's look at the second "WHEREAS," Madam Speaker: "The suggested benefits of comprehensive free trade with the United States have been greatly overestimated." Well, how have they been overestimated? I haven't heard the Prime Minister or any of my colleagues in Ottawa say that there are going to be massive increases of employment, that there's going to be any major changes take place. "Overestimated" is a word that they haven't quantified, they haven't justified, and the member who introduced it, I would have hoped, would have.

We have seen again another word used here that can't be substantiated. I don't think it's overestimated at all. In fact, what I'm hearing coming from the Government of Canada is a reasonable approach, and I've heard it talked about - fairer trade - not necessarily free trade, but enhanced trade seems to be a better terminology - that they want to assure some long-term industrial jobs, that there are cautious steps being taken when it comes to the industries that are under protection like the supply management industries.

Let's go to the next "WHEREAS": "WHEREAS the economic dislocations and adjustment problems of a comprehensive free trade agreement have been continually underestimated." Again, using that word that they haven't been able to quantify, haven't been able to lay before the public any justification for the using of a word "underestimated," - nothing further to substantiate it with. Again, the only reason that it was introduced to this Legislative Assembly was for their own political fearmongering approach to the people of this province and Western Canada.

"WHEREAS continental rationalization of production will in all likelihood," those very definitive, positive terms, "will in all likelihood make Canada a "low-tech" ghetto in the 21st Century." What the dickens is he talking about when he talks about a "low-tech" ghetto is what free trade will mean to Canadians?

We're in an international world of trade, competing with Japan, competing with the industrialized nations of the world, and because we enhance our trade with the United States and keep up to the technology and the demand of the market there with transfer of technology back and forth, I would think, Madam Speaker, that one would have been better to say we will see an advancement in our technology. We have never been hurt by technology that flows in from the

United States, Madam Speaker. In fact, I would say, probably, that's one area that we may - and I use the word "may" - see some positive developments quicker than anywhere else.

So, Madam Speaker, to turn this country into a low-tech ghetto is absolutely, totally irresponsible terminology to use in any public debate or any public forum because it can't be substantiated and is absolutely a fearmongering approach on the subject which is important to the people that support and elect these people as it is that support and elect us.

Madam Speaker, "WHEREAS the greatest potential for harm in a comprehensive free trade agreement would come to the resource exporting regions of the Atlantic Provinces and the West." Where has he been? Where has this Minister of Agriculture been? How does he think we operate our grain farms in Western Canada? Where do we sell our grain? We sell it into a free trade international market.

It can't hurt us. It can't hurt us on the side of our sales. We are already hurting and they haven't recommended anything positive to help us. We buy our fridges and our stoves and our consumer products basically Canadian-made, and I can tell you if we had a little bit freer trade we would probably have them bought for a little less money by Western Canadians. I think probably we'd have it bought for a lot less money when I compare the costs of some of the consumer goods in the United States, directly across the border from where I live, and where we have to buy in Canada.

As long as Ontario is the industrial muscle of Canada and have the seats in the House of Commons, do you think that they're going to throw willy-nilly to the wind the protectionism that they have? No way, no way! So we don't need to worry about an irresponsible throwing to the wind of our protectionism for the industrialized people. No way, but what we do need is some work to enhance the markets that are available to all Canadians, and that's what I perceive happen.

I hear the argument coming from people that it is going to hurt our sovereignty, that it's putting our sovereignty on the table. No way, Madam Speaker, no way is that about to happen. We know that we've got a strong nation and we know that our friends in the United States to the south of us respect that. I don't see any way, shape or form of any sovereignty being put at threat because of free trade negotiations, Madam Speaker.

I would far sooner have, Madam Speaker, a friendly good working trade relationship with them than to see the way in which mud was thrown in their faces by the socialists every time they turn around and turn those people off. They've probably done more in their irresponsible activities, whether it be marching in front of the U.S. Embassy, with the burning of an American flag, Madam Speaker, to hurt the relationship between Canada and the United States than anyone else in our nation, and yet they stand up and have the gall to introduce a resolution with so much negativism to it.

Madam Speaker, and, yes, I know there are concerns. The Minister of Culture is quite rightfully correct in standing saying she has some concerns about the film industry, about the actors and the entertainers. What is she doing though with her department to enhance it? -(Interjection)- Yeah, she's helping all right. She's helping a certain group in our society with certain film

productions and presentations that I don't think too many societies want as the major foundation of their society. That's where she's coming from.

Well, it would just about knock you over, Madam Speaker, to hear the Minister of Culture say the cultural industries pay more in taxes than they receive in grants, and she's almost astonished at that kind of a thing. Well, goodness sakes, Madam Speaker, where does she think she's at? I mean where is she coming from? Does she not feel that that's the way the whole system should work, that if you're going to run the services, the health services and all the government needs that they should pay taxes, more than they receive? If you had everybody in society receiving more grants than they're paying in taxes, you'd have an economy like they've got in Manitoba under the socialists like before. We've been told the whole of Canada would be broke. That's exactly where they would head us, and we're paying the price. That's that socialist - well, of course, they used the Member for Brandon East as their economics professor - so we now know why they're looking at the world upside down.

Madam Speaker, could you indicate how much time I have left for my remarks?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has three minutes remaining.

MR. J. DOWNEY: So my three-minute warning light is flashing. Thank you, Madam Speaker. You're very observant. I didn't know you could see that little light from way up there. You've got good eyes.

Madam Speaker, let's go further to the "RESOLVED's" because I want to conclude my remarks with that. Well, there's not much, Madam Speaker. Let's go to the "RESOLVED's."

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that negotiations with the United States be limited to sectoral agreements rather than a comprehensive package; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Canada should pursue fair trade with all nations, including the United States, through the GATT . . ."

Well, Madam Speaker, when I.

Madam Speaker, let's go further to the "RESOLVED's" because I want to conclude my remarks with that. Well, there's not much, Madam Speaker. Let's go to the "RESOLVED's."

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that negotiations with the United States be limited to sectoral agreements rather than a comprehensive package; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Canada should pursue fair trade with all nations, including the United States, through the GATT . . ."

Well, Madam Speaker, when it comes right down to the "RESOLVED's," they're probably not as far out of line as they are with all the preamble to it. That's their biggest problem, that the "RESOLVED's" aren't as bad as the preamble. But the final "RESOLVED" is:

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Federal Government should direct its energies to restructuring the Canadian economy . . . "Now what does that mean coming from a socialist? Does the restructuring of a Canadian economy mean we should have more grants paid out to the people than the taxes coming in? Is that restructuring?

"... to ensure the establishment of a national policy of equitable industrial development in all regions of Canada, and break down barriers to interprovincial trade." Well, I could agree with that, to break down interprovincial trade barriers because we do have a lot of interprovincial barriers. In fact, it probably would have been better advised if the resolution had dealt with that and forgot about the criticisms that they put in the initial proposed resolution.

I conclude my remarks, Madam Speaker, by saying before they continue to put resolutions that are of scare tactics, that are irresponsible without substantiation, they should think twice about it. I make no bones about it, Madam Speaker, I'm for enhanced trade with the United States. When you look at 200-and-some million people immediately south of us and this province immediately in the centre of our country with all the opportunities to enhance the jobs, to enhance the kind of lifestyle that the people of Manitoba could have through enhanced trade, I fully support it, Madam Speaker, and I'll stand on any platform and say it and debate it with the socialists of this House.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before recognizing the next speaker, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students from Grade 6 from the Morris School, under the direction of Mr. Terry Serediuk. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

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

RES. NO. 2 - FREE TRADE (Cont'd)

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I want to take this opportunity to place a few remarks on the record on this resolution, after hearing a former Minister of Agriculture from the Conservative side elucidate on his position on free trade, Madam Speaker, it's no wonder that he would, in fact, as we did on sugar beets, want to sell out the shop or give it away in terms of any negotiations that we've had with the Federal Government or others, he would do the very thing with the United States. He would sell out the shop in quest of some notion of free trade, Madam Speaker. That's what his position has been and one revealing comment in his remarks was that we should be able to buy wherever it is cheapest, Madam Speaker, in terms of our goods as farmers in this country.

Well, Madam Speaker, I would subscribe to that position provided we were not asking the taxpayers of this country, who are also employees and workers, to pay for income support programs, to pay for a two-priced system of wheat in this country which I support, to pay for income stabilization for the hog sector which I support in national support programs, to pay for - (Interjection)- I'll deal with turkeys, Madam Speaker, to pay for subsidies to sugar beet growers on a provincial basis.

Madam Speaker, if that's their notion of free trade, I don't subscribe to that position. I want to say to my honourable friends, it was an early Prime Minister, in fact, one of the Fathers of Confederation, the first Prime Minister of this country, Sir John A., who said that policies of this country are first to develop Canada. Madam Speaker, their position is to sell out Canada, to give it away.

MR. L. DERKACH: That's silly, Billy.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell calls that position silly. Madam Speaker, I heard him on a platform just a few days ago in Binscarth, he said that our policy - they were concerned it was a silly policy dealing with natural gas. Madam Speaker, is \$50 million in the consumers' pockets silly, because that's what the honourable member is saying. He's saying that somehow we have concerns. There is one member on their side, who knows, that knows what the full value of public ownership of the distribution of natural gas is, in addition to the 50 million.

It will be an issue in the next election. I want to tell my honourable friends, it will be an issue, to be able to provide services to Manitobans. I expect, Madam Speaker, that those members will be standing up and accounting for it. How many communities?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has the floor. Any other member who wants to participate in the debate can wait their turn.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, members opposite know that they are on very, very slippery ground. I'm glad that the Member for Roblin-Russell got up at Binscarth and said publicly that he really doesn't support our entry into natural gas - doesn't support the issue, the issue of providing natural gas to consumers of Manitoba at about one-third the cost that we have been paying up till now.

Madam Speaker, those are the free traders. Let's look at the natural gas issue as it relates, in terms of Canada's own interests, and the province's own interest.

Alberta and our present Federal Government said: Yes, we want to deregulate natural gas prices. We want the world price totally deregulated. Madam Speaker, the moment they deregulate it - what are we having now? We have the Province of Alberta saying: Oh, we want the open and free market, to rule only when the price is high, Madam Speaker, only when the price is high.

But when the price is down and we can ship natural gas to the United States at almost half the cost of what we are paying here in Manitoba, no more free trade, no more open market, Madam Speaker. We now want to control the price. That's the kind of free traders, Madam Speaker, we have on the other side of the House.

To stand up on the public platform and say, we don't want to save Manitoba consumers \$50 million a year,

Madam Speaker, I find that a very weak position, a very weak position, vis-a-vis - (Interjection)- Madam Speaker, I'm pleased that there were some people in this Chamber listening to this debate.

The Honourable Member for Arthur talked about wanting greater access to markets. Madam Speaker, there is no one in this Chamber, I believe, that does not want greater access to markets, but on a fair basis. The member talks about free trade. What will happen, for example, to our brewing industry, Madam Speaker? The Member for Sturgeon Creek, a former Minister of Industry and Trade, knows what would happen to the Canadian brewing industry if there was an open-border policy.

What will happen to the constituents of the Member for La Verendrye and a number of other members, in terms of supply-manage commodities? They'll give you the marketing boards; they'll tell you, you can have your marketing boards. Let's open the border, Madam Speaker, we'll raise and remove all the import permits. What will happen to the entire feather industry in this country, the dairy industry? Chaos, Madam Speaker, chaos. It should be wiped out, and the members opposite know it.

Madam Speaker, what we have done in the supply-manage areas, we have said that consumers will pay a fair price and we are, in fact, even Conservatives talk about managing the market and managing supply. Even this new farm organization, these Canadian cattlemen who want to have greater access to market talked about wanting to have a greater . . . just a minute here, I want to quote Mr. Wilson who set up this new farm organization in which members of the Provincial Hog Boards have joined.

Madam Speaker, I think the Provincial Hog Boards who want to have greater access to U.S. markets is laudable; it is laudable, but they cannot argue and should not be arguing that that access to those U.S. markets is there at any cost, because they are asking all the workers, all the taxpayers of this country to provide income stabilization for their product when markets are low. Madam Speaker, for them to say, we want access to that market regardless of the consequences is very, very dangerous, very dangerous indeed, and I would caution anyone to suggest that that is the approach to be taken.

Madam Speaker, if we would have free trade, we would not have a sugar beet industry in this country. No, we would not have a turkey industry; I've acknowledged that, you should have been listening to me, the Member for La Verendrye. We would not have a poultry industry in this country without free trade, but the poultry industry in this country, the feather industry in this country has in fact cleaned up its shop. It has not asked for one penny of public subsidy to that industry.

But what it has done, it has said that if we will manage supply in this country, we will not overproduce. That's not what the sugar beet industry wants. The sugar beet industry says, because of the nonsense of the Federal Government - and I call it nonsense - we are now going to offload our expenditures and we're going to provide a sugar beet industry that will be supported 66 percent by provinces.

If we had a free and open market, we would not have a sugar beet industry, Madam Speaker, because

I think, as the present Prime Minister at one time said, free trade is like sleeping next to an elephant, and when the elephant rolls over, guess what happens to the person who sleeps next to him? Not very much movement after that elephant rolls over on you, not very much movement. And I think, now that same Prime Minister is proposing to say, at all costs we will open the doors to free trade, Madam Speaker.

I believe that it is in Canada's interest to set up trade relations around the world, as this resolution states, fair relations, fair trade relations. No one is arguing about the need for greater access to markets, Madam Speaker, no one on this side, but that access has to be fair.

Madam Speaker, at a time when the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives are continually putting up and wanting to put up greater and greater barriers in the area of trade, and especially as it relates to agricultural products and other areas. We should be very, very leery as to what kind of negotiations we take up.

I would like to say, Madam Speaker, that there will be some gainers, there will be some winners in any negotiations, but the question is, how many losers and how much loss will there be to Canada, will it be at the expense of industrial development in the Maritimes; will it be at the expense of our supply-managed commodities across this country, including the west; in agricultural, will those areas, in fact, be traded away?

Madam Speaker, I venture to say that the negotiations that will go on, they won't trade away marketing boards, they will not give up marketing boards, no, I understand that. Maybe some of the farm community don't; maybe some of the members opposite don't. Marketing boards will stay, but a heck of a lot of good will marketing boards be when they open up the border and say you can bring in the product, as they are doing from time to time on the import permits.

The Member for La Verendrye knows what I talk about when he talks about import permits. When that commodity comes in, when it's dumped, when there's excess production in the United States and that commodity comes in at half the price, you could have marketing boards until you're blue in the face, your industry will be dead. And that was done and can be done overnight, Madam Speaker, because we know the extent the poultry industry and its fluctuations in the United States. One company, just in Minnesota, for example, produces more turkeys than the entire 100 producers of turkeys in Manitoba; one company, one farm. They not only produce them, they process them, they breed them and they market them; one firm, Madam Speaker. Is that the kind of farming that members opposite adhere to? Maybe they do; let them stand up and say so.

That's the essence of efficiency. Madam Speaker, the essence of efficiency at what cost; at what cost to the whole history and, in fact, the lifeblood of rural Canada in the way it was structured? We have to go back in terms of Canadian history and look whence we came from and how we developed. And what are we prepared to do, or what are we allowing to happen to our areas of regional development, our whole structure, our whole farming community, how that will affect our entire farming community with the area of free trade, Madam Speaker.

Because the only bright spot today in agriculture is our supply-managed commodities. It's the only bright spot in agriculture. There are some market surges in terms of beef at the present time, and in hogs, Madam Speaker, they are cyclical and there will be a downturn. Sure as the lights are on here, when those lights go off, as well, the markets will, in fact, be cyclical. And, generally speaking, what has occurred over the last number of years is that the downturns have been far longer; the depressions have been far longer than the upturns, which means that we, as taxpayers in this country, will in fact be called to play a very major role in the support of those commodities.

So, for some members, a former Minister of Agriculture, to get up and say we want free trade, we're wanting free trade at the expense of taxpayers and taxpayers who support the farmers in this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

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

I'd like to make a few comments in respect to free trade as well, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for the Minister of Agriculture but, when he puts certain things on the record, I must say I'm sort of shocked and dismayed at the comments that he has made in his speech. It's unbelievable when I hear the Minister of Agriculture that he doesn't take a broader view as to segregate Manitoba basically from the rest of Canada and the rest of the world.

When you look at Canada having an \$80-billion surplus with the United States, and when you then talk of free trade, you know who's calling the shots. I think we have to realize . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye has the floor.

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

I really appreciate that when you make the members of government recognize also the Opposition and a little silence in the House, Madam Speaker. It is not fair.

Madam Speaker, when you talk of free trade - and I agree that it should be called fairer trade. I agree that the name isn't possibly quite right. But at the same time, Madam Speaker, negotiations have to take place. Do you realize what happened in the drug patent legislation that was before the federal House? I can remember members on the opposite side, on government side, speaking up against that, who to this day haven't read the bill, don't know what the bill is about, and still public outcry against the bill.

Yeah, the Minister of Industry and Technology is laughing and I don't blame him because he knows it's the gospel truth. I would believe not 10 percent of the members on that side of the House know what the bill is actually about, but I could tell you. My time would be limited on that, but here they voice their opinion strongly against it because of what it is. It is the Federal Government that is in favour of it.

Madam Speaker, this free trade issue, we have to make sure that we get the best deal possible out of that trade deal, because the trade negotiations will take place whether Canada wants to negotiate or not. Madam Speaker, we just heard the other day that our auto trade agreement is going to be on the block as well. Well, six months ago, we would have thought, hey, that's enshrined in stone, that will never be negotiated on, but it will be. The \$80 billion surplus is at stake, Madam Speaker, and unless we're going to address the problem - I think our Member for Arthur put it on the line very, very simply why are our grain prices as low as they are. It's not Canada's dictating the price or asking for a certain price in the world market. It's the United States that's dictating the price and I think, the sooner we realize - we've got the milk industry. The United States would only have to increase their milk production by 10 percent, and they would absorb all of our milk production, and we have to stay competitive. Madam Speaker, we have to stay competitive in Manitoba; we have to stay competitive in Canada, and that's what is going to dictate to us our free trade.

I found it interesting when the Minister of Agriculture - and this is actually what inspired me to get up and speak on this, and that was in respect to sugar beets. I actually find it ironic in one sense that the Minister of Agriculture will constantly talk of sugar beets. He's at Altona at the district meeting, municipal meeting, and he brings out and makes a comment, in spite of the Opposition. And he states about 1985, May 4, that paper that the Honourable Charlie Mayer signed and sent to him that there would be no more Manitoba contribution in respect to sugar beets.

Well, Madam Speaker, it's in '86 that he signed a strategy paper with the Federal Government, with all the Agricultural Ministers, agreeing to tripartite stabilization. But that he will never mention, Madam Speaker, and this is what basically motivated me to get up and put on the record that I think that we as members of this House, as members of government have an obligation that, when we speak out, No. 1, it should be truthful. Madam Speaker, we should never try to deceive the public. We've seen that before the last election. I'm not going to mention all the different items.

When I see the Honourable Minister at Altona, I want to be proud of our Minister of Agriculture, in spite of him sitting at the other side of the House. But when he tries to mislead the public - and if it's unparliamentary to use "misleading," then I'll even withdraw, but that's the only way I can express myself, Madam Speaker. I think it's in the wrong context when he just uses a part of something of that nature. I believe all of us here in this House should be - I've heard you indicate many a time that all members are supposed to be honourable, or are honourable.

Well, Madam Speaker, I can't quite agree with you on that statement because I believe, in order to be honourable, you have to act honourable.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. PANKRATZ: It's like, whether you're at home or whatever, you can't demand respect, you have to deserve it, and you earn it. Unless you earn it - and

that's what I find, and that's what motivated me. Because I believe that the Minister of Agriculture sort of wanted to - he saw me sitting here listening to him and he sort of wanted to get back at me, I don't know for what reason. But when he's distorting the facts on the sugar beets and I realize that, when free trade will come up, possibly that will be on the table.

But let's not forget we've got an \$80 billion surplus that we have to address through free trade, and the United States is calling the shots. Madam Speaker, thank you for allowing me to make these few comments.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I've just heard from one of my colleagues it's six o'clock, but I think it's important to put my views on record. I'd like to actually table a document. On June 4, 1987, Bill Merkin, Deputy Chief U.S. Negotiator for the U.S.-Canada trade agreement, briefed Congressional staff on the progress of negotiations towards a bilateral U.S.-Canada trade agreement. I have a summary of this. I'd like to table copies of this in the House, Madam Speaker.

I would like to, in effect, deal with certain portions of this, Madam Speaker, that really reveal the hidden agenda that the Conservative National Government has. For example, let's listen to what Bill Merkin says about the cultural sector. Now, I know you people on the opposite side, you tend not to want to listen. You tend to want to spout off the line of your national party and, no matter how many errors they make nationally, you march side by side with them.

Let me quote the section on cultural sectors. This is what Bill Merkin, the Deputy Chief U.S. Negotiator, had to say: "Cultural sectors as defined by Canada include films, broadcasting, publishing, and sound recordings. The U.S. Administration will push Canada to define them as narrowly as possible to prevent Canada from using 'cultural sovereignty' as a broad means of protection."

Now, we all know that already our cultural sector is attacked, because we have so many Canadian magazines that are not able to even reach the newsstands because the space is taken by American publications. We have the American signals come in from their TV stations and, quite truthfully, we need to protect our cultural industries. I think it's important to reveal the hidden agenda as shown by this document.

Now, another thing is on the Auto Pact Agreement. This is what the document says, Madam Speaker: "The Administration is confident that Canada will agree to drop the duty remissions program (although the Canadian negotiators have not formally said so). The Canadian Federal Government thinks it can get provinces to agree to remove the duty remissions program and make requested changes in the Auto Pact because it can threaten to withhold substantial federal revenues from the provinces."

Now, they have said, Mulroney and others have said that the Auto Pact Agreement is not on the table. Here, this speaker representing the U.S. Government says that they have indicated that it's on the table.

"Auto tariffs will also be dropped," he continues. "The Administration is also trying to address the issue of offshore production and plant closings.

"There are two reasons automakers operating in Canada consider the Auto Pact advantageous: (1) Duty Remissions Program; and (2) Multilateral Implementation by Canada. If the U.S. can get at these two things, the pact becomes no more than a shell. Looking at it from this angle, it will not be necessary to completely remove the Auto Pact" agreement.

So right away, they have outlined that this is their agenda. Wait, Madam Speaker, members on the opposite side will see this come true. Members opposite always talk about, at length, the member from wherever the hell he's from - (Interjection) - sorry, sorry. I'll withdraw that, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. H. SMITH: I just forgot where Jim Downey comes from.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

We also don't mention honourable member's names. We call them only by their constituency.

MR. H. SMITH: The Member for Arthur, he's not the Agriculture critic any longer, but he keeps on talking and all the Conservatives talk about the fact that they have an interest in agriculture. Let me read from this document the hidden agenda that the American Government has and they are, in effect, supporting blindly the Federal Government's position.

Here's what it says: "The issue is on the table but not much progress has been made so far. The Administration will address Canadian dairy and poultry quotas and discriminatory practices of the Canadian Wheat Board.

"The most important issue for agriculture in the talks is to try to develop a unified stand on agriculture subsidies and global agricultural policies so the U.S. and Canada can increase negotiation power in the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade talks.

"The U.S. and Canada both have meat import laws. Canada is interested in exempting each country from the other's meat import laws."

Now, they are saying very clearly that they have a hidden agenda in this area, and I don't see how the Conservatives across the way can be supportive of this. They read the Globe and Mail, they read the Free Press. They should know about the Auto Pact Agreement.

Now, the service industry, I have one article here talking about the service industries that appeared in the Free Press. You will have the franchises come in and take over the book industry, the book retail shops. They'll start a firm, mass advertising, and they'll drown the little Canadian out of business or down to a subsistence level.

Hair cuts - I don't care what the industry is, even in banking, insurance, stocks, they are going to enter the service industry in this country and they are going to take jobs away. Now you people don't mind that, you don't care. Madam Speaker, you know, you've heard the Conservatives yourself and you know their outlook. They don't care about the little guy, the little businessman. They care about the multinational, the big outfit.

Look it, I know you people from what you stand for, what you say and I know it's clear-cut that you people

Thursday, 25 June, 1987

are not concerned about Canadians losing their jobs, you're not concerned about the small businessman who struggles to get ahead.- (Interjection)- I know, look it, they react to that, don't they? They want someone to get up and make a speech that sort of goes along with them, that doesn't make any firm commitment to an independent Canada with independent sovereignty.

The fact is, I just was in the library, the Reading Room here in the Legislature the other day, and the librarian has two bound copies of old newspapers from 1911. You Tories across the way should look at these, because the 1911 election was one that was fought on reciprocity. The Liberals were for free trade. You people that time - your stripes were different - at that time, you were against free trade. I went ahead and read over some of the material. By the way, there was - (Interjection)- You change your position not by examining the position, not by coming around to a

conclusion of what you would like to see for Canada and Manitobans, you just echo your federal party blindly against all evidence that's been presented. You just don't listen.

Now the Member for Arthur -(Interjection)- you know, you see the "monkey see-monkey do" sort of, the three figures. He always represents that view in the House. He makes faces and plays with his hands and really attempts to be funny instead of seriously addressing the issues.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The hour being 6:00 p.m., I'm interrupting the honourable member, who will have six minutes remaining when this issue is again before the House.

The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday)