



Third Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



VOL. XXXI No. 3 - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 16 APRIL, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 16 April, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports By Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to file a copy of each regulation filed under The Regulations Act, being Regulations Nos. 23582-27 182 inclusive; Nos. 183-27683 inclusive; Nos. 184-6084 inclusive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Conservation Districts of Manitoba Annual Report for 1982.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I have leave to make a non-political statement at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if there was ever any doubt that Manitoba was truly the curling capital of the world, I think that 1984 proved that we are just that. When the last rock was swept, Manitoba counted five Canadian championships and one world title. History was certainly made. It has never happened before and I'm sure that we're not going to see that repeated too often, if ever, in any province.

Bob Ursel and his Granite foursome started with a victory in the Junior Men's and will represent Canada - there is a chance to have another world championship in Canada in next year's World Juniors; Connie Laliberte and her Fort Rouge rink rule the world in ladies curling in Perth, Scotland; Mike Riley from the Pembina Club captured the Brier before losing in the semi-finals at the Silver Broom in Duluth; and Lloyd Gunnaugson's Valour Road squad set a record of its own by winning the Senior Men's for the third year in a row; D'Arcy Kirkness and her Assiniboine Memorial team won the Canadian Junior Women's championship. Manitoba was also represented with distinction at the Canadian Senior Ladies' championship by the Mabel Mitchell rink from

Brandon who was the previous year's winner and ended up losing in the finals; and also the Canadian Mixed by Cliff Seward of Manitou.

Much credit comes to these rinks but, of course, we should remember the two Ladies' and Men's Curling Association because they had to be well organized to do so well.

To highlight this success in curling, we'd like to do something a little unusual. We can't do that with all sports, but to remind the rest of Canada what we're doing in curling, it is the intention of the province to host a banquet for the curlers, for these five teams, where we will present the appropriate medals and ribbons.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: I'd like to say, through you, Mr. Speaker, that members of this side of the House wish to join the Minister of Sport in his announcement and his congratulatory note on the five Manitoba rinks that won provincial championships as well as the other Manitoba teams that did participate in national championships, as well as the five Manitoba teams that won national championships.

We, on this side of the House, have a number of members that do participate in the great game of curling and I, for one, being a personal friend of Mike Riley's, was very disappointed that he wasn't successful in Duluth, but we were certainly pulling for him as were all Manitobans. I congratulate the Minister and his government on having a provincial dinner for these worthy curlers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for 1983, the Municipal Board - I believe the Clerk has copies for all members - and the Actuarial Report on the Pension Plan for Employees of Participating Municipalities in Manitoba as at January 1, 1983.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 68 students of Grade 9 standing from the St. Boniface Diocesan High School. They are under the direction of Mr. Bennett and Mr. Magnifico. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Also before Oral Questions, I have a statement for the House.

On Friday, April 13th, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain raised a matter of privilege concerning the issuance of a Special Warrant. I took the matter under advisement in order to peruse Hansard and review the facts. When a matter of privilege is raised it is necessary to show: (1) that the matter is raised at the first possible opportunity; and (2) that a prima facie case exists which would justify giving the matter priority over all other items on the Order Paper.

Since the matter was raised on the first day of regular business of the Third Session, I am satisfied that the matter was raised at the earliest possible opportunity.

The second requirement is a little more complex. The need for and special use of Special Warrants for the smooth administration of the province have been in use for some years, and are specifically provided for in Section 42 of The Financial Administration Act. Thus, the issuance of a Special Warrant is not in itself a matter of privilege. It is when the size of the Special Warrant is sufficient to obviate the necessity of having an Interim Supply Bill passed through the House that a matter of privilege may arise.

It should be borne in mind that the passing of the Estimates and the approval of the Supply bill are among the most fundamental principles of Parliament, and any infringement would be a matter of privilege. Since the Estimates debate has not been concluded until well into the fiscal year, it has been the practice of the House to advance a portion of the money by way of Interim Supply, with the proviso that the Estimates would be debated and passed.

If there were a limit or restriction on Estimates debate, it could be argued that Interim Supply gave the members the opportunity to complete their debate. Since there is no limit or restriction on Estimates debate, members have the opportunity for full and complete debate. Thus, the size of the Special Warrant is a matter on which the government has decided in the administration of the province.

It is a matter for debate between the members and not something for the Chair to decide. There is, therefore, no prima facie case that would give the matter precedence over other matters on the Order Paper.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: With respect, Mr. Speaker, we must challenge that ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be upheld? Those in favour please say, Aye? Those opposed please say, Nay? In my opinion the Ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

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

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Pawley, Penner, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uskiw.

NAYS

Banman, Downey, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 26; Nays, 19.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is accordingly sustained.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Special Warrant covering funds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. The Financial Administration Act states, in part, that where funds are insufficiently provided for the Cabinet may pass a Special Warrant covering funds that are urgently and immediately required. Since the Cabinet has passed a Special Warrant for \$1.5 billion, which is larger than any Special Warrant ever before passed in the history of the province and, indeed, larger in dollar value and percentage of government spending than any Interim Supply bill ever passed by this Legislature, how does the Minister of Finance justify the urgency and immediacy of that action?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that matter was dealt with in the matter of the question of privilege, but I can certainly send a copy of the News Service release which I issued on the day that the matter was made public by the government over to the member and he can read that.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, The Financial Administration Act is, of course, put in place to govern the management of the financial affairs of this province. It appears that, in this case, The Financial Administration Act has been breached. It depends upon whether or not the Minister can justify the immediacy and urgency of the \$1. billion. I therefore would ask how he justified

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In a ruling you gave to the House before question period today, and just now confirmed by the House, it was suggested that the matter raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain as a matter of privilege, was a matter for

debate among members. We certainly acknowledge that. The purpose of question period though, Sir, is not for debate and not for questions of legal interpretation or legal debate in this House.

The appropriate opportunity for that debate, if the member wishes to engage in it, is the Throne Speech Debate about to take place. But certainly the purpose of question period is to elicit information, not to engage in debate which the member is obviously trying to do.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure that the honourable member will recall that questions should not ask for a legal opinion nor should be argumentative, but in fact should ask for information.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for a legal opinion. I am asking how the Minister of Finance discharged the duties which are clearly placed upon him in Section 42 of The Financial Administration Act. What was the urgency and the immediacy of \$1.5 billion being passed by way of Special Warrant? If the Minister can't justify that then he clearly is in violation of The Financial Administration Act.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are aware that the House sat for some time at the beginning of this year, January and February, and it took us some time to get matters ready to come back before the Legislature. — (Interjection) — Well, if the Member for Sturgeon Creek wants to answer, he can do so.

A MEMBER: You don't have an answer - again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance can't justify the urgency and immediacy of the \$1.5-billion Special Warrant, can he tell us who made the estimate that \$1.5 billion was urgently and immediately required?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It appears that the member has forgotten who makes decisions when people are in government. It was the Executive Council.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister of Finance recommended this breach of The Financial Administration Act to his colleagues, did he consult with the Provincial Auditor or the Legislative Counsel? — (Interjection) — And the Minister of Finance says from his seat that that is a lie. I say the Minister of Finance has broken The Financial Administration Act and he should answer to this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, once again on a point of order. The purpose of question period, regardless of the innuendo and attack which is contained in the last statement by the Member for Turtle Mountain, and without commenting on the character of that statement,

I would suggest that that line of questioning is one which engages in debate, is argumentative and is not designed to seek information.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wishes to ask questions in question period then certainly he knows the rules. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, it's up to all members in this House to observe those rules so that the benefits of questions period are there for all members, not just for the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's on the same point of order. Surely anything that is the subject matter of debate is also the legitimate subject matter of questions.

Mr. Speaker, your ruling, which we have respectfully challenged, points out that the question of privilege with respect to the issue raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain, in your judgement does not exist. It does not detract in any way the questions that are being asked whether or not a Statute of the Province of Manitoba has been breached, and those are the straightforward questions that the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is asking about. — (Interjection) — We haven't had the answer from the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Minister of Finance is under no obligation to answer a question, but perhaps I can give him one final opportunity to justify his action which appears to be in contravention of The Financial Administration Act.

How did he justify the urgency and the immediacy of a Special Warrant for \$1.5 billion?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite matters, let me make it perfectly clear that it is our opinion there is no question; that there was no breach of any act; that we had the legitimate right to do what we did; and again, if he wants the justification, I am prepared to send a copy of the news release over to him which deals completely and sufficiently with our reasoning for doing what we did.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Are we now to accept propaganda releases, by way of news releases through the Information Department, as justification for actions of Ministers of the Crown when there is a question being placed as to whether or not they've breached acts of this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as it was indicated clearly to the Member for Turtle Mountain, it is not our opinion that there was any breach. Any breach as alleged, is a figment of the imagination of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. But, Mr. Speaker, when there are attempts to provide lengthy answers in the House, it is suggested that the Minister is simply providing propaganda.

The Minister made reference to a News Service release. It would indeed be helpful for the honourable member probably to peruse that News Service release in order to make himself more familiar with the basis for the issuance of the Special Warrant.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister wishes me to peruse the news release from his propaganda department, I would like to send a copy of Section 42 of The Financial Administration Act to the First Minister so that he can peruse it.

Assessment Review

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister how many farmers in this province have been asked by his Assessment Branch to provide information with respect to income, such as income received from surface rights agreements, to be assessed by his Assessment Branch as to whether or not his farm dwelling is subject to taxation. Could the Minister indicate how many farmers in Manitoba have received that kind of information or that demand from his Assessment Branch?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I don't have the exact number at my fingertips, and I'm not sure if the exact number can easily be obtained. There are tens of thousands of farmers in the province, and the assessment process is an ongoing process.

I can only assure the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that the procedures followed, by assessors and by councillors sitting in Courts of Revision, are in accordance with the same statutory provisions that were in place when members opposite were responsible for the administration of that act. The only way in which they might in substance vary, would be a reflection of court decisions which have been taken with regard to the assessability or exemption status to be granted to any such property.

But certainly the question of taking income off-farm into consideration, as a determination of whether or not an exemption shall be granted with regard to farm residences has been in the statute in its current form since 1924 and in the Statute in one form or another since 1894. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that — (Interjection) — late 1893, the Attorney-General, who is more of an authority on the laws of the province than I am, advises me.

Mr. Speaker, the key element in this question related to assessment reform in the long term is a recommendation in the Weir Report which suggests that farm residences should no longer be exempt and that all those residences should be taxable.

Mr. Speaker, the Weir Report makes that recommendation and I think that it is one that merits attention because of the difficulty of determining who is a farmer for purposes of granting that exemption.

I think the member highlights a very real concern that local municipal councils have, and I'd welcome discussion with him during my Estimates on the measures assessors take and Courts of Revision take to try and address this difficult problem which I hope some day will be resolved through assessment reform.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A supplementary question - and I thank the Honourable Minister first for his lengthy answer even though he didn't give me the information.

Since this Legislature in its collective wisdom last year established the Surface Rights Board which would sit to handle concerns of farmers regarding agreements for compensation because they have lost farm income through the operation of various oil companies, and because this Legislature considered it of such significance that they established a Surface Rights Board, will the Honourable Minister consider the income from surface rights compensation as farm income just as they presently consider income from crop insurance as being legitimate farm income? Would the Minister, in considering it, ask his department to take that in full consideration as farm income and not as other income?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, without in any way supporting the suggestion that income which clearly is not related directly to the definition of farming - production of crops, livestock, etc., - but rather compensation with regard to mineral rights, the damage done to crops and to the available use of fields does appear to have a similarity to crop insurance. On the basis of that similarity, although I am not willing to concede that it is the same, willing to suggest there is a similarity, I will ask staff to have a look at that and I'll get back to the member with a more detailed answer.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I want to first of all clarify, I'm not asking for exemption from any mineral rights, royalties or anything of that nature. It's the issue of surface rights compensation for lost farm income. Now, at the same time will the Minister consider deferring all Courts of Revision until this matter has been clarified, because ratepayers only have 10 days to file their objection if Courts of Revision are going to proceed without this clarification being made, would the Minister consider that?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinction the honourable member makes between surface rights and compensation or payments revenue received with respect to the ownership of mineral rights. My difficulty was in agreeing with him that it is distinctly a farming loss or farm income and should be so defined. I've taken it as notice and will report back further to him on that.

With regard to the implications on Court of Revision, Mr. Speaker, I'll also have to take that question as notice to determine whether or not the matter has to be addressed as a policy question prior to the completion of Courts of Revision. I'm not sure that's the case. I have had discussions with staff on this matter - in fact, just this very morning - and I'll get back to the honourable member as to whether or not there is

a specific impact on Court of Revision that has to be addressed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, along the same line of questioning to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, can the Minister of Municipal Affairs confirm that he has, or his staff have, taken upon themselves to follow the same line of tactics as the Federal Department of Revenue, when it comes to the assessment of farm buildings, as it does incomes to the people of Canada, Mr. Speaker, when the farm people who are being sent letters accusing them of being guilty, and they have to prove their innocence, is that his policy or is that his Department of Municipal Affairs who are carrying that out? There's an accusation made that the farm community are guilty and have to prove their innocence by forwarding all documentation which is really private and none of the department's business.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, contrary to the suggestion contained in the question of the Honourable Member for Arthur, there is no taxation of farm buildings. The only taxation which applies is farm residences. Farm buildings have been, are, and continue to be exempt and that law has not been changed and, as I said in response to the Member for Virden, it's been in place in one form or another since 1894, or perhaps the fall of 1893.

Now, if the member has some concern regarding the taxation of farm residences, which I think was the more direct reference that could have been made, he will recall that, when he was on this side, the same problem with regard to determining whether or not an individual qualified for the exemption for that individual's principal residence, faced his government. That problem relates to the question of net income and whether or not 50 percent or more of the net income of the individual comes from farm sources.

Mr. Speaker, that's a very difficult question under both the legislation and under court decisions. Most of those took place prior to the formation of this government and, since there have been no legislative changes since then, they all still stand. Access to income information has been provided for under the statute and that information is provided by way of justification for an application for exemption.

Mr. Speaker, the crucial thing here - and I'm surprised the Member for Arthur does not make this distinction - an individual is applying for an exemption and, in so doing, provides income information under the act to justify that exempt status. But any comparison of that process with National Revenue is not warranted, is totally unfounded. The authority is provided for in the Act, which remains unchanged from the day he was on this side.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and keep my questions short to not get into debate. The Minister of Municipal Affairs makes reference to farm dwellings and I will certainly make reference to farm dwellings. I will ask him if he agrees with this letter of notification that went from his department to a large number of rural people - he wouldn't identify the number, but I

know there are a large number of people - and if he'd bear with me I would ask him the question if he agrees with the statement that was sent: "If you, as an owner, tenant, lessee or occupant consider yourself not liable to taxation on your dwelling, a net income statement will be required as verification." A net income statement as verification. The final sentence is: "If no reply is received within 30 days we will assume that the dwelling is subject to taxation." Does he agree with that approach to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, although I have not seen the specific letter to which the member refers, it obviously conforms in its intent with my previous answer to his question, and that answer stands. An individual who wishes to have his or her farm residence exempt . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . If the honourable members opposite would like an answer to the question, I'd be happy to provide it. Only those individuals who qualify are exempt. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba don't think that everyone's exempt from property tax, only those who meet certain qualifications. The letter clearly states that to obtain the exemption an individual must provide an indication that they are a farmer in accordance with the provisions of the Act. That's what I said, in my words; the letter chooses to use slightly different words to express the same intent. I have no problem with the fact that those claiming an exemption must show that they have the status entitling them to that exemption. To do it any other way would make a farce of our taxation laws.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell the Legislature and the people of Manitoba how he and his department, his government, determine who will be sent these letters in Manitoba to pay these taxes? How does he or his department or his government determine as to who gets these letters and who does not get them?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm certain that the letters do not go to people living in the City of Winnipeg; I'm certain that they go to people who would normally want to qualify for an exemption, and I would think that the letters would then go to those people who would normally want to qualify for the exemption. But I suspect they don't go to all 30,000-or-so farmers in the province, only certain municipalities in the province are reassessed each year. I expect that the letters would go out to farmers in those municipalities that are being reassessed. Now, within those municipalities, how those individuals who wish to have the exemption are chosen to receive the letter asking them to provide evidence that they're entitled to the exemption, that I'll check with my department and I'll get the information for the member.

But to assume for a minute that it's some percentage of all of the farmers in the province, no. It would be only in municipalities where reassessment is occurring and it would be with respect to those who want the exemption and about whom there is some question

with regard to the status of their income, whether it's at least 50 percent on farm income.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Another question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In light of the fact that his department is demanding that information within 30 days of the mailing of that letter, how can he reconcile that with Section 41(1) of The Assessment Act, which says that "if a person wishes to appeal their assessment they must file with the Court of Revision at least 10 days before the court sits?"

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is confusing apples and oranges. The first provision — (Interjection) — I didn't want to use the term "bananas" for obvious reasons. Mr. Speaker, the provision which the Honourable Member for Virden quotes, reference to the letter, is a determination in the preparation of the assessment roll and precedes the Notice of Assessment which usually goes out in the fall of the year, and the determination on that notice whether or not an individual's farm residence is assessable and therefore taxable.

The Court of Revision process follows that notice. So, first an individual is determined by the assessor to either have exempt status for purposes of farm residence, or non-exempt status. Only after that status is determined and appears in the Notice of Assessment does the Court of Revision process and the 10-day notice apply. They're two entirely separate questions. One happens months before the other occurs.

Jobs Fund

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry. Could the Minister explain his statement that the Manitoba Jobs Fund has created some 21,000 jobs, in view of the report in the Winnipeg Free Press of April 10th, quoting from Statistics Canada, where Statistics Canada report an increase of 9,000 full-time and 4,000 part-time jobs between March, 1983 and March, 1984? Could the Minister explain the basis for his claim?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What was indicated in that statement that there has been, during the course of the first year of the Manitoba Jobs Fund, some 21,000 Manitobans who have worked on Jobs Fund supported projects. They were for varying lengths of time depending on the specific project, but the fact is that some 21,000 Manitobans have been able to have varying lengths of work during the year because of the Manitoba Jobs Fund and the co-operation that it received from the business community, from other levels of government, from the Federal Government and the Municipal Government, and various community organizations throughout the province.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answer that the jobs were for varying lengths of time, could he confirm that some of those jobs were for as little as one day's duration?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There is no question that the jobs were for varying lengths of time because many of the jobs were related to construction activity that was taking place with Jobs Fund supported programs. There were many jobs that were of long-term duration for all of the year, in fact, there were a good number of permanent jobs created out of the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, under the Jobs Fund Manitoba Employment Action Program, some 40 percent of jobs that were supported under that program turned into permanent, full-time, regular jobs for Manitobans.

I'm informed under the Science and Graduate Program under the Manitoba Jobs Fund, that those jobs turned into permanent jobs for graduates of Manitoba universities. I know in that specific program I've had representation from the business community indicating that that was a good program. In many cases, those were jobs that they would have otherwise not created without the assistance of the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are jobs of varying lengths of time, some of short-term duration that were part of the construction jobs related to specific construction activities, others of a longer-term nature, and a good many that turned into permanent, regular full-time jobs for Manitobans.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has not answered the question. Let me ask him whether he or anyone in the government has complained to anyone in the Federal Government over the criticism by Mr. Jim Treller, Manager of Economic Services with the Department of Employment and Immigration, wherein Mr. Treller questioned whether it was acceptable for the Jobs Fund to take credit for creating jobs when it is the smallest contributor in a tri-level program, wherein he questioned the acceptability of counting jobs that may be financed with funds derived from cutting back in certain government departments; wherein he questioned whether the Jobs Fund had contributed to Capital projects that would have been done otherwise? Did he complain to anyone in the Federal Government about Mr. Treller's statement? Can he advise the House whether or not as a result of the NDP Government's criticism and complaints that this gentleman, this federal civil servant, has been suspended?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I did not make any complaints to the Federal Government with respect to the alleged comments of that Federal civil servant.

I am informed that some members of the Provincial Government's staff did enquire of the Federal Government to ascertain whether or not that was the view of the Federal Government with respect to the job creation activities of the Provincial Government, and also to ascertain whether or not there were concerns by the Federal Government with respect to Provincial Government activities.

We're informed by the Federal Government that that was not their position; that their position was that they

were in agreement with the general thrust of the Manitoba Jobs Fund and were cognizant of the co-operation between the various levels of government and the business community through the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

I can indicate, as I did at the time when the announcement was made and it was highlighted in the media release of that same day, that the province recognizes the significant contribution from other levels of government - from the Federal Government, from the Municipal Government, from other community organizations in the province, and the private sectors - that it was through the efforts of, indeed, most Manitobans that we were able to have the kind of success we had this year in the Manitoba Jobs Fund. That has never been denied by the province, in fact, we have complimented other levels of government and the business community for their support. I cannot confirm if any action has been taken by the Federal Government with respect to that person. I would suggest that is a question that should be directed to the Federal Government, not to the Provincial Government.

Tuberculosis in cattle herds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Acting Minister of Agriculture, I guess. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Rossburn community and this 10-page of petitioners who have petitioned me and the serious outbreak of TB they've found in a cattle herd out in the Rossburn area, I wonder if the Acting Minister of Agriculture can tell me if the Department of Agriculture and the government are prepared to come to the assistance of the Rossburn community, especially the farmer who has had the herd of cattle in his yard for over a year highly infested with tuberculosis and, up till now, has been unable to get any action basically at all from the Government of Canada. Of course now, Mr. Speaker, with the Honourable Eugene Whelan entering the leadership contest, I wonder if and when the Rossburn community will get some action on this serious outbreak of TB that's prevalent in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, I'll take that question as notice for a report back to the House.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister if he also can possibly involve the Department of Health, or I can ask the Minister of Health the question, do they not feel that the Rossburn community should be checked for TB to see how serious this matter is? This herd has been known to have TB for over a year; they've been confined to the farmer's yard since August, 1983, and they're still there as I stand here today.

The community is considerably uptight and I wonder how badly the area is infested; if, in fact, any of the community have any concerns or anxieties. I wonder, would the Minister of Health consider that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this is certainly the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture. The question was asked of him and he'll give you the answer as soon as possible.

Assessment exemption

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, could the Minister of Municipal Affairs confirm that under the reassessment farmers who have enjoyed the exemption to taxation on their farms homes did not receive a letter demanding justification of that exemption?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that but I'll check it out. As I said, in response to an earlier question, I'm not sure what criteria were used in determining the continuance of the exemption.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for oral questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To begin with, may I apologize to members opposite for the fact that my remarks may not be of too great a length today and I want to assure them that I, indeed, paid close attention to the Throne Speech on Thursday afternoon and I've spent a considerable length of time in reviewing it and perusing its contents over the weekend. Although it's thick on words it's rather thin on substance and I don't want anyone across the way to feel offended if I don't take the customary length of time that is given to the two leaders for debates on the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to begin my address, Sir, by extending to you the traditional words of congratulations, traditional yet nonetheless sincere on my part, on the resumption of your high office in this Chamber. Indeed you have always conducted yourself with a sense of dignity and decorum, and have continued to display those characteristics as you have presided over the Chamber. I know that there have been some difficult circumstances over the past year but nonetheless I have been impressed with your sense of fairness and impartiality as you have ruled on questions in the House.

I would as well like to extend my words of congratulations to the Deputy Speaker for his continuation in that position during this Third Session of the 32nd Legislature and as well, although we have sat and deliberated since last fall, there have been a number of changes that have occurred in the

government's ranks since last we had an opportunity to debate the Throne Speech. I have not had the normal opportunity in the course of one of these free and open debates to extend the normal words of congratulations to those who have been added to the ranks of the Treasury Bench, Sir. So I would like to extend my congratulations to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Government House Leader, and as well to the Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health on their appointments during last fall. To the relatively small number of others who have not yet made it to the Treasury Bench on that side of the House, Sir, I have one word to pass along, "patience," because given the Premier's annual additions to Cabinet, the ever-increasing numbers each year to record levels in the Treasury Bench of the province, your time may still come. On the other hand, hopefully, for the people, the taxpayers of Manitoba, the government's mandate will run out before the Premier's desire to bring all of you into Cabinet.

I should also at this time like to thank the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech, the Member for Wolseley and the Member for Rupertsland. It is indeed a significant honour to be asked to move and second the Throne Speech, and I know that both of you recognize the significance of that decision.

Mr. Speaker, as I direct my thoughts to the Throne Speech, I must readily admit that I had a great deal of difficulty finding material of substance upon which to found a debate. Indeed I might be paraphrasing or plagiarizing what's been said by others, but never have so many words been used to say so little.

Quite frankly, I felt badly for the Administrator as he had to sit there and calmly mouth so many phrases of propaganda on behalf of the government. I believe that there were many who were in attendance last Thursday who shared our concerns for the Administrator as he was put through that ordeal with the excessively long script that he had before him — (Interjection) — the Member for Arthur says, it will be difficult to try and give away invitations to the next Throne Speech - but the Administrator did indeed do his best as he presented those empty vacuous platitudes in somewhat of a positive manner. I guess we have to wonder whether or not the Lieutenant-Governor and the Chief Justice got an opportunity to review the Throne Speech before they decided that they weren't available to read it.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, many members of the public and members of the judiciary in the gallery, I think, were probably critical of the length of the Throne Speech last Thursday. In fact, it's the longest that I have ever had the opportunity to listen to and from many of my colleagues who have been here much longer than I, they suggest that perhaps it was the longest ever delivered in this Chamber.

I found it rather interesting and a bit ironic as I overheard a discussion in the reception following the Throne Speech in Room 254; I heard a discussion about the excessively long speech and a couple of the government Ministers suggested that it really wasn't any longer than normal Throne Speeches have been in the past, but really it was just read too slowly. I can't believe it when this government will go to any length to off-load the responsibility for anything that it does, including the length of its Throne Speech, absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker.

As I prepared for my remarks here today, I reviewed some of the things that have been said in the past. I happened across my own response to the Throne Speech in 1982, this government's first year of office. At that time, I suggested that one of the things that I had felt I would find most difficult in the change from being on the government side to being on the opposition side was the fact that I had never been one who wanted to be critical, who wanted to take a negative view of things and at the same time, I thought that it initially was going to be very difficult. Then I, at that time said, having listened to the Throne Speech, I didn't realize how easy it would be. Those words said then are just as applicable today; that having listened to the Throne Speech it certainly isn't going to be difficult to perform one of the aspects of the role in opposition and that is, to criticize the government's efforts.

I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech we had to endure last Thursday was not only lengthy but filled with empty platitudes. While there was a whole host of self-serving statements that lacked any commitment or confidence, I don't think there were too many people and members of the public at large who were fooled by it.

They know that we are witnessing an incompetent government and a party in disarray across the way here, a government that's lost its will, a government that no longer has the courage of its convictions, a government that has backed off so many major public issues from the position that it originally took, whether it be the French language proposal, whether it be the first draft of The Farmlands Ownership legislation, whether it be the ill-considered proposal to limit deposits under The Consumer Protection Act or the foolish attempt to amend The Payment of Wages Act last year.

During the last two years as we chronicle and review the various different aspects of this government's attempts to be a government, they have received so many black eyes - not only in the Legislature here - but in the court of public opinion out in the province-at-large, Mr. Speaker, that obviously now they don't want to proceed with anything other than housekeeping and minor changes, minor tinkering to various acts. I thought that the cartoon on the editorial page of the Free Press on Friday said it all when we saw a picture of the Premier with an NDP hat on the end of a stick waving it in front of the open door of the Chamber wondering whether or not he would proceed in.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we should be happy about the fact that the government is not going to do very much or anything - if anything at all - this coming Session because perhaps the poor beleaguered taxpayer should be thanking heaven for small mercies. When you're dealing with such an incompetent government the best thing I suppose you can hope for is that they do nothing.

I'm reminded of a remark that was made in a speech last year by the President of the Investment Dealers Association of Canada. At their annual meeting his suggestion was that the next time that you speak to or write to a politician and are tempted to ask him or her to do something for you, then make sure you ask him or her to do nothing. That's the best thing you could ask of a politician, he suggested. I thought that he must have had in mind this government, Mr. Speaker, when he made that remark. I thought that he must have

had this in mind because his suggestion was that if they would do anything it would cost you a great deal more and it would probably be the wrong thing in any case.

Speaking of the litany of failures that this government has in its past two years and the black eyes that it's received, I note that the Throne Speech almost totally abandons the commitment to the activist approach that we've heard in the first two years in government. I recall vividly how the Throne Speech kept referring to an activist approach to government - a pro-active I think was the word that they coined or found that they felt described their approach to government - and tried to make it different from other peoples' approaches to government. I think it was intended to indicate that they were really going to seize a call to action, Mr. Speaker. It seems that that reference to activist government and an activist approach has been almost totally dropped.

Even in the area of their commitment to organized labour, the people who bought and paid for their support in the last provincial election, and if we can believe from the write-up that occurred in a national labour magazine last year, a write-up of an article that described the involvement of the Manitoba organized labour in the NDP's 1981 election campaign, how they took major credit for the election of this government. I recall the article was written, I believe, either by Dick Martin or by John - the Premier's principal secretary now, I can't recall - John Walsh - I believe it was he perhaps or both of them who wrote that article. It's interesting to note that having written that article and having taken major credit for election of this government that he is now the Premier's principal secretary.

In any case, the major thesis or implication of the article was that there was a big IOU owing from this government to organized labour in this province, and that organized labour would be collecting, and collect they did in the first couple of years with more restrictive labour legislation, new changes both administratively and philosophically in the Workers Compensation Board, changes that resulted in many full-time appointments of paid-party hacks to jobs on the board and getting away from the concept of representation by both the labour force and the management side in Workers Compensation, totally wiping out that concept and making it a very one-sided directional kind of approach that seemed to ignore all previous principles in this area, Mr. Speaker.

The crowning touch was told to me by a member of the executive of the NDP Constituency Association in the Minister of Labour's constituency who said to me that this government has given a virtual veto over any legislative changes to Dick Martin, on behalf of the Manitoba Federation of Labour. This individual told me, Mr. Speaker, that Dick Martin gets to see any major change in legislation - any major policy change - gets to see it and approve it before Cabinet passes it. That's one of the responsibilities that they've turned over to the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

In fact, when we met earlier this year with the SFM and we were discussing the various proposals and options which the government was considering on the French language issue, they told us that the bottom line was, that the proposals or the amendments had to be acceptable to the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

Many of our caucus sat in discussion with us and I tell you we were flabbergasted, Mr. Speaker, at that suggestion. They said that contrary to opinion that was being expressed publicly about their influence in the final analysis in the various amendments that, indeed, the bottom line for this government was, that it had to be acceptable to Dick Martin on behalf of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and that he sat in decision and review over the various different alternatives and the various different amendments that were being considered, he sat in the final review of it as they arrived at decisions.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I make is that despite all of these close and obvious ties and commitments to organized labour in this province by this government, the Throne Speech seems to indicate that even organized labour is going to be disappointed by this government's inactions in the forthcoming Session. There's only one reference to action on the side of the labour portion of the Throne Speech and it's a very guarded, veiled suggestion on Page 13 that says, and I quote, "My Ministers will also propose measures to streamline and modernize labour relations procedures."

I know that many people out in the community-at-large, in businesses and working in various endeavours, are concerned that there may be contained in that veiled suggestion some very dangerous prospects for people out there in the community who are investors and who are trying to make a go of it in the business side, but I don't see it as that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that the reference is so veiled and indeterminate, because this government has probably decided already that it's going to back off its intention and commitment to enter into some major review and change to The Labour Relations Act and they're probably going to do almost nothing other than something cosmetic, I think that it's probably a far cry from the potentially divisive and disruptive kinds of proposals that were put before the Marba Smith Committee that was reviewing labour legislation in this province during the past year. I know that the Minister of Labour and the others have probably concluded there's not very much that they can do given the climate in Manitoba today and given the fact that if they did do anything major, there would be a large public confrontation that would probably result in another failure on their part. My guess is that they'll probably shelve the vast majority of the recommendations that were under consideration. I would think that that's probably, on their part, wise decision-making because I don't think they could stand another public whipping in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I detect a rather significant shift in gears in the Throne Speech and in some of the government's recent actions and I believe that Manitobans should take at least some of the credit for what appears to be a death-bed repentance by the government. In response to many speeches and countless references, questions and hours of debate in the Legislature, urging by members on our side, the government is finally, in this Throne Speech, indicating some acknowledgement of the private sector and its role in our economy in Manitoba. Although this acknowledgement may well be too little, too late, or it may be a totally inappropriate form of participation and recognition of action by the government on behalf of the private sector. We don't know what it's going to be from the references in the

Throne Speech - but it seems to me a little bit like the old story of the mule and the sledgehammer - at least the government at this point has finally paid some attention to some of the things that are being said by people throughout the community at large in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, recently part of the evidence that I cite of this renewed interest in and renewed recognition of the role of the private sector and the need to have some competent business expertise when you're dealing with so many of the changes, the economic development thrusts and so on, one of the evidences of this was a recent announcement of additions to the Board of McKenzie Seeds, which on the surface they appear to involve the appointment of people with some background and experience in business and we think that's a good thing.

Members on this side of the House argued last year, both in committee and in the Legislature, that when McKenzie Seeds was taking an obvious dip downward in terms of its effectiveness and its ability to operate - and I won't cite all of the various problems - but certainly some of them had to do with a great deal of mismanagement. Some of them had to do with things brought forward by my colleague from Turtle Mountain that involved investigations by the Provincial Auditor, by the RCMP and many many other problems that that Crown corporation had to deal with. It was suggested that one of the problems was, that this government had appointed a board of directors with virtually no business expertise, with a total inability to examine the normal business operations of that corporation, and a total inability to understand even a basic financial statement, or a balance sheet; and that total inability had led to the abdication of responsibility for operation of that Crown corporation to a small knot of people in their administration; and that small knot of people in their administration obviously caused a great deal of difficulty in terms of the company.

Mr. Speaker, it was being run, in effect, by one of their party hacks who had pulled the wool over a lot of people's eyes and caused a great deal of difficulty with that corporation and predictably, obviously, that was not able to be contended with by the people who they had appointed to the board because they lacked the kind of business knowledge and expertise to deal with it.

Well, having said that, having argued that we needed business expertise on the board, we were glad I think on this side to see the government at least attempt to appoint some people to the board who did have some knowledge, some expertise and some background in business. — (Interjection) — And as my colleague from Turtle Mountain says, they're not all NDP hacks. So even that is another positive step forward.

But I found it interesting that one of the initial statements that was made about their change in management and their change in the board of directors was, that they were going to have a whole new approach to marketing, and that they were going to use such things as cartoon characters - smurfs and popeye, I believe was what was suggested by the Member for Brandon East - and when I talked to a friend of mind who is in business about that, he said, since when did they do a survey of marketing that indicated that six and seven year-olds plant vegetable gardens primarily? And he said to me, that if they are going to use the

smurfs and the popeyes they obviously know something that the rest of us don't know because in the past, it has always been adults who plant vegetable gardens and buy the seeds, so I don't know. But in any case they have come up with a whole new approach and maybe some of it has to do with the new business and marketing expertise that they've put on the board.

MR. L. SHERMAN: It's the answer to the cabbage-patch doll.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, there first appears to be further evidence of the government learning from our advice and direction. On Page 4 of the Throne Speech, on the Jobs Fund, there appears to be an admission that the past year's efforts did not produce satisfactory quality or long-term job opportunities. I just read it here and it says: "However, with improvement in our economy my government's efforts to expand employment will concentrate increasingly on longer-term job opportunities, opportunities which offer better quality jobs and more secure jobs." Well, if that is the new found wisdom and the new direction then obviously, Mr. Speaker, they must be admitting that the last year's direction, and the last year's efforts . . .

A MEMBER: That means that they're shifting all their Special Assistants into the Civil Service.

MR. G. FILMON: Oh, well, I wasn't aware of that but I am told that means all of the Special Assistants are now being shifted into the Civil Service. So that's what the long-term commitment is on behalf of this government.

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, it appears as though they have decided that last year's efforts weren't working. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what members on this side have been saying for a year. When you talk about putting people to work on brush clearing and grass cutting and putting up signs, repairs and renovations and all those things, Mr. Speaker, short-term jobs, well all you have to do is look at the government's own statistics. They tell you that the Jobs Fund created jobs that lasted an average of 13 weeks, and as was discussed earlier in the question period, many of them go down to as short a length of time as one day.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Name one.

MR. G. FILMON: That's the kind of jobs that the Jobs Fund has been creating for the past year. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance wants to know one. A heat exchanger was changed in the Glenboro Curling Rink this past year and that involved one person day's work, and that is a statistic of the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker. That is one job created. I am suggesting to you that if that is one job created, Mr. Speaker, it is going to take 365 of those to keep one person employed.

Mr. Speaker, further, this government, as part of its statistics, in instances where they haven't even contributed 5 percent of the cost of the project, is trying to take credit for 100 percent of the jobs that were created by the project. In addition to that, Mr.

Speaker, most of the efforts of this past year in the Jobs Fund have been concentrated on the public sector of employment in our province in which there is something just over 50,000 jobs in total, direct and indirect, totally ignoring the private sector where there are 400,000 people employed in Manitoba; 400,000 people on that side totally ignored by the efforts of the Jobs Fund during the past year, unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, on top of all of that, they spent \$1.3 million in advertising the success of this program, billboards throughout the province, radio, television, print ads in the newspapers talking about the wonderful effects of the Jobs Fund; doing nothing more than frustrating and upsetting people who genuinely had projects that they wanted to undertake to create lasting jobs; business expansions, opportunities to employ more people on a long-term basis, permanent jobs. People would see these billboards and they'd say, I must be able to qualify because I have an idea; I want to take a risk, I want to create a new enterprise or an expansion that will allow people to be employed in Manitoba. They go and they call the Jobs Fund, and they don't qualify. Or, in other instances, if they do qualify they are told that the money is expended, totally exhausted and no longer available. Yet for six months after that, they continue to see the advertising, and there is no money for the job creation efforts that they have.

It's unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, that this government could do that. Even in the area where they were creating jobs, let's examine their effectiveness. Let's look at the public sector, and look at some of the things that happened as a result of Jobs Fund activity. Mr. Speaker, we looked at some of those ads, and we talked to some of the people who were in the ads. In one case, I spoke to a mayor of one of the large towns in southern Manitoba who was involved as one of the people who gave a testimony to the Jobs Fund. That person said that he had to do it, that it was one of the requirements of getting the money from the Jobs Fund, that you had to sign a release to say that you would make comments and allow them to be used for the Jobs Fund. But the amazing thing was that there was a corollary to the ad in which he appeared.

In November - I believe it was around the 12th of November - his town got a letter from the Jobs Fund saying that they had qualified for a further Jobs Fund grant, and that was to do with landscaping around their new firehall. They got this message in November, I believe it was around the 12th of November, but the grant expired, it had to be utilized at the end of the fiscal year, March 31, 1984. So the question is: would you prefer him to seed or to sod between November and March? That's what he was worried about, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the Throne Speech reads, as it does on Page 5, "Most of these efforts will involve the private sector. They will include encouragement of private sector investment and private sector jobs. In fact, significant expansion in the private sector is one of the principal aims of my government's recovery strategy." We can only say to that, "Hallelujah! Hallelujah!" Why did it take \$200 million and a full year to find out that the jobs and the real opportunities were in the private sector? Why did we spend all that money on the other side?

So, Mr. Speaker, as we wade through the verbiage and the rhetoric of this Throne Speech, and there certainly is a great deal of that, it's incredible to what lengths the government will go to cover up its failures and to cover up the lack of commitment with a great many flowery phrases. But, as I say earlier, Manitobans will undoubtedly see through all of that.

In the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, the government uses its approach to fine-sounding phrases and words, something we have seen a great deal of before. They tell Manitobans that they are "the foundation, the cornerstone, the heart, the basis of the economy" without any corresponding evidence that the government really is in touch with Manitobans. In fact, if we look at the last two-and-a-half years, it's reminiscent of the campaign slogan, "Great people, great future," except that nobody around here and nobody throughout the province knows what that great future is or how you can measure it given this government's performance over the past two-and-a-half years.

The government in this Throne Speech has touched every base, hasn't left a stone unturned as they try to ingratiate themselves with the people of Manitoba. They talk about the unemployed, they talk about the youth, the women and the farmers, and the big businessmen, the small businessmen, the investors, everybody is told how important they are to this provincial economy in Manitoba today, but there is nothing new in the Throne Speech; reworked, rehashed verbiage of everything that's been done before, no commitment to anything new, Mr. Speaker, no evidence that the government has really identified any of the key issues involved in their so-called priority areas. All of these people who are so important to Manitoba aren't told what their role is going to be, or how the government seeks to involve them, or how the government is going to do anything worthwhile to work with or to help them. No indication that the dedication or the imagination or the resourcefulness of Manitobans that they seek out is in any way going to be translated into anything positive on behalf of this province. Mr. Speaker, it's the old saying, "If you don't know where you're going, any road will get you there." That's the theme song of this government.

You look further at some of the things in the Throne Speech, and you see on Page 2 about the visits of Their Majesties and His Holiness. I can say, I think honestly, that we on this side and, indeed, all Manitobans are pleased and proud that they will be in Manitoba later this year. But rather than try and tie the statement about their visit into some commentary about our province having weathered the effects of the recession better than the other provinces in this country, why don't they tell that to the 47,000 people in Manitoba who are unemployed today? Why don't you tell them about that, what you're doing? Why don't you tell people about the fact that these 47,000 unemployed people, that number is more than 20,000 more than the number who were unemployed in 1981 when you took office? Why don't you tell people about that?

Rather than taking credit for the fact that Manitoba in many ways has not suffered as greatly as some of the other provinces, why don't you compare it to some of the historical patterns of the ebbs and flows of our economy which show beyond question that Manitoba

doesn't go up as high in the peaks, and Manitoba doesn't go down as low in the valleys, and that what you are following is an historical pattern that is there because of the nature of Manitoba's economy, the fact that our economic contribution in this province is spread over so many difference sectors; that it's spread very evenly amongst agriculture, agribusiness, manufacturing, mining, transportation, banking, commerce, service industries and so on, and that inevitably Manitoba doesn't have the severity of dips when the economy is waning, and doesn't have the peaks when the economy is rising; and that what you are doing is just simply telling people what they already knew, and not anything for which you can take credit.

The government appears to be signalling in its Throne Speech and the various announcements that it's made a major shift in its fiscal and spending policies, Mr. Speaker. I know that we will learn more about that next week when the Budget is brought forward. But what they don't tell you in this new-found wisdom is that they're not doing it of their own volition. When they tell you that they're now going to be bringing in a Budget that has an increase in expenditures of probably under 5 percent over last year and they have a commitment to a reduced deficit, very little of that is because they have found any new wisdom; it's because of the pressure of the effects of the financial markets on them.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that they have very little choice. Those financial markets have already downgraded our credit rating in Manitoba - the first time in more than a decade, it happened last year - because of their response to what this government did in its first two years of office, and has every indication that it'll become more difficult for this provincial government to borrow money on the financial markets in the near future. Again, because of their fiscal mismanagement and the inappropriateness of the actions that they took in spending in the past years.

Mr. Speaker, they don't tell us in the Throne Speech that we have the third highest per capita debt of any provincial government. It's something in the range of \$25,000 per family of four for the provincial cumulative debt alone. They don't tell you that our deficit this year is the largest single deficit in the history of this province, or that cumulatively we have the largest cumulative deficit in the history of our province.

Despite the Minister of Finance's attempts in letters to the editor and in speeches to offload the responsibility on previous governments, I remind him and members opposite that interest costs is a portion of the provincial debt. We're only in the range of 4-5 percent in the 1981 Budget and after two years of his government's economic and fiscal mismanagement, they're now between 9 and 10 percent, double what they were and that's just in two years of his government's action. That's because in their first two years of government they insisted on increasing their expenditures by almost 18 percent in the first year of government, and then by a further 17 percent in the next year of government, at a time when provincial governments and Federal Government throughout this country were working on numbers increases in expenditure that were half that rate. When the Federal Government, the model of fiscal restraint in this country, was talking about 6 and 5, we were getting 18 percent and 17 percent out of this government. That's the kind of actions we were getting,

so they can't offload the responsibility onto previous governments.

Manitobans will know, Mr. Speaker, how this government operates when there are no external restraints and constraints to its spending; when there's nobody outside there pulling a rein on them and telling them that enough's enough, that they've spent enough and that there isn't anymore borrowing capacity and that their credit rating is going to be downgraded. We know how they would act if they didn't have those constraints on them because they showed us in the first two years of government, and the taxpayer won't be fooled by this change of heart come the next election. They know what kind of fiscal mismanagement we're in for if this government has a choice with a free rein.

Speaking of fiscal matters, I can't let this opportunity go without commenting on the obscene manner in which this government treated the Interim Supply question this year. The matter was raised on Friday by my colleague from Turtle Mountain and questions were asked earlier today. We had a request for a matter of debate on the topic, but I will take the opportunity now, Mr. Speaker, to discuss just how they dealt with that question of providing for the government fiscal needs in the forthcoming months of this year. We all know that they had a right to pass a Special Warrant. We didn't need to be lectured by the Government House Leader or the Minister of Finance about the requirements of The Financial Administration Act. We knew, Mr. Speaker, that we had brought amendments, and the specific sections that were referred to were ones that were passed in 1979 when we were in government. The fact of the matter is that they do have a right to pass a Special Warrant for Interim Supply when the House is not in Session. Everyone knows that we entered into this new fiscal year April 1st without the Legislature being in Session, therefore, they had a right to pass that Special Warrant. That's not the question, Mr. Speaker; the question is whether or not they acted properly and in accordance with the requirements of that particular Section 42(1) of The Financial Administration Act, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to repeat the requirements which I believe were quoted earlier today in the question period.

It says and I quote, "Where, when the Legislature is not in Session, or when the Legislature is in Session, but has been adjourned for a period of more than 10 days" - that part of it they complied with, we were not in Session. I go on and I quote, "an expenditure not foreseen or provided for or insufficiently provided for is urgently and immediately required for the public good."

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can agree that since there wasn't authority provided for, as of April 1st, there was some unforeseen requirement, and one might assume that it was for the public good. But the question is was a Special Warrant of \$1.5 billion urgently and immediately required, or could the government have done what is normally done, and that is, pass a Special Warrant, maybe even for 30 days, maybe even for 30 percent of the normal borrowing requirements of the forthcoming fiscal year? Let's grant them, Mr. Speaker, that they could have certainly gone anywhere up to 30 percent and technically been correct, but they knew that this Legislature would be in Session, in fact, at the time they passed the Warrant the date had been

set, April 12th, and they had every reason to know and understand that this Legislature would be available to pass Interim Supply, at an appropriate time. After the Throne Speech Debate, after the Budget Debate, fine, it could have been delayed until then, but they did not have to pass a Special Warrant for almost half of the entire year's expenditures of this government.

Mr. Speaker, without question what that did was eliminate the need to debate Interim Supply during the entire Session. Just by way of Estimate, I would say that this takes them at least until September, this \$1.5 billion. That's without knowing whether or not the government is going to come in, but based on last year's requirements and about up to 5 percent more this year, that would take them up until sometime in September. Is that an urgent and immediate requirement to the government? The urgent and immediate requirement is that they could avoid debate in this Legislature on a matter of Supply. That's the only urgent and immediate requirement, is that they would not have to face the music in this Legislature for their spending requirements. They have been backed off in so many different ways that they will go to any lengths to avoid debate in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and that is the manner in which they deal with the affairs of this province.

It is one of the absolute requirements, one of the foremost rights of members of this Legislature to participate in debate and vote on Supply and they took it away from members throughout this Legislature. I'm not just speaking on behalf of members on this side, I'm speaking on behalf of their backbench members who are left out completely of the decision making and the opportunity to discuss the manner in which the funding was provided for the affairs of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go further and quote just a little more of this Section 42(1) because it says, "And of the member of the Executive Council having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent and the expenditure for the public good, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may order a Special Warrant to be prepared and to be signed by the Lieutenant-Governor authorizing the expenditure of the amount estimated to be required."

Mr. Speaker, how can the government tell us that the amount they have estimated to be required for urgent and immediate requirements is almost half of the year's expenditure? Only this Minister of Finance would have the audacity to try and argue that they urgently and immediately require to pass an amount estimated to take care of the next six months' expenditure of this government. That's an unbelievable affront to the legislative process and to the members of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, unbelievable. But that's the manner in which they deal with it. It's a direct attempt, in fact a direct action by this government to subvert the role of this Legislature, a very sleazy move at the best of times. There is no question about it.

So what we have is, we have a government lurching from crisis to crisis, going into the Cabinet Room behind closed doors where nobody knows what's going on and passing a Special Warrant that takes away the responsibility and the right of members on this side of the House to debate or vote Interim Supply - takes it away completely.

Now we recognize that with this government's record of incompetence and failure that they would want to

avoid another opportunity to debate their spending priorities, especially on the freewheeling basis that the Interim Supply Motion provides so that we couldn't call attention to all of the various inadequacies that I have spoken to earlier, that other members have spoken about, that has been the topic of public conversation. The fact that not only have they caused us all these fiscal problems through their mismanagement, not only do we have 47,000 unemployed here but their planning horizon seems to be a matter of months, maybe even weeks, maybe hours, I don't know.

Here we had them for two years increasing the size of the public service in all of those positions that are so vital to providing services to people throughout this province: executive assistants, special assistants, public relations people, information officers, all of those most important positions — (Interjection) — economic advisors, assistant deputy ministers, directors, all these people at a senior level where at the same time they were cutting positions in other areas. Then they come forward, after padding the Civil Service to the tune of about 500 positions in all of these areas, with new-found wisdom this year and they say they're going to cut 273 positions. Now where are they going to cut them? At the direct delivery of service level.

You find positions like grader operators in the Highways Department cut so that our roads that are already in difficulty, because we're not rebuilding and reconstructing and maintaining them, are going to be in worse shape because we have graders sitting around, pieces of equipment that cost us hundreds of thousands of dollars, nobody to operate the graders because these people have made their priority choices to fill their offices with political hacks, political support people and leave out the direct delivery of service people, cut the line positions that are serving the public. That's their planning horizon, Mr. Speaker, where they can flipflop from one tack to another overnight and expect that the public is going to give them some great credit for this new-found wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, returning to some of the other areas of the Throne Speech, the section that deals with "Key Legislative Priorities" is more interesting for what it doesn't say than for what it says. It tells us about the fact that the government passed over 100 bills last year. Well, we were all very well aware of that. We sat through the longest Session in the history of this Legislature to do that. It says because they passed over 100 bills last year, we won't need to consider very many this year. That is a curious way of telling us that because they took such a beating and were forced to withdraw so many of their proposals and they want to avoid further shame and humiliation, they have decided that we don't need any more legislation in this province.

They are going to be remembered for their ineptitude in history and the fact that they couldn't even manage the affairs of this House. They have demonstrated that they are totally incapable of passing even legislation that they say they're committed to, and they're the laughingstock of the whole country as a government or a poor excuse for a government.

A MEMBER: The Typhoid Marys of Canada.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, they tell us that because we passed so many bills we aren't going to have to

deal with too many and the legislative priorities, because of that, are going to be in economic development initiatives and in health care. Well that's interesting because, from my view, those are two areas that don't really require too much legislation; they just require the right policy initiatives.

In health care and in economic development, I have not in the past seen too many bills come back that have to deal with that. Unless they are going to find some new ways of taxing people, some new ways of intervening and interfering with the private sector and economic development in this province, there isn't a requirement for legislation to accomplish positive things on behalf of health care and economic development.

In fact, I would say that most people on the private sector side would prefer, after two years of this government ignoring it or even worse still confronting it, they'd probably prefer that the government just get out of their way and let them do the things that they do best and that's take risks and create new job opportunities for Manitobans.

You know, on the area of health care, I mean that's one area that all of us on this side will agree is a No. 1 priority for public expenditure on services for people. We would be anxious to participate with this government in ensuring that we do indeed maintain the highest standard of health care that our province can afford for its people.

We welcome initiatives in the area of maternal and child health. That was a result of a task force that we had the pleasure of participating in the formation of. The Member for Fort Garry, when he was the Minister of Health, was one of the prime movers that resulted in that task force having been established and coming forth with recommendations which hopefully - the meaning of the phrase in this Throne Speech is - that they will hopefully be bringing forth initiatives to carry out many of the recommendations that were brought forward by the Maternal and Child Health Care Task Force.

They talk about expansion of the Children's Dental Health Program. That's another area that we were involved with and continued to expand during our term of office and improved upon. We would like to see what this government has to say and has to do in that area.

There are other initiatives that are targeted in the Throne Speech that I'm sure will be nervously awaited by some members of our population, the suggestion of initiatives in the area of reproductive health services. That, I think, may be regarded rather nervously by some people in Manitoba today, because although there may be needed improvements in this field, Mr. Speaker, that term in the past has been used for unacceptable types of initiatives to the population at large.

Then we have, Mr. Speaker, in that area on health care, we have a continuation of the self-serving attempt on the part of this government to take credit for the completion of health care facilities that were either committed or under construction when our government left office.

You know, health care has a longer planning horizon than just one year. To date, we haven't seen the evidence of any future plans from this government in the area of development of Manitoba's health care system. All we have seen is Throne Speeches and speeches by the Minister of Health that take credit for all of the

things that were started or committed by our government. That's all we have seen so far, Mr. Speaker.

Indeed, when members opposite were running for office in 1981, they talked about rebuilding and restoring Manitoba's health care system. Today, all the references in the Throne Speech are to maintaining the excellent quality and standard of health care which they inherited, and taking credit for the completion of the facilities which we initiated; that's all we see in their Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, this Throne Speech seems to place a great deal of verbiage on public relations statements coming forward to cover up the criticisms that were brought forward in that series that was done last fall in the Free Press that said: "Hospitals In Crisis." I think it's curious that the Minister of Health or the Throne Speech refers to the fact that Manitoba's health care system compares so favourably with those of other provinces when, at the same time, they've appointed Mr. Justice O'Sullivan to do a review commission on the standard and the things that are happening in Manitoba's health care system. Well, which way is it? Is there a problem that you want Mr. Justice O'Sullivan to identify and make recommendations on, or do we have one of the best health care systems in the country? Make up your mind, that's all I ask of the government on that particular topic.

The area of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be no recognition of the real problems and concerns that Manitoba farmers are facing, no mention of the federal-provincial study that was done on Canada Packers and its viability. What did it show? Are there problems in the meat packing industry in Manitoba? Tell us about it, tell us what your solutions are going to be and tell us how you're going to address those problems.

The continuing cost-price squeeze that farmers are under; the continuing negative effect of federal taxes on farm-consumed fuel and petro-chemical products; the grain stabilization payouts; The Western Grain Transportation Act. What do all these things mean for farmers in Manitoba and what are the problems and concerns that this government's going to address on their behalf?

MR. H. ENNS: The only thing they're doing is they're sending out higher assessments.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, all we get is a commentary on the low soil moisture and the dry weather conditions. It's incredible! We get an offer by the government to have the Minister of Agriculture report to us regularly on when it's raining outside. I can tell members opposite that every farmer in this province is well aware when it rains, and they're well aware of the soil moisture conditions in their area, and members on this side are well aware of those consequences and concerns as well, and they need more than a commitment on the part of the Minister of Agriculture to give us regular weather reports. They need a great deal more than that I can tell you.

MR. L. SHERMAN: They've developed a talent for recognizing rain over the years, you know.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, on the side of energy the review of the government's energy conservation

initiatives is not only patronizing but obviously it seeks to divert attention from the government's total failure to recognize and take advantage of the real opportunities that exist in Manitoba today, to market our energy for the purpose of creating real long-term jobs in this province.

Their loss of the Western Electric Power Grid and Alcan remain as a testimony to their inability to negotiate and deal with major investors and other governments on the area of energy. The Throne Speech has a couple of references in there that are obviously aimed at their discussions that are taking place today, perhaps with American utilities, because we happen to know that they aren't able to have any meaningful discussions with Canadian utilities, and I quote from it: "I am informed that the discussions with neighbouring utilities on the sale of Manitoba-produced electricity are progressing well." Well, who are those discussions taking place with? They must be with American utilities because we happen to know, Mr. Speaker, from various sources, that they aren't having any discussions of meaningful nature with the Province of Saskatchewan, in fact, in Saskatchewan today there is a need for a purchase of power, because the Saskatchewan Government is giving consideration to selling back the Island Falls Power Plant to Flin Flon; and if they sell back the Island Falls Power Plant to Flin Flon, then they will have a need for buying some firm energy from Manitoba, but they can't arrive at any discussions or agreement with this government because they can't talk to them. They've got an incompetent group running their discussions on the energy side and they can't arrive at any agreement or understanding.

What about Alberta? Are they dealing with Alberta, Mr. Speaker? Well, of course, they're not, because Alberta has turned them down flat. I have a copy of a letter that was tabled publicly in Alberta from the Minister of Energy and Mines, and it's dated March 9, 1984. He says, and I quote, "I would appreciate it if you can inform me whether any significant changes for increased electrical demand has taken place within your province which would warrant a return to discussions on the Western Electric Intertie Project." That was the question in the letter of March 9th from the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Here's the response from the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications of Alberta. He says: "In these circumstances I would suggest that future discussions of the proposed Western Electric Power Intertie Project should realistically be deferred again for a further period of two years. In my view it would, therefore, be premature to discuss the Western Electric Power Intertie Project at this time."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell you what, they were quite prepared, and so were the Blakeney Government, to enter into an agreement with us. In fact, their government's Ministers signed Letters of Intent, draft agreements, at the time we were in government, but what happened was this government got into office and everything fell apart. The Blakeney Government pulled out first, the Blakeney Government, an NDP soul mate government of this government, and then Alberta dropped the idea as well.

Mr. Speaker, we have read into the record the comments of the former President of Sask Power who said without question that it was this government's

actions that scotched the whole deal and that put it on the rocks for all time as long as this government is in power.

So, Mr. Speaker, isn't it ironic that this government that has so little love for our American neighbours is left to deal with and negotiate with Americans. These people who burn American flags are now going cap-in-hand, on bended knee, to American utilities to try and sell Manitoba's energy, their last resort. Mr. Speaker, I find that interesting because — (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: I find that interesting because really, on the scale of priorities, selling energy to the Americans is undoubtedly the third preference. It's never been that strong an alternative, Mr. Speaker, because although off-peak exchanges may be a viable type of arrangement with the American utilities, firm energy interties have always had more difficulties and less value for Manitoba than firstly, of course, No. 1 priority establishing energy-intensive businesses here in Manitoba and industries that would utilize our power and create jobs right here; or secondly, dealing with our western neighbours who have the opportunity to have their peaks occur at a different time and, therefore, more benefit to them of selling at their peak need times, and more benefit to us. But those, Mr. Speaker, are the top priorities and this government is faced with whatever it can get, and that is the third priority, and that is to deal with our American neighbouring utilities. Mr. Speaker, they'll have to make whatever deal they can and if it's a sweetheart deal, they will have to answer for it in this Legislature, but we're always happy to see them make some use - we have almost 1500 megawatts of unused power capacity, overbuilt to that extent, and obviously this government has to try and cover up for its mistakes when it was the Schreyer Government and try and sell that power in some way to whoever will buy it, regardless of whether or not it's a good deal.

Mr. Speaker, they have another reference in the Throne Speech on the energy side, and it says, "In addition, my Ministers are continuing discussions with power-intensive customers, whose interest in locating in Manitoba derives from the economical energy source we possess." Well, Mr. Speaker, we're all ears. We would like to know more about that. Is this the Alcoa reference? Is this the discussions that are taking place with Alcoa today? We know that they are. We obviously have sources that tell us that the government is having meetings. We think it might be better if the government was a little more open and put these things on the table, told us who their discussions are taking place with; which officials of the company; how frequently. What is the nature of them? How close they are to an agreement, Mr. Speaker? Will they share that information with members on this side?

Mr. Speaker, just maybe we could help with the negotiations and the discussions that are taking place. I mean we have had a great deal of experience. Mr. Speaker, when members opposite were in opposition

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If there are other members wishing to enter the debate, they will have the same opportunity to do so in due course.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: When members opposite were in opposition, they cried loudly and longly about the fact that they wanted to be involved in the Alcan discussions, and we made arrangements for them to meet with the Alcan people. We booked Room 254, and the Alcan officials were there and available to give them information and answer their questions and all of those things. We invited them. But, Mr. Speaker, here we have a case where they are dealing with another potential aluminum smelter operation, as we understand it, and we're offering to get involved and to help them in their discussions.

We have some experience. We know from our previous experience, Mr. Speaker, that Alcoa may well be a company that may want to deal with this government on the basis of a long-term agreement to buy power. They, in fact, in about half of their smelting operations do not own their own source of power. Unlike Alcan who own their own source of power in all their smelting operations, Alcoa only own their source of power in about half of their operations. So they may be interested in signing a long-term agreement to purchase from these people.

They may be able to deal with them and still retain their philosophical hangups about having to sign an agreement to sell a portion of a plant or something like that. But I find it ironic, Mr. Speaker, that these people couldn't come to an agreement with a Canadian-owned company, Alcan, and yet they prefer to deal with a U.S. multinational corporation. These are the archenemies of the U.S. multinationals. The people who like to kick them around publicly when they talk in their philosophical speeches are now on their hands and knees dealing with Alcoa. Isn't it ironic?

Mr. Speaker, we know that they may well be able to enter into an agreement to sell power, but they would still have to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . Mr. Speaker, they may well enter into an agreement whereby . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . Mr. Speaker, I would willingly take a position if the government would only tell us what they're doing, just give us some indication of what they're doing. I would be glad to take a position on it, but tell me what you are going to do. The whole problem with this Throne Speech is that there is no commitment to do anything. So it's very difficult to take a position, Mr. Speaker, when the government makes absolutely no commitment to do anything.

Mr. Speaker, they may well enter into an agreement that allows them to sell power to Alcoa. If so, we'll be interested in what benefits they are going to confer on them. We'll be interested in knowing whether or not the long-term power agreement is anything like what was done in the Labrador or Quebec agreement or any of those things, because they'll have to put it forward, Mr. Speaker. I tell you this though - I just warn the members opposite that they had devastating results

from one secret agreement that they entered into last year, and I would suggest to them that they think twice before another secret agreement is entered into.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of this Throne Speech, we have all sorts of references to Federal Government involvement. In fact, we have the very open suggestion on Page 10 that they are indeed intending to take credit for all their initiatives twice, once through an announcement of entering into a federal-provincial agreement and, secondly, through the Jobs Fund. That's what they are going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I can count no fewer than 11 references to federal-provincial programs. Obviously the government is relying very very heavily on federal dollars in order to . . . Of course, Mr. Speaker, their strategy is that every dollar they can get from the feds is one less dollar that they have to take out of their own Treasury and of course, it will help them keep the deficit down. It will work in an election year. There's no question about it. It will work in a federal election year.

Right now, of course, the Federal Government is anxious to enter into these agreements with them, because we have a Minister of Transport here in Manitoba who is desperate to be re-elected and would love to have an opportunity to enter into federal-provincial agreements to spend all sorts of money. I think the cash register that we had going on Mr. Axworthy's endeavours during the past couple of years is about 850 million, and this government, of course, is anxious to get involved because it helps them out. One failing government is leaning on the other hoping that jointly they can take some positive effect out of it, and they can both benefit.

Mr. Speaker, we know about this government and its efforts and its involvements with the Federal Government. We know from other Ministers and other governments about how things go in federal-provincial meetings these days. When the Ministers get together, what inevitably happens is that the Federal Trudeau Government has very few friends. In fact, the only people they can count on to support them at any federal-provincial meeting is the Government of Manitoba.

This government's Ministers are the first ones in line when the Federal Government comes forward with a new proposal or a new initiative to say, me too, we agree. In fact, it's getting so bad that the Federal Government puts forward a proposal for a new initiative, and this government comes forward and says, let's entrench it. That is the way it works. We have heard from other provinces and the Ministers of other provinces just how it works.

Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we find in the Throne Speech when we find 11 references to federal money being brought into Manitoba to prop up the sagging fortunes of this government and, at the same time, to help the re-election efforts of the Federal Liberal Government. I'll tell you this, that they should have a little integrity at least in the manner in which they deal with it because that isn't going to be to the lasting benefit of Manitobans. That isn't going to be the kind of thing that, in the final analysis, is going to help this government after this election year. It's going to take a great deal more stimulus from the private sector to get Manitoba growing and working again.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech is laden with very selective statistics and various members on this side

have questioned some of the statistics in question period. Today, the Member for St. Norbert asked the Minister of Trade and Technology just how he could square some of the statistical references. The fact that Statistics Canada says that there were only 9,000 full-time and 4,000 part-time jobs, yet this government says that they've created 21,000 through the Jobs Fund. Well, of course, we're getting part of the answer along the way. We're finding that a job is a job even if it's one day in length. Of course, that doesn't really add or detract from the unemployed on a long-term basis.

They selectively refer to things such as the population having increased by 12,000, month-over-month, for one period of last year. The fact that our employment increases from the 21,000 in the Jobs Fund doesn't square with others. All of those things, Mr. Speaker, are things that don't square. I just say one thing to the members opposite and that is that statistics are for losers - this is what is normally said in the field of sports these days - and this is no different. If you try and put together the statistics that are quoted in the Throne Speech with the reality of what they themselves have printed in the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, it's really interesting.

We find, for instance, that there's been an increase in the public administration sector in Manitoba of 5,000 jobs over an 11 percent increase whereas Canada as a whole has had an increase of only 1.4 percent. How does that square with your statistics? Does that mean that we are supporting, as a result of all these public programs, these people on a temporary basis? What's going to happen afterward? That's what I'd like to know.

Mr. Speaker, our manufacturing employment is down 1,000 according to the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics on a year-to-year basis and I would think that's of greater concern to the people of Manitoba than the fact that they are supporting on the tax dollar 5,000 more people in the public sector. I would think they'd like to be aware of the 1,000 drop in the manufacturing sector; that doesn't occur in the Throne Speech. It seems to me that this selective use of statistics is not something that the government should be very proud of. In fact, it's something that the government should take some responsibility for answering.

The Manitoba Investment Program which is referred to in the Throne Speech - how will this new program differ from the programs offered by the Federal Government to the department and DREE? How are these programs, the Provincial Trade Promotion Programs, going to increase our opportunities to succeed in the overall market? Tell us about the real initiatives that are going to be taken. Don't just tell us that you've got this program and it's going to do wonderful things. Show us some initiatives.

Surely, we've got to strive to have better support for our service industries. If we want to prosper and succeed beyond our borders, now is the best time. Our manufacturing industry has the greatest opportunity with the dollar being as depressed as it is, to be exporting into the U.S. What are you doing to support that effort? What are you doing to expand that effort?

Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks there's going to be an announcement of one of the major manufacturers in Manitoba putting forth a major expansion program, 250 jobs, but it's going to be at the Lakehead, it's not going to be here - one of our

largest manufacturers in Manitoba. Why? Well, I can think of many reasons why; the payroll tax, the new restrictive labour legislation, all of the problems that they have to deal with in terms of Workers Compensation, and all of those fees that are imposed upon it. Mr. Speaker, those are the things that are causing jobs of Manitoba manufacturers and Manitoba investors to be created elsewhere, outside this province, where they don't have to deal with all the roadblocks and all the things that are put in their way.

When I was up North a few weeks ago doing a tour of the mining industries in Manitoba, I spoke to various of the major mining companies and we talked about some of the problems they have to deal with. Of course, Mr. Speaker, they deal on a worldwide basis. They don't have to just compete with somebody down the street and that is, in fact, the case with so many of our employers here in Manitoba. Their competition isn't somebody down the street who has to put up with the same burdens and the same impositions as they do. They have to be competitive outside our borders and in many cases on a worldwide basis. That's true of our agricultural industry; that's true of our manufacturers; that's true of our mining industry.

You know what they told me, Mr. Speaker? In the case of Inco in Thompson, taking into account four items that are on their payroll in 1980, UIC, CPP - outside of the control of this Provincial Government undoubtedly - Workers Compensation, and the payroll tax. Of course, in 1980 the payroll tax wasn't there, but those four items in 1980 amounted to \$800 per staff person for Inco. Those four items in 1984, Mr. Speaker, amounted to \$2,200 per staff person, an increase of almost 180 percent over a period of four years, largely because of the efforts of this government.

You wonder, Mr. Speaker, how much longer our employers can withstand the pressures being put upon them when they have to compete on a nation-wide or a worldwide basis in order to sell their products. How can they continue to be competitive? What in the Throne Speech gives them any assurance or any confidence or optimism that they can be more competitive on a worldwide basis or a nation-wide basis? It's not there, Mr. Speaker, because this government will concentrate on regulating, restricting and taxing companies, not on showing them any encouragement, not on showing them any concept of understanding of the problems that they face.

While we have the wonderful area of the Throne Speech that deals with improved private sector consultation telling us about the love-ins that they had in Portage la Prairie and other places when even their good friend, the president of the MFL, told them that it wasn't working, that they weren't getting any mileage out of it and the whole thing was a total failure, now we're told that they're going to carry on with these private sector consultations. They've got to justify the position of the paid lobbyist that they hired at \$80,000 a year or whatever it was . . .

A MEMBER: 85.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . \$85,000 a year, and he needs something to do so he's going to organize some more of these consultations with people in the private sector

so that they can try and elicit some positive comments from the private sector to justify many of the things that they're doing, Mr. Speaker; try and dampen the negative criticism that they get from the business community by bringing them together in a consultative process. Well, I want to know what the results of these consultative efforts were. Is that where they got the idea for the payroll tax? Is that where they got the idea for first contract legislation? Is that where they got the idea for setting up this Labour Act Review Committee? Is that where they got all of these wonderful ideas about taking over the insurance and the pension industry in Manitoba? Is that the kind of consultative process that leads to some of these wonderful recommendations that we've had in the past? Well, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if that is what we can expect from them.

How about local government? We're told here all the marvelous support that they are giving to local government in Manitoba. Is that why property taxes are up so substantially in our province today? We on this side, Mr. Speaker, have evidence of what real effects we've had from this government's support for municipal governments throughout the province; this government that campaigned on a commitment to reduce the burden on the property taxpayers in Manitoba and what did they do during the first two years of their government? Firstly, let's compare them to what happened during our term of office. During our term of office in the City of Winnipeg, using City of Winnipeg and Winnipeg School Division as the evidence for it, during our term of office the realty taxes on the average home increased \$78.03 in a total four-year period. That was what the increase was.

In the first three years of this government, that same average-assessed home in Winnipeg has increased \$298.02, Mr. Speaker. That's almost a fourfold increase because these people have been so helpful to the municipal governments and the property taxpayers in the municipal levels. In just three years they've quadrupled almost the rate of taxes on these properties in Winnipeg. Well, that's the help and that's the evidence that should have been in the Throne Speech, not those platitudinous statements about what they are doing for local government in our province, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, as you listen to, and I did, some of the comments that were made by the mover of the Throne Speech, it's obvious that there isn't a good deal to recommend here. There isn't a good deal for the members opposite to even support in their Throne Speech.

The Member for Wolseley told us about all of her travels, I presume at public expense, throughout the country in various different cities - I believe she said she was in Toronto and Vancouver and Montreal - and she sampled the opinions of cab drivers in every city. She used that as the material for her Throne Speech Debate. That kind of definitive research produced for her, Mr. Speaker, the evidence that things were a lot better in Manitoba than they were anywhere else in this country. We should be happy to be Manitobans because the cabbies across the country tell her that things must be better in Manitoba according to the information that she was provided. That's the basis upon which we should take pride in the Throne Speech, she says, and that's the information that she says commends the Throne Speech to us.

Well, I can understand why she has difficulty in debating this Throne Speech and in recommending anything from that which is presented in this Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker.

Further the Minister of Municipal Affairs - and I believe it was in question period on Friday - said that he didn't believe that the Throne Speech was the vehicle that should be used to repeat many of the previous commitments and promises of the government. However, all you have to do is read the Throne Speech, and it's nothing more than a repetition and a rehash of all of the various things that the government wants to try and take credit for throughout the past couple of years.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I could say and I'm sure that my predecessor as Leader of the Opposition and colleague, the Member for Charleswood, won't mind if I borrow a phrase that he has used before in this House when I refer to this Throne Speech as thin gruel. It offers little hope or any new commitments to action by this government, by this failed government.

Normally a Throne Speech sets out guideposts for action, creates optimism in the future, but this one does none of that. It is nothing more than a rehashing of previous inadequate responses to the problems and concerns of Manitobans today, a very lavish and lengthy attempt to cover up with verbiage the abject failure of this government in its responsibilities to Manitobans.

So regrettably, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside

THAT the motion be amended by adding to it the following words: That this House regrets:

- (a) that the government's failure to provide a rational, long-term view in dealing with the economic and fiscal affairs of the province;
- (b) the government's continuing failure to demonstrate any commitment to deal with the serious problems which exist in the agricultural sector in Manitoba today;
- (c) the continuing failure of the government to attract private sector investment for the establishment of meaningful, long-term jobs in Manitoba;
- (d) the government's contravention of the statutory provisions of The Financial Administration Act; and
- (e) that by virtue of its failure in every field of endeavour charged to its responsibility, this government has lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, before that question is put, I wonder if we could have the Leader of the Opposition table the letter that he referred to from Manitoba and the reply from Alberta.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition was gracious enough to compliment

me in continuing in my role as Deputy Speaker, and I would like to take this, my first, opportunity to congratulate him and welcome him to his new position as Leader of the Opposition.

I couldn't help but think, seeing him standing there in his blue suit today, that he looked a lot like the captain of a new ocean liner, and an ocean liner that's steaming full steam through the night. I only hope that he sent his messages to the engine room to reverse the direction of the ship which he is in command of now. I know it takes a little bit of time for ocean liners to change course, but I hope that underneath the waters the propellers are in reverse and the rudder's been shifted a little bit.

I think it is somewhat of an honour for me to follow the Leader of the Opposition today in the Throne Speech Debate. The opposition has put up their best man and our side has put up his equal.

I believe that the Throne Speech is an interesting exercise in that we can speculate on where we would all like to see Manitoba go and in which direction we are proceeding as a government. I don't expect the opposition to accept my particular vision of where Manitoba's going and where our government is going, but I would hope that they would understand.

We have obviously come out of a period of significant recession and maybe almost depression in Canada. Perhaps it's not time to rejoice yet, but things are getting better. I believe that our short-term job creation projects for the last couple of years have had a significant impact. The opposition, of course, has quibbled over just how many jobs are created by the Jobs Fund, and that's always a valid discussion to undertake. I don't take issue with them for questioning the particular numbers. However, I think that it's obvious that, regardless of the precise numbers of jobs created, that it has had an impact. In fact, if we have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, it's not because we did nothing. It is because we had the Jobs Fund.

I take a certain amount of satisfaction in knowing that the Jobs Fund has created a lot of useful programs and a lot of useful work for people in Manitoba. The Homes in Manitoba Program has certainly benefited a lot of people in my particular constituency. Last year, there were 330 new homes built in River East, and that's no small accomplishment for a construction industry which was in such a recession only a few years ago.

The wage subsidies for Careerstart for science and engineering graduates - there are so many programs which have created jobs - that I wonder sometimes if maybe the press overlooks just what we are doing, because there are so many that are under way right now.

The message of this Session, of course, is not what we have done in the way of short-term job creation, but where we're going for long-term economic development in the future. I hope that the message gets through because we are doing something and we are getting in gear now for that long-term planned development.

Short-term planning, of course, is a problem in North America. It's a problem of business. It's a problem of society. North American corporations have a notoriously short-term outlook in their planning. The preoccupation with short-term profits, getting a little bit extra money

this quarter over last quarter or this year over last year, it leads to some of the short-run business practices which have led to the problems we are having in our economy today, for instance, the milking of corporate assets.

The American steel industry is not in good shape because capital was never reinvested, but the cash flow of the steel producers was simply milked to subsidize other endeavours by the owners. Colt Industries had a steel factory in Pennsylvania which was milked - it was very profitable - but there was never any reinvestment and the profits were taken out and put into other areas. Now that steel mill has been closed down once again, to get short-term profit from the tax benefits of closing down a factory.

Another problem is pollution, of course. We are spewing lots of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide into the atmosphere because, in the short run, we make more money by polluting rather than by taking care of the long run which would be a non-polluting environment.

Takeovers are another way that corporations are going after the short-term big buck. You take over another corporation with a good cash flow and it makes your balance sheet look a little bit better but it doesn't really contribute to economic development. It is simply a shuffling of ownership.

If we really want to get under way for long-term planning, and corporations are telling us we have to give them tax subsidies for long-term planning, for research and development, but of course once again they're simply talking about short-term benefits through tax credits for what they should be doing which is long-term planning anyway.

I think we have to look at the social framework in which all this is taking place. Who are our business heroes? Are they in shipbuilding? No. Or textiles? No. It's the Super Lotto winner, the person who gets instant wealth overnight. Our heroes are the Nelson Skalbanias and the Peter Pocklington who go out and flip real estate, make a big buck, but they haven't contributed anything to the economy. They are the high flyers who stream across the sky like a shooting star when times are good, and then fizzle out when times get bad. So we have to shift our thinking from the short run, the short-term profits to long-term planning.

Northern Telecom, for example, spent years researching and developing its digital switching equipment and when it got it, it didn't sell out and make a quick buck, it's producing it and that is now creating 500 jobs in Winnipeg. There's an example of a good, long-term corporate planner, as opposed to some of the short-term problem planners that we've seen in the steel industry.

For me, long-term planning means three things. First of all, it means a willingness to forego short-term, big bang projects in order to get the best long-term deal and I think this is particularly relevant when you're talking about Hydro and how we envision the development of Hydro. If you read the book that came out a few years ago called "Forced Growth," you can see what happens when governments decide to embark on a crash development program before the time is ready. I think that was what we were seeing a few years ago when we had projects for massive development for a power grid and for an aluminum smelter. They were a bit before their time.

The aluminum markets crashed and the deal for Alcan fell through, not necessarily because of bad negotiations but because the world market wasn't ready for a new aluminum smelter. The western economy wasn't ready for extra power consumption in Saskatchewan and Alberta and I think we have to be ready to exercise a little bit of patience. I know the Leader of the Opposition said that they were all ears when it comes to aluminum smelter contracts or negotiations, but I don't think that is the sort of thing that you would negotiate in public. Once you've gone out and made your commitment and said we've got an agreement, you are at the mercy of the people whom you're negotiating with.

The same thing goes for exporting Hydro from the Province of Manitoba. You know, I'm sure that there are negotiations going on and if we have a little patience, we'll hear plenty of good news on exports of Hydro in the next year or two years. Who knows how long it may take? But it will be coming, because we aren't forcing growth, we are simply planning for growth. We're ready when the markets are ready, and we are not prepared to sell below cost in order to get the big bang for the immediate gain. It certainly looks good and that's one of the other problems I have.

Long-term planning means another thing to me. It means focussing on job creation rather than capital investment. I think that we often get too preoccupied with the megaprojects, a megaproject which is really only a massive investment of capital. It's not necessarily a massive job creation. It's just a massive investment of capital. The aluminum smelter that the Tories said they had all lined up was a .5 billion investment, and it would have created 600 jobs — (Interjection) — okay, I will accept the Opposition House Leader that it was \$1 billion, and it was 700 to 1,000 jobs. But when Northern Telecom invested \$25 million, they created 500 jobs. You don't necessarily need a massive investment to create a lot of jobs.

As a matter of fact, if you read the Throne Speech, you'll find that 60 percent of all the new jobs created in Manitoba in the next few years will be in the small business area. They won't be in the massive megaprojects area, it'll be in the small business area. This is the area that we intend to co-operate with for developing the economy of Manitoba.

The third area for long-term planning which I think about is deciding what businesses Manitoba should be in. That's critical if we have to assess what we're good at, what we can do, and where we can compete. And you have to think of some of the corporate analogies, for example, Singer Sewing Machine a few years ago decided that sewing machines weren't exactly a growth area, so they went into the aerospace industry. They still make sewing machines, they still improve their sewing machines, but their major growth comes from aerospace production. Sears Roebuck found that it was nice to retail, but the real growth was in a different area so they went into personal financial services, and that's where most of their growth is coming from now - You're In Good Hands With Allstate.

Manitoba's in much the same situation. We have our traditional resource base of agriculture, mining and forestry and these, of course, are areas that we have to maintain and strengthen. The Throne Speech announces some \$90 million in federal-provincial agreements to strengthen and maintain those particular

sectors. If we really want to grow, if we want to grow like Singer Sewing Machines, we've got to identify other areas to put the major focus of our investment into.

Some of the other major areas which we're looking at, the ones that we've identified, are transportation and electronics. Transportation, of course, we have \$275 million federal-provincial agreement with the feds for developing, among other things, Winnipeg as a North American centre for bus manufacturing and technological development, and that's a significant amount of money, \$275 million. You add that to the \$90 million for agriculture, mining and forestry, and that's not much different from an aluminum smelter. The thing is it's spread around over several different areas and it's not played up in the media, it's not played up by our government as the big all-pervading panacea to our problems.

Electronics is one of the particularly good areas that we can develop Winnipeg as a centre for. We've recently attracted a \$41 million National Research Council manufacturing technology centre. The significance of that goes far beyond the 175 permanent jobs that will be created in that research facility. If you look at what happened in Ottawa when Silicon Valley North was developed there, it evolved not from a few entrepreneurs setting down there, it evolved from the fact that the Federal Government was involved in research in electronics during World War II and the people that it employed, some of them got good ideas and went into private sector, set up their own businesses, they hired people and some of them got good ideas and went off on their own, so now in Canada we have significant employers such as Mytel and Bytec and Systems House and lots of other high-ec companies.

The same can happen in Winnipeg with the National Research Council facilities here, with the location already of Northern Telecom, with the development of a lot of homegrown high-ec industries which are sponsored by the Provincial Government and the Federal Government's joint effort for business development. We're setting the stage for synergistic growth which means that people come here, they work here, they get good ideas and they branch out and they start new enterprises. It's what happened in Ottawa, it's what can happen in Winnipeg.

Because we've chosen a path which dwells on transportation technology and electronics, we also have to be aware of the international economy which we operate in. If Manitoba is to compete in world markets it's got to have more trade. We've announced two new programs in the Throne Speech for trade promotion programs, an international technological assistance office for exporting knowledge through the Department of Education.

We also have to keep in mind the maintenance of our universal health care system. That's probably one of the most significant things we've got going for us in Manitoba insofar as export development or industrial competition anywhere in Canada. You know we usually think of health care as a service to people, but we've got to start thinking about it as an economic building block just as well.

In the United States where they don't have universal health care, insurance programs are one of the major negotiating points for labour negotiations in all the major industries there. If you look at General Motors, in 1982,

\$483 of the cost of every new car went to pay for health insurance premiums for their employees. Those are costs that we don't have in Manitoba. Anyone who locates in Manitoba doesn't have to pay these massive health benefit insurance programs. Inco, which in Ontario pay \$600 per employee for its health care, doesn't pay that in Manitoba. That gives us a very major competitive advantage in terms of international competition with the United States, and that's a competitive advantage that grows every year because the health care costs in the United States are running out of control far more so than Canada, and it's a competitive advantage we have against the other areas of Canada.

The solution of many of the right-wing governments in the west has been to extra bill, to impose user fees for hospitals, this sort of thing. We feel that's not the way to go because the minute you start allowing the extra billing or the user fees for hospitals or any other medical service, you open a niche for private insurance to come in; not that that's necessarily bad, but once you have private insurance you have negotiating points in wage contracts and you've got your foot in the door for getting a system just like the United States where the employer has to pay for health benefits for his employees.

So, the maintenance of our universal health care system is certainly one of the most significant and one of the most important things that we can do in order to preserve and develop the competitive advantage that Manitoba has.

Another area where we have to look forward is in labour relations and labour policy. In the past, the traditional emphasis of labour legislation has been on confrontation and equalizing the various players in the labour struggle, management and labour. This has always been based on greed; labour greed if you're management oriented, and management greed if you're labour oriented. It's two competing systems. This is something that the Conservative Party and the right wing generally has always believed in, but we feel we have to go beyond that into a system of co-operation between labour and management. I think this is one of the things that sets us apart from British Columbia or any other right-wing area where the Conservative Governments have traditionally seen the solution to labour problems as destroying the unions, and that's happening in Saskatchewan, it's happening in Alberta and B.C. and that's not the way to go. The way to go is to proceed from the confrontation to the co-operation.

Equalizing power for the negotiators for labour and management is still an important area to preserve. There is going to be fine tuning from time-to-time and it's necessary, times change so there's nothing wrong with keeping up with the times and preserving the equality of bargaining power between labour and management, but co-operation is the essential ingredient for long-term planning.

Last Session we had amendments to The Workplace Health and Safety Act which made joint management and labour safety committees in the workplace a requirement. That's one area where you can legislate co-operation. However, we primarily hope to show the benefits of co-operation through government leadership. The Provincial Government is leading by example by putting labourers as members on the

boards of Crown corporations. That's a thrust toward industrial democracy that we believe in and it's working well at Manfor, and it goes hand-in-hand with the \$40 million redevelopment of that corporation.

We're also working co-operatively with labour to settle problems such as the essential services definitions in hospitals which is the only one in Canada which takes effect if there should be a labour dispute. Perhaps one of the major areas where we've shown co-operation that no other provincial government has is in negotiating a wage reduction with the MGEA last year. If you look at what happened in Quebec, or B.C., or any of these other areas where wage negotiations were imposed, it certainly wasn't through co-operation with labour.

There's no use, of course, having Crown corporations if they're always going to behave like private corporations. They have a special role of leadership and that's why we are focusing on Crown corporations. It's not something that we legislate, it's something that we deal with through policy, and that's perhaps why the press misses that particular thrust. It doesn't happen in the Legislature so they don't report it. — (Interjection) — The opposition scoffs at the press.

The fact of the matter is that we are making a lot of progress with the Crown corporations. Recently in Europe, we have seen two great labour disputes, one with coal miners in Britain and one with steelworkers in France. Both of those industries are technologically outdated and they're uncompetitive in world markets, and both are government-owned and operated. Yet one government is avowedly capitalist and the other is avowedly socialist. Both are using the same solution, and both have obviously not got the proper solution.

Britain and France have far too long operated with no long-term planning. We have to realize that there are sunset industries as well as sunrise industries and we have to start planning for the sunsets as well as the sunrises and that's something that hasn't taken place before. In order to prepare for the closure of a corporation or the phasing-out of technologically defunct or uncompetitive companies, we have to have a provincial training strategy to improve the responsiveness and flexibility of our training institutions and that was announced in this Throne Speech. We need new programs to retrain workers whose jobs may disappear due to technological change, and that was announced in this Throne Speech.

We have to deal with the issue of plant closures to make sure that workers have sufficient notice that they can prepare for new careers, or to prepare other operations in consideration of other owners for the companies which are being closed down. There is simply no guarantee for any job these days. With rapid technological change, no job is secure forever. We have to become used to the idea of changing jobs several times during our working careers.

Last Session, we passed the pension reform which made it a lot easier to change careers, because it made it easier to transfer pension plans from one employer to another; it reduced the vesting term for employees and that certainly was a great step. It may not have been sexy and attract a lot of press attention, but it's very useful to people who are changing careers and getting ready for the long-term planning of their own personal work careers.

To sum up, I guess what I would like to say is simply that capitalism and socialism, as concepts, are really

becoming passé. The example of Britain and France shows that you have to find new ways of doing things and not become hidebound in holding to particular ideologies. The new right, of course, is focussing on going backwards, and I would hope that our particular party is focussing on progressing from the present situation of capitalism versus socialism, and that we're focussing more on co-operation with private enterprise and co-operation with labour. I would hope that the opposition would, at least during this Session, change its particular tactics from confrontation to co-operation with the government.

It certainly is a better way to go than the terrific confrontation between socialism and capitalism which is taking place in British Columbia. If we are going to create stable government, if we're going to create a stable economic climate and a stable political climate, we have to have a certain amount of co-operation without the radical swings and the really almost obnoxious confrontation which takes place between those who are too firmly wedded to their political principles.

I would simply like to say I thought that the Throne Speech had a lot to offer if you're willing to look deep enough and if you look for the direction that the province is going in, and our vision of where Manitoba's future lies.

As I said before, I don't expect the opposition to agree with me, but I do expect them to understand it

and I hope they will at least focus their criticisms on the concept of co-operation versus the concept of confrontation. I hope that they will evaluate their particular adherence to the doctrines of confrontation. Perhaps the new Leader of the Opposition can send that message to the engine room to change direction, and I hope he does it soon before it's too late in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: If there are no other members wishing to participate at this time, could I suggest an adjournment of the debate and simply leaving the debate open?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, we have no objections to that. Therefore, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn, with the understanding that the business would be finished for the day.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)