



**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. 4A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 17 APRIL, 1984.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 17 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 Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to inform the Legislature that the Government of Manitoba has reached an agreement on an important export power sale to Northern States Power Company of Minneapolis, Minnesota. This announcement is also being made by Northern States Power in Minneapolis today.

Under the terms of a recently signed Memorandum of Understanding, Mr. Speaker, Northern States Power will be supplied with 500 megawatts or 500,000 kilowatts a year of firm power for 12 years.

Beginning May 1, 1993 and running to April 30, 2005, the agreement will generate an estimated \$3.2 billion over the 12-year period, or an annual average of \$270 million.

Mr. Speaker, a sale of this magnitude and at such good terms will be of enormous benefit to Manitobans.

It will also be a benefit to NSP in that it will allow them to defer a 500 megawatt fossil fuel plant.

The Memorandum of Understanding with Northern States Power was negotiated by the Manitoba Energy Authority, which is the Provincial Agency charged with the statutory responsibility for negotiating all electrical energy exports from the Province of Manitoba. The Board of Directors of the Manitoba Energy Authority is made up of representatives from the Provincial Government and Manitoba Hydro.

I would like to publicly acknowledge the work of the officials of the Manitoba Energy Authority. In particular, I would like to thank and pay special tribute to my Deputy Minister, Mr. Marc Eliesen, the Chairman of the Manitoba Energy Authority, for his leadership and work which has led to the signing of this Memorandum.

Mr. Speaker, following a formal signing of the contract in early June in Winnipeg, we will apply to the National Energy Board for an export permit. At that time comprehensive information will be made available regarding this sale.

It is important to note, that the NSP sale will affect the start-up date for the construction of the Limestone Generating Station. I have asked Manitoba Hydro to accelerate its current studies aimed at determining the most economic time to begin construction. I expect those studies to be completed by the end of this summer and a decision on Limestone construction to be taken by the fall of this year. In the meantime, the Government of Manitoba will be meeting with construction industry

and labour representatives, potential Manitoba Limestone suppliers - particularly medium and small size companies - and northern communities and associations, in order to ensure that the orderly development of Manitoba's energy resources takes place with the maximum spinoff possible for Manitoba and Manitobans.

Building the Limestone dam would mean a cumulative expenditure of approximately \$3 billion over the period required to complete the project. It would generate more than 17,000 person years of employment, 6,000 person years of employment would be directly related to the dam construction and an additional 11,000 person years would be indirectly related.

Our province is fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in having abundant hydro-electric resources owned by the people for the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba has had a great past, but this government has confidence for an even greater future for us.

Although this represents Manitoba's first major long term firm power sale, the Government of Manitoba is hopeful that in the coming months this valuable renewable resource can be used to further other economic opportunities and to stimulate additional investment and employment in Manitoba.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, in responding to the Minister's statements and the enthusiasm with which members of the New Democratic Party applaud these statements, I am, of course, reminded of the many occasions where they charged another government with going in the wrong direction in exporting power sales; involved, of course, in the export of power sales is the providing of jobs in another jurisdiction, rather than in Manitoba or in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me hurriedly indicate though the welcoming of this kind of announcement for Manitoba Hydro and the people of Manitoba. I think the people of Manitoba will be anxious to know what this means to them individually. For instance, could it perhaps bring back the hydro freeze that was in existence from 1979 to the time this government came back in? Or will it, in fact, mean that perhaps Manitobans can expect hydro rates to drop from a result of the revenues that this sale will generate, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, we applaud any action that of course will bring forward orderly development of the next phase of construction on the Nelson River. It's a promise that we, as Manitobans, have yet to see fulfilled. I remind the Honourable Minister that even with this sale we, of course, still have an additional 1,000 megawatts of surplus power on the Nelson River and we will be anxiously awaiting any future announcement as to the acceleration of the start up of Limestone.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that the government will address itself in the same forceful manner in terms

of providing utilization of our rich hydro resources here in this Province of Manitoba; and second best to our sister provinces in developing a Canadian grid and providing Canadians with jobs first, rather than as what has always been known and always been accepted, even though we have no difficulty in accepting the sale, this export of power across the border, but along with the export of power across the border also goes the generation of many thousands of jobs to those jurisdictions south of our border.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty in acknowledging and applauding the Minister's successful conclusion of this agreement to suggest to him, of course, that these kinds of negotiations have been ongoing for a number of years.

These kinds of negotiations have been particularly, and were particularly pursued by a former colleague of mine, the then Honourable Don Craik when he was charged with the responsibility of Hydro, is common knowledge, Sir, and the Hansards of this Legislature are filled with the discussions and the efforts that were being made at that time to forge the kind of south-north link of the use of power which makes a lot of eminent sense. They are the heavier users in the summertime, we are the heavier users in the wintertime. Those kinds of discussion have taken place on numerous occasions in the past and I applaud the Minister's successful conclusion in this instance.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table the Annual Report for the Department of Government Services for the year 1982-83.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Negotiations with Alcoa Company

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines following upon his optimistic announcement earlier in the Session today. I would like to follow through on a second portion of the Throne Speech that refers to his department and, Sir, I would like to ask him, in view of the reference to the attraction of energy-intensive industry to Manitoba, whether or not negotiations are currently under way between his department or Manitoba Hydro and the Alcoa Company, with respect to the establishment of an aluminum smelter here in Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated last year in the House - I'm not sure whether the people on the

other side believe me that we were undertaking negotiations with a number of aluminum companies - I did not give the names of any of them for reasons of competitive confidentiality because what one wants to do, Mr. Speaker, is ensure that one canvasses all of the options and gets as many eggs in as many baskets as possible. We thought that was the prudent approach to take, Mr. Speaker. We found that previous administrations had put all of their eggs in one basket, and then the basket may be dropped, so we thought it was prudent to canvass a number of options; so we are having discussions with a number of aluminum companies and Alcoa is one of those companies.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that with the coming of Easter we are all appreciative of the reference to the eggs in the baskets, but I would like to ask the Minister of Energy and Mines which officials of Alcoa has the Government of Manitoba, or Manitoba Hydro been in discussion with?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions, at the most senior levels, with Alcoa. Indeed, I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition seems so concerned about this issue. A few months ago he was quoted in the paper saying he was cautioning people, that talks between the Manitoba Government and the giant Aluminum Company of America are very very preliminary, and he said, "There is nothing to get excited about at this point."

Mr. Speaker, he went on to say that without the NDP reversing its policy and selling the company a portion of a power plant, they will not be very successful. That is the Conservative position. Unless we give away the power dam, there will be no development. We on this side of the House, the New Democratic Party Government under Howard Pawley, believes that fair development can take place on the basis of power contracts. That is the basis on which we have pursued discussions with aluminum companies, Mr. Speaker. We hope that they will be successful. We are confident that this is the rational basis for development in Manitoba. That will provide the greatest short-term benefit and the greatest long-term development and it shows a very clear contrast in approaches between the Pawley Government and the other government, which would give the resources away possibly to induce development, and ours which wants to take both into account, the short-term and the long-term, so that all Manitoba benefits.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to find out that the Minister can indeed read my quotes from a few months ago. I have to indicate by way of prefacing my remarks, Sir, that we on this side can understand very fully the difference between giving away and selling. Obviously the Minister and his colleagues do not understand that difference, but that's okay; we appreciate that. What I'm saying is, in view of what he has said, is there anything for us to get excited about with respect to the discussions with Alcoa today?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that these discussions indeed will lead to a development in the future. We are having discussions with other

companies as well and if at some stage it is appropriate to make announcements in this Legislature, I make the commitment that I will make those announcements in this Legislature so that we can all hear them.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate who is representing Manitoba in these discussions and negotiations.

**HON. W. PARASIUUK:** Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Energy Authority, the same group that was so successful in negotiating the power sale with the Northern States Power Company. That group is operating under my jurisdiction and, Mr. Speaker, I hate to say leadership, but I think all told that's correct, they are operating under my leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I have confidence in their ability to negotiate something that is far better than the types of dreams that we've heard about in the past and we will bring forward solid substantive achievements. There may be instances where these will entail letters of understanding and Memorandums of Understanding and, of course, we will let people know about that at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker.

But let it be clear, the people of Manitoba are well represented by people who have the long-term interests of Manitoba at heart, who have worked far and beyond the call of duty to ensure that we have a better Manitoba, and we'll have a better Manitoba.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate when was the date of the last meeting between officials of Alcoa and representatives of Manitoba.

**HON. W. PARASIUUK:** Mr. Speaker, I think there are some matters of confidentiality that I cannot divulge at this particular stage. Mr. Speaker, we have to undertake negotiations. I would hope that the opposition would be constructive and would not want to try and sabotage any of these discussions, Mr. Speaker. I noticed a number of green faces on the other side when I read my discussions. I can say that we have had very recent discussions, Mr. Speaker, with representatives from a number of aluminum companies; and at the appropriate time when we don't have constraints of commercial confidentiality, I will in fact let the House know.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Good. Good.

**MR. G. FILMON:** In view of the fact that when the Minister and his colleagues were in opposition, they insisted that they be told about the discussions that were going on between our government and Alcan and our government and IMC, and they asked for position papers and various different things to be tabled. I don't think it's unreasonable that we should just simply be able to ask, when was the last date at which they met with Alcoa officials. I don't think that's too much to ask and my question is, when was the date of the last meeting between members representing Manitoba and Alcoa?

**HON. W. PARASIUUK:** Mr. Speaker, I said there were discussions very recently - there were some last week

- but there were discussions with other aluminum companies as well over the course of the last few weeks and that should be made clear to the opposition. There are a number of discussions going places. It's a matter of trying to ensure that all of them are brought along to the fullest extent possible so that we in fact can have a good choice in Manitoba; that we may in fact not only pursue one development but possibly two developments or hopefully even three developments, Mr. Speaker. That, we believe, is a wise and prudent approach. So when it comes to disclosure, I have indicated in the statement that I read in this House, that when a contract is signed and a referral is made to the National Energy Board, we have said that we would make available to the public that which can be made available.

We on this side, Mr. Speaker, will ensure that the House is kept informed. We hope that we can keep them informed of everything. There may be some instances of commercial confidentiality, which I hope the other side, the Conservative Party, would understand. I would hope that they would come together and try and build with us constructively a better Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. We believe that we on this side of the House can provide the leadership to achieve our potential and we hope that they will come along with us and act constructively to ensure that that potential is indeed achieved.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Minister that we only seek this information in a co-operative spirit that indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have been shown in recent times about some of the secret decisions that are made behind closed doors by this government, the passing of a \$1.5 billion Special Warrant, certain agreements that were entered into last year and the difficulties that this government gets into with secret agreements.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I'm asking of the Minister is, when are we likely to hear any information about any agreements between the Government of Manitoba and Alcoa with respect to an aluminum smelter?

**HON. W. PARASIUUK:** I would hope that I would be able to present information soon. I have heard - I think that's a good term for the Legislature - I have, in fact, heard the Member for Lakeside give that type of answer many times but I can even go further than that, Mr. Speaker.

We've said that we hoped that in the course of the next few weeks, months, as the months unfold, Mr. Speaker, we hope that we can have other announcements. We, in fact, have developed this program to build a better future, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that we certainly will keep them informed. There is no secrecy involved.

The \$1.5 billion Special Warrant was made public immediately with the press release. That was done by O/C. I don't think that is secrecy, Mr. Speaker; that surely isn't secrecy and to have it imputed somehow that by releasing an O/C immediately, by having a press conference, that that is secrecy, Mr. Speaker is indeed not constructive but somewhat mischievous.

### Tax relief for homeowners

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the First Minister's campaign promise in 1981, to ease the property tax burden and, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that using, as an example, an average home in the City of Winnipeg School Division assessed at \$7,000; in view of the fact that over four years of Conservative Government the net property tax has increased some \$78, whilst in the first three years under an NDP government the total taxes have increased by some \$298, four times the total increase over a four-year period of Conservative Government, can homeowners expect some relief in the forthcoming Budget from this government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert is, I'm sure, quite conscious that matters pertaining to the Budget are announced Budget evening in the appropriate due manner, that is customary to this Chamber and to governments everywhere.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the clear election promise by the First Minister in the fall of 1981 and, in view of the complete failure of this government to live up to that promise, would the First Minister not agree to at least reduce the number of political advisors, communications people, and the excessive costs of advertising in order to provide some small degree of relief to the homeowner in the city and in the Province of Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I will double-check my calculations, but it my recollection that during the first year that this government served in office the amount of grants to local governments, school and municipal, I believe exceeded the amount of grants provided during the first three years of the previous administration - still obviously not enough.

There is responsibility also at the local level for ensuring that increases be kept to a minimum. I would like to at this point, Mr. Speaker, commend local governments in the Province of Manitoba. I have received some information in the last few days that encouraged me to believe that local governments are acting very responsibly, in fact, there have been some instances where there have been mill rate decreases on the part of local governments which I find very very encouraging. I think the Honourable Member for St. Norbert should feel good this afternoon that there's been some leadership provided by local government, school division level and by the municipal level to contain costs that's being demonstrated at the local level of government.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, using the example that I used in the Winnipeg School Division, in view of the fact that in three years under the NDP the total increase is nearly four times the total increase over a four-year

period under the previous Conservative Government, is the First Minister blaming municipalities for those tax increases or does the Provincial Government take responsibility for those tax increases?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, unlike the honourable member we are not trying to find scapegoats in local government. We recognize that all Manitobans through various levels of government must provide vital and important services, and those important services are provided through the school divisions, the municipalities of the province, through the City of Winnipeg. At the same time there's a responsibility on governments to contain costs during difficult times. And what I indicated to the honourable member - and he must not have heard - rather than blaming local government I had, indeed, commended much of the local government in the Province of Manitoba this time for containing costs and, in some instances that I know, Mr. Speaker, have caused a net reduction in mill rate. I would like to commend that level of local government, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I'm sure, could provide other examples that indeed where that is occurring, that there is leadership being demonstrated by local government. I think we should feel pleased and not be looking around, as the Honourable Member for St. Norbert appears to be desirous of doing this afternoon, of blaming someone or else.

### Effect of reduction in grain prices

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the recently announced reduction in the initial grain prices, can the Minister tell this Legislature and the people of Manitoba what effect the reduction in the initial grain prices may have on the grain farmers of Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for that question. We are very concerned, obviously, with the reduction in the initial prices to be paid on grains.

It will, we believe, place greater strain on an already depressed farm economy across Western Canada. If anything there is now greater responsibility on the Government of Canada to make amendments to The Western Grain Stabilization Act, to make an immediate payment to sensitize that legislation and to make sure that cash flows now before seeding time to Western Canada, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** What steps have you taken as Minister to assist the Manitoba grain farmers in view of this announcement?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we have made representations as far back as 1983 recognizing the serious cash situation of Manitoba farmers and of farmers in Western Canada. As late as the last week in March we did send a telex to the Minister of

Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, recommending five points and I think the honourable members opposite should be made aware of the five points that we have stressed to the Federal Minister of Agriculture dealing with The Western Grain Stabilization Fund. (1) To reduce the averaging period to three years from the current five-year period. This will remove the impact of very low years from the average at an earlier date. (2) Basing payouts on a crop year in order to reduce the time lag between the cash flow period and the receipt of payments by farmers. (3) Include an adjustment factor for increased sales volume so that the effect of increased volumes does not fully offset price declines. (4) Compute the net cash flows on a provincial basis to make the program more sensitive to more local farmer requirements. (5) In view of the cash shortage of Western Canadian farmers to permit farmers meeting hardship criteria to discontinue paying contributions to the fund while maintaining participation by establishing a contingent liability to the fund for the unpaid contributions so that they will be able to stay in the fund and receive the cash required to complete their spring seeding.

### Assessment Review

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to also address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, in the light of his recent response. Could the Minister give this House any indication of the number of Manitoba farmers in each of the last two years who have had their farm dwellings taxed because of their declining net farm income?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question because that does not fall under my purview.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture if he has raised this question with the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs who has a very serious problem with his department who are going around this province almost indiscriminately asking farmers for privileged information to determine whether or not their farm dwellings should be taxed?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. If members have a preamble to a question they should recall that preamble by definition comes before the question and not after the question.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, the honourable member should be aware that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and myself are working very closely, along with other colleagues, to deal with the whole question of assessment. Maybe the honourable member doesn't realize that.

As well, he should be aware and I am sure that most people are aware, that the law he is speaking about has been on the books of the Province of Manitoba long before any one of us here in this Chamber were members, Mr. Speaker, and that it's a law in longstanding.

Mr. Speaker, it was a commission that was established by his administration, by their administration, that recommended, rather than piecemeal changes to the assessment legislation there should be a broad review of the exemptions and procedures and we, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs of this government are working very hard to try and deal with that question in the long term, rather than by dealing it piecemeal, Sir.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** A final supplementary to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, because I know he had an interest in municipal affairs in the past, and because he also has a good knowledge of agriculture and probably a list of all the farmers of Manitoba, will he inform the farmers of Manitoba of the strenuous efforts that this government is taking to relieve the tax burden on farmers who are hard pressed because of declining farm incomes?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member is asking to do a mailing to all the farmers. Mr. Speaker, I think we should take him up and consider his request and mail a publication to all the farmers of Manitoba recognizing that this government has put more into agriculture than any government in the history of this province. Admittedly, Sir, it will never be enough and we recognize how difficult it is in the farm community with depressed incomes and the like, but we certainly want to take his encouragement under advisement and I thank him for that.

### Self-government for Camperville

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I direct a question to the First Minister. In today's Free Press it indicates the proclamation of self-government for the community of Camperville and, in view of the province's desire to entrench self-government for Indian and Metis communities in our Constitution at the recent First Ministers' Conference held in Ottawa, I believe the first part of March, can the Premier advise if the Camperville situation was developed in consultation with that community?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think we should just remind the Honourable Member for Swan River that at the First Ministers' Conference, the question of self-government was indeed raised and dealt with rather extensively. There were, in fact, a number of governments supportive, other governments not yet prepared to be supportive. Insofar as the issue of Camperville and the announcement yesterday, I am not aware of any consultation.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Well, in view of the announcement and the implications it has for some 50 or more other Metis communities in the province, is the First Minister in agreement with what the mayor of that community is doing?



**MR. SPEAKER:** Questioners should not ask for the opinions of the Treasury Bench, only for information which might be available from there. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder then if I could ask the First Minister whether this government supports the self-government introduction of the Camperville community.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this government, along with other governments, particularly the Government of New Brunswick and the Government of Ontario, adopted the position of the evolution of local government towards self-government, but not in unilateral fashions or unilateral manners or ways, but in a manner that would be consistent by way of development through the constitutional process of Canada.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I direct a further question then to the Minister of Northern Affairs. In view of the fact that Camperville has proclaimed themselves self-government in the Province of Manitoba, what implications does the Minister see for his department with respect to the Camperville community?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should inform the honourable member that the issue of self-government and the question of Metis self-government has been raised to this government previously and I am sure is something that has been talked about in a number of other jurisdictions across Canada.

In fact, in August I believe of last year, the Mayor and Council of Camperville presented a paper to the Provincial Government outlining some directions that they would like to see taken in terms of gaining some self-control, and I think the Premier has amply put it, that self-government and self-control is something that all Northern Affairs communities desire and a greater degree of control over their local administration and the resource areas.

The fact is that I spoke with the Mayor of Camperville, the Mayor of the Community Council there, this morning and asked whether this new conceptual framework that they're talking about in Camperville would in any way impair the operations of the Community Council with respect to the Department of Northern Affairs and the jurisdiction of the Department of Northern Affairs vis-a-vis The Northern Affairs Act on that community, and the answer is, no.

I think it is to be left for the people of Camperville to further explain and define what this Metis self-government is to be about. I think the department has worked with a number of communities to develop their local control mechanisms and we're convinced at this point that our Northern Affairs communities will continue to work toward incorporation. There are a number of communities that are nearly at that point and we certainly encourage them to develop the expertise in their local communities, to handle their own affairs, to

be more consistent with other LGDs and municipalities in the powers and jurisdictions that they have locally. That's what they're asking for from our perspective and that's something that we're prepared to work toward. This is another issue.

### Status of power sales to provinces

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines and the Minister responsible for the very successful negotiations that are leading up toward a \$3.2 billion power sale. I note a slight sense of pessimism in the members opposite.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question?

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Mr. Speaker, the opposition lead critic this afternoon questioned that we had a power sale to the Northern United States Power Corporation instead of our sister provinces. Would the Minister of Energy please inform the House as to the status of the negotiations with our sister provinces toward future potential power sales to those provinces?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question in view of some of the somewhat convoluted speech made yesterday by the Leader of the Conservative Party where he supposedly tabled documents that show that somehow the grid was lost but, in fact, the letters that he tabled were in response to a request that I had made to see whether, in fact, we couldn't be good Canadians; to see whether we couldn't, in fact, promote the development of power sales to Saskatchewan and Alberta.

I will be speaking on the Throne Speech Debate tomorrow and I will be able to table other documentation. — (Interjection) — I see that the Member for Sturgeon Creek is heckling. I wore this burgundy tie deliberately to see whether in fact the colour of his face would match it. I can see that his happiness is such that the tie is getting close to his colour.

Mr. Speaker, I will be able to table documentation tomorrow that will show that the demand projections for energy in Alberta and Saskatchewan are down 30 percent and 40 percent of what they envisaged in 1981 or '82. That is what's going on in Alberta and Saskatchewan, but I'll be pleased to talk about it tomorrow in the Throne Speech. I'll be pleased in fact to find out what the specific position of the Conservative Party is, because today the Member for Lakeside said that we shouldn't be selling to the Americans, and then he turned around at the end of his statement and said that it was wonderful because, Mr. Speaker, they had started it when, in fact, this particular sale has nothing to do with any initiatives they ever undertook.

### Effect of reduction in grain prices

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Minister of Agriculture and I



would have thought the Member for The Pas, when he was asking the questions, would have shown a little more interest in the subject matter on which he was questioning the Minister. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if he has in fact figured or calculated the amount of dollars that the lowering of the initial grain prices will cost the farmers of Manitoba?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, of course no one knows what the crop will be because the initial prices are for next year's crop, but there are estimates that the reduction in income will be over \$200 million.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, that is a substantial amount of money and I'm sure that we, as an opposition, would request to the Minister, and I'll ask him, if he will take direct action to put forward some provincial pressure on the Federal Minister of Agriculture who is busy campaigning, and the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, not to allow this to happen, in fact, put forward a proposition to them that the wheat prices should not be allowed to drop and that we cannot afford, as a farm community, that kind of a reduced income in this province. I would request that the Minister do that and do it immediately following this sitting of the House, and not go through his tirade of how he has requested the Federal Government to make a payout of the Western Grain Stabilization, as in fact it took us to prod him to do that even.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member well knows that the grain prices are a reflection of the world market in grains, a market that he and his party support in terms of having the open market and they reflect the grain prices, Sir. That is to say that the depressed prices are of serious concern to this government and we have attempted to say in the fall of 1983 and the summer of 1983 and the winter of 1984.

It may take, again if it will help to maybe shanghai the Minister of Agriculture who is now a leadership candidate, and bring him to his senses to pass and bring forward amendments to The Grain Stabilization Act so that needed cash flows can come to Western Canada, after the fact, Mr. Speaker. They made a payout to Ontario wheat producers without any contributions there and there is now close to a billion dollars sitting in the Western Grain Stabilization Fund of government and farmers' money, and no payout being made. We are totally frustrated by the inaction of the Federal Government and we hope that they will move, as the opposition members have indicated in Parliament that they are prepared to give speedy passage to any amendments, we hope that move will take place very shortly.

### Mandan Line

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. Today he's made a couple of remarks regarding dates in the future, 1993 and this fall. I remind him that Manitoba Hydro was going to make an

announcement in January, February or March. I'm wondering now if he can tell us when that announcement affecting the Mandan Line, when it will be made. Many of my constituents who will be affected by that line have been expecting that decision now for three months.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUKE:** Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly take the question as notice and I'll do another check with Hydro and I'll certainly get back to the member.

### Labour Law Review Report

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Labour and would ask her whether she has received the report from Ms. Smith, the consultant to the Labour Law Review, and whether or not she is expecting to table it in this Legislature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Yes, the government has received the initial report from Marva Smith on Phase I of the Labour Law Review and it is under consideration by Cabinet and caucus at this time.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, a last part to that question; will she be tabling it in the Legislature?

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, that decision has not been taken yet. The report is still under consideration by Cabinet and caucus. When the decision is made, then I will let you know.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** A further question to the same Minister. In light of the fact that she is not prepared to table the document at this time, I wonder if she could inform the House whether she can give this House the assurance that no action will be taken with regard to labour laws in the Province of Manitoba until that report has been tabled and industry, as well as the Legislature, has had a chance to look at it.

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the member, if he speaks to representatives from both the Employers' Association and from the labour side, would know that I have for quite a long time been meeting with them as has Marva Smith and the group, working on the original report. This has been going on through public hearings; it has been going on through consultations since last January. I have also given my word that I will consult with them before the bill is tabled in the Legislature, before it is brought in for first reading and I intend to do that. That will happen within the next month or so. Since that word has been given and since those people take our word for it, I would suggest that members opposite do the same.

Those meetings will be set up in the very near future.

## Remembrance Day to Peace Day

**MR. R. BANMAN:** A question to the same Minister on a different subject matter. I wonder if she could inform the House whether or not she is considering changing the name of Remembrance Day to Peace Day?

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, that is not a consideration before us now, although I will tell the member certainly that I have received some letters to that effect. We have received a number of letters regarding Remembrance Day in general and there have been a number of suggestions about whether it should remain the same, whether it should be changed. Those will be dealt with in the future; they're not before us now for consideration.

## Tuberculosis in cattle herds

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday in my absence, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell raised a question which was taken as notice on my behalf concerning the farmer in Rosburn who has had the herd of cattle in his yard in quarantine, infested with tuberculosis.

Mr. Speaker, I received a report from my department and I will try and give it to the honourable member. The cattle were tested by the Federal Department of Health of Animals Branch on October 4, 1983 - the test, as it's called, the "Coddlefold" test. Four animals showed a sensitivity to tuberculosis. Two of those animals were slaughtered and it does take four to five months for all the tests to be handled. One animal was negative; the other animal was confirmed as having Avian Tuberculosis.

Another type of test was done to further the testing on the animals. It was the comparative cervical test. That showed several cows with a sensitivity to Avian Tuberculosis. I am advised that that does not mean that they have tuberculosis but it shows a sensitivity to it.

I am advised as well that Avian Tuberculosis is not a health threat to humans or to other animals. It would take many years for a cow to die from Avian Tuberculosis, I'm advised. Also in terms of threat to the neighbouring cattle and herds, there is very little since it is through saliva and eating together that the threat would be transformed.

The disease is spread from animal to animal by saliva, as I've indicated. If cattle are kept confined in a barn, a cow could over time spread the disease to a neighbouring cow in a feed-lot situation. This is unlikely, as the cows have been confined in a barn and I am given to understand that the disease takes years to spread. It is rare for an animal to die from Avian Tuberculosis unless it has had the disease for many years. Tuberculosis transfer between hogs and cattle would be very rare, a very rare occurrence. They would have to be housed together and share the same feed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If the Honourable Minister has a lengthy answer, perhaps he would pass the document over to the member who asked the

question so as not to abuse the time of the question period.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I'm just about finished.

The honourable member raised a very serious question and a concern in the Rosburn area, Mr. Speaker, and I as well have met with farmers from that area with the same concern, Sir. Chickens with Avian Tuberculosis do not necessarily die and they can have it and die from other causes.

I am advised by Mr. Checkowski, the farmer involved, that cattle were released from quarantine on February 14th. Both federal and provincial veterinarians are certain that there was no connection between the bear-baiting of animals and any of the disease problems that the farmer has.

Mr. Speaker, the bear-baiting problem that was as well raised is of great concern to myself and my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources. We're endeavouring to have our staff do what we can to eliminate the dumping of dead carcasses in that area because it is not an occurrence that we agree with at all, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, the Honourable Opposition House Leader.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. H. ENNS:** Relative to House business, I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Finance when he would be prepared to introduce the Budget into this Chamber.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is an understanding that we will be finishing with the Throne Speech Debate by this coming Tuesday at 5:30 in the afternoon. That being the case, I would be prepared to present the Budget on Tuesday the 24th of April at 8 o'clock in the evening.

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** No, Mr. Speaker, further to House Business before we enter on the Orders of the Day. In view of the announcement by the Minister of Finance that the Budget will be presented on Tuesday, April 24th, I believe there is agreement with members opposite that, in terms of the actual commencement then of response in the Budget Debate that the House would be prepared to adjourn on Wednesday, April 25th - not sit that day - to adjourn the evening of April 24th, a week tonight until 2:00 p.m. on Thursday the 26th.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the House then will not sit a week tomorrow, April 25th, and also that the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House will meet on Tuesday April 24th at 10:00 a.m. in Room 255.

**A MEMBER:** What about Easter Monday?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the question regarding sitting on Easter Monday was raised, as I recall last Friday, and we agreed that we would be sitting on Easter Monday as has been our past practice . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** . . . Mr. Speaker, I have been in consultation with the Opposition House Leader regarding sitting times, sitting arrangements and the Business of the House, and we agreed last week that the House would be sitting Easter Monday. I'm surprised that any members of the House on either side have any concerns now about that. Two House Leaders have been making those arrangements. I trust they're acceptable to members on both sides. If they aren't, I'll raise that with the Opposition House Leader and we can reconsider . . .

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** There'll be no complaints.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the amendment thereto proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. The debate is open. Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to speak on the Throne Speech Debate and the amendments that are proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and support the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition party in pointing out to the people of Manitoba the incompetence and the way in which the Province of Manitoba are being governed.

The confidence of the public has certainly been shaken and is no longer with this particular government. I will in the next few minutes, Mr. Speaker, point out my thoughts as to what I think the comparative differences are between the positive action taken during our term of office, some of the things that the current government could be doing, and to develop a meaningful input into the Throne Speech Debate.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the mover because she had very little to work with and was able to put in a bit of time by walking around the waterfront or going all over it and trying to defend a government that is pretty well impossible to defend. Of course, she tried to make it interesting talking about her taxicab trips throughout the country.

As well, I want to say to the seconder, that I am left a little bit with some questions unanswered and would hope during the next few weeks of debate in the Legislative Assembly what he and the people that he represents, the Native people of this province, what they really think self-government means so that the people of this Assembly, so that we as an opposition

party and the people of Manitoba can get a clear understanding as to their intentions and really what they want.

I warn him as well, Mr. Speaker, that I believe he and his people have been taken into a great deal by the Trudeau Liberals in Ottawa and the Howard Pawleys and the New Democrats in Manitoba; that they had better look very carefully before they move ahead too far with them because I can tell you and tell him, Mr. Speaker, that I think they and his people will be the losers in any negotiations because they don't always come clean with what they talk about and I would want him to be well aware of that. I think the rest of the people of Manitoba could attest to that and back me up on that statement.

As well, on behalf of the people of the Arthur constituency, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my welcome to the Queen and Prince Philip and to Pope John Paul II on his visit this coming summer. I think it's an honour to have them come to our province and I, as I said earlier, want to greet them on behalf of the constituency of Arthur because I know there are many many people from that area looking forward to their visit and an opportunity to be present at the different occasions of which they will be at. I'm extremely pleased that the Queen will pay a visit to the Westman Region, to Brandon. However, I don't represent that community, but I come very close to it and I'm sure that many many people from all of southern and western Manitoba, as well as the United States, will pay a visit to her when she is in that fair city. So I make those comments as a member for that area and on behalf of the people of the Arthur constituency.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if it had not been for that announcement in the Throne Speech, there would have been very little there of any substance. That really is the only positive thing and the only major thing that is really going to happen when this government is in office in this coming year by the looks of the rest of the speech. Never has it taken so long to say so little and the leader of our party pointed out very capably yesterday that very fact in many areas.

As I go through my comments, I think it's going to be very obvious that we, as an opposition party representing a large number of people in the province, almost half the people of Manitoba when you look back at the election results, that this government has truly lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba. They have not got a firm sense of direction. They are at a loss to proceed with legislation that they have passed - I use the seat belt law as an example - it was to have come into effect on the January 1st, but somebody whispered in their ear that it was a bad political move. It was a bad political move that they should spend \$750,000 of the taxpayers' money to show people how to do up their seat belts. Well I have never, Mr. Speaker, in all my life seen such a group of people who pass a law and then don't have the courage of their convictions.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I will be making reference to some issues in agriculture and would be hoping that the Minister of Agriculture would be pointing out where the past Farmlands Protection Act is at, whether or not he is going to proceed to proclaim the act or whether he has taken into account the speeches and the real feelings of Manitobans and discard that bill and start over again to try and encourage people to come and

invest in the province from other parts of Canada and not discourage the kind of investment that is so badly needed. I will make reference to that again in another section when I'm dealing more specifically with the agricultural issue.

We are seeing, Mr. Speaker, a government that governs by press release and propaganda. When the Minister of Finance was taken to task yesterday by the Member for Turtle Mountain and asking him as to why he circumvented or why he did not live up to the law that he tried to bypass or go around The Financial Administration Act, he said: "Read my press release." That was his justification for the actions of passing \$1.5 billion so he doesn't have to account for the debate in this Legislative Assembly. That was his justification, Mr. Speaker. You know, never before have we ever seen such an incompetent Minister of Finance and I think the First Minister of this province would be well advised to replace such an incompetent person who is doing the kinds of things that he is doing. He does it with a sleazy approach, Mr. Speaker, one which is hard to accept.

The Throne Speech as we get into it, uses a lot of reference to the Jobs Fund - I know that some of my colleagues will be talking a lot more about it in that particular area - but I want to talk more specifically about the demonstrated incompetence and misguided leadership that this government are giving the institutes or the institutions and those particular organizations that relate to or tie directly to the Provincial Government.

The No. 1 issue, of course, that is raised in Western Manitoba has been the way in which the Brandon University has been handled; that in fact the Board of Governors appointed by this particular government have taken action to remove the President of the University and then looked for a reason to do so after. Yes, remove an individual from their job and then look for a reason to do so after. And there is fairly strong speculation that the reason that it is being done is, that there was an election promise by the Member for Brandon East and the Premier that that kind of action would take place, that there would be an automatic dismissal of that person after a New Democratic Party was elected and I think it is a shame. It is a black mark on this government, Mr. Speaker, that they don't have the courage to have an inquiry, a public inquiry into a public facility that is paid for by the people of Manitoba, that could affect the education of many many people in that province and the name of that particular university.

The people of Westman region are extremely upset at the incompetent way in which the Member for Brandon East, which the Premier and his Minister of Education have abrogated their responsibility on the operations of that facility.

I condemn them, Mr. Speaker, as do all of Manitoba condemn them in the irresponsible way of handling such an important matter. They should still, Mr. Speaker, have an inquiry into the way in which matters have been handled there so that each and every taxpayer of this province know that there is not an abuse of funds and that there is not someone being treated unfairly. The only way to clear the air would have been to bring it out into the public and have an inquiry into it.

They have seen fit to do otherwise, Mr. Speaker, and will pay the price in those two seats in Brandon, as

well as assuring the western regions of this province that there will be Tory members here to represent the people in the Legislature. The two Brandon seats, Mr. Speaker, the two Brandon seats will come to the Progressive Conservative Party and that will be one of the main issues that will be talked about during the next campaign for the next provincial election. That, Mr. Speaker, is coming a lot sooner than the government would wish.

Let us deal with another issue that has been a scar on this particular government, and that has been the handling, or the mishandling, of McKenzie Seeds under the direct administration or the responsibility - or it was for a certain period of time while it was convenient for him politically - under the Member for Brandon East who has not stood in his place once and defended himself. He has been muzzled, Mr. Speaker, and why won't he speak out? Why won't they tell the people of Manitoba what the outcome of the RCMP investigations are? Why aren't we allowed to see what the former manager had to say to the Premier of the province? What is the big cover-up in the McKenzie Seeds issue? Who was implicated? Who was implicated in that particular issue?

They sit very quiet, Mr. Speaker. They sit very quiet, but we know the people of all of Manitoba, particularly the people of the Brandon region and those two seats in Brandon, know that there's something wrong there. I will tell you, again getting back to the general problem that this government has, that there is no confidence or trust left in them, particularly in the Member for Brandon East. Of course, the Member for Brandon West knew well enough to bail out from this group of incompetent people who are ruining, not only institutes like the Brandon University or the McKenzie Seeds, but the entire province.

He bailed out, Mr. Speaker, because he thought he should be a Cabinet Minister to help them. They may have been well advised to take him in because he might have been able to give them a little bit more light earlier on such issues as the handling of McKenzie Seeds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with another current issue. I want to deal with another current issue that this Minister of Municipal Affairs has allowed to take place, that this Minister of Agriculture has said he is not responsible for when it comes to the taxation of farm dwellings, taxes imposed on farmers, and how did it come about? How were those farmers selected, Mr. Speaker? They haven't told us; they haven't told us that for some particular reason. Does your name come out of a hat? I expected to be questioned as a Member of the Legislature and as a farmer, as the present Minister of Agriculture. Certainly he should be questioned as to whether his house should or should not be taxed because of off-farm income. But what about the average farmer whose living along his normal way of life and all at once he gets a letter that reads, you are guilty until you prove your innocence. You are guilty till you prove your innocence when it comes to the taxation of farm homes. When the letter states that you can charge straw as an income to your farm but you can't use hay as an income; if you sell hay that's not a farm income.

What a harassment are we seeing take place with the people of Manitoba? it's an out-and-out outrage that the people have to be harassed by such

incompetent people as the present Minister of Municipal Affairs, and still we haven't heard the Premier, or the Minister of Agriculture, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, or anyone else stand and say, they're going to deal with it in a way in which is fair to the people of Manitoba. Why don't they deal with the people in a fair and open manner instead of coming in the back door with a letter that would say that you're guilty until you prove your innocence?

Well, if they think there aren't many people concerned about it, the R.M. of Brenda, the municipality of Brenda, have just forwarded a copy of a resolution to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I would hope that he would take note of it because there is a meeting as well tonight dealing with this particular issue. I think they should be able to put forward their explanation as to who and as to why they're proceeding in this manner and take a fairly major look at it before they advance any further and harass the people who have to pay these taxes.

Fairness is all the people of this province want, not an underhanded approach by a Minister of the Crown who would force closure on the debate on the major issue that we've seen him do already. That's the kind of Minister he is. That's the kind of approach he takes, so I guess we can expect it, but we won't stand for it as members of the opposition; we won't stand for it as members representing a community that are already hardpressed.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are a great number of young people in our farm communities who are going bankrupt. In fact, this Minister when he stands and says he holds the record for the greatest Minister of Agriculture; he holds the record all right, the record is the greatest numbers of farm bankruptcies in all of Canada, 400 percent since 1981 in Manitoba. He leads the way; that is his record, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Agriculture and he stands in this place and is proud of it. He's proud of his record leading the country in farm bankruptcies and that's what he's saying he's proud of.

Mr. Speaker, he is something to behold, I can tell you. I would think that there are many farmers that would like to behold him right in a certain part around the upper part of his body and see what he would have to say then. That is, Mr. Speaker, where we're at.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, as well, we have a government - I use that term loosely I know - but it appears that they have harassed everybody in society. They have harassed the farm community; they have harassed the nurses; they have harassed the taxpayers; they have harassed small business with a payroll tax; they have harassed everyone, but they had to look around to find one more group. Who did they find, Mr. Speaker? They found the Legions that were having bingos; the Kinsmen clubs that were selling raffle tickets; the Lions clubs, all those people that go out and sell tickets and hold bingos for community betterment, to have something in their own community that a service club is proud of.

Yet this government said, who haven't we harassed yet? Who haven't we made feel uncomfortable and help contribute to our funds that we're mismanaging? Ah ha, it is the Legions. They have little bingos out there and they're contributing to the well-being of that community. We should get involved and have them send

all their bingo numbers in; we should get in on the rake-off. And what did they do? There is an uprising out there that they will again have to deal with and I know, talking to my colleagues, that the people aren't going to stand for it. The only way in which they can correct the measure is at an election time, and the people are on hold, the people are on hold.

They are saying in all these announcements we heard, what did we hear in the last part of the last Session that went on for three years, what did we hear? There were some of these announcements that we're rehearsing again now about these federal-provincial agreements and we're hearing all these great announcements. Again today they're applauding themselves and patting themselves on the back for an agreement that's going to come, or some kind of a Letter of Intent that's coming into effect in 1993. Well that's pretty cold comfort for the 40-some-thousand people that are looking for a job right now. How are they going to live that long under this kind of an ill-guided group of people? Well I can tell you, they aren't waiting very long either, just till the next election and they can mark their "X" to turf out these people who promised them a great future, a no-business loss. That's what they're waiting for. They're not interested in your hydro announcement because it's too long, too far down the road. You won't be here to turn the power on, to see the first light bulb lit from that power agreement, if in fact it ever does take place.

So I say they have alienated everyone. They're digging into the purses of the little old men and women and young people who want to go and play bingo and have some fun - they thought they would get the hand of government into that as well. Is that really all they have to do? Why aren't they employing themselves with something that has some meaning to it instead of harassing the people of this province? I don't believe they even know how to run a bingo and that's what the people of the Legions are saying, why are they again on our backs? Why don't they get off our backs?

Let us deal for a few minutes, because we are in a time of - I would not say economic recovery - I would say that in Manitoba we are in a continuation of a recession, that we see record numbers of people unemployed. What happened during the Progressive Conservative years prior to the NDP? And I want to make reference to a few of the things that actually took place, not because we falsely promoted a Jobs Fund that would create a job for a day or two days. We're not against those jobs, but what we were working for and demonstrated could be done under the proper economic policies and strategies was to put in place policies that encourage private investment for long-term job creation and economic activity.

One only has to look west to the boundary of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, where Manitoba and Saskatchewan elevator companies, farmer-owned producer companies under a Progressive Conservative Government built an oil seed crushing plant at Harrowby, Manitoba - 40 jobs for long term, \$40 million investment and look at the number of farmers who are selling commodity to that. Some 3,000 farmers are producing canola for that plant and sunflowers for the plants in Altona, expanded to do the kind of service that was needed. That's what we call agriculture economic development. That's what we call Manitoba

development and everyone gets advantages from that, Mr. Speaker, the trucking industry, the combine industry. The Minister of Agriculture turns his back and says, well, I'll be damned. That's really all he's interested in, some real economic activity in the province. That's what he thinks about the people of this province.

Let us move further east, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague's community of Minnedosa where we saw the startup of an alcohol producing plant made from agriculture commodities. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I happen to be fortunate enough to have the opportunity to market some of my grain corn to that facility. I think it's a tremendous thing for people to be able to do that. And what did that do? That didn't give a person a job for a day; that gave long-term employment; gave a commitment to those people of that area that they would be there to pay them for the work they did, to buy grain from many many farmers to take the by-product to produce animal feeds. That's the kind of development. And how did it take place? It took place because there was a government that had the will to take the taxes off the initial years to get them going. It wasn't a tax subsidy at all; it was just common sense, darned good government. The member from the United States now sitting here beside me should pay a little more attention to some of the home grown kinds of activities that can take place. — (Interjection) — I'm not anti-American at all.

Let us look at another one. You know, this is quite a story. We drive on forward, further east, and we see the other side of the coin. We've seen Imperial Oil where they've built a magnificent fertilizer plant at Bloom right by Portage la Prairie, employing people, servicing people, the farm community, providing long-term jobs. And yes, who built that? It was Gerry Fullerton, who this government hired to do things for the government. Well, we're paying him \$85,000 a year, but I haven't seen any more development. He was a great man with the private sector, but he kind of went into his shell when he got into the government. Where is the production from this man?

What it proves is that the private initiative, the private incentive and the company that has provided the funds and put his ideas together worked, but what he is doing now is I'm sure he is spinning his wheels. I, Mr. Speaker, have no personal reflection, in fact I want to compliment that individual for the work he did in the private sector because it was worthwhile, long-term investment for the people of Manitoba. They're paying taxes and they're helping this community. Those are the kinds of hard, real things that the governments can do to encourage people to come. But, no, Mr. Speaker, the government are bound and bent they're going to fool the people and they won't with a Jobs Creation Fund.

My goodness, the people of Manitoba see these huge green signs. Well, they use them as dart boards. They've got the picture of the Premier on the one end and the back end of a mule on the other and they're throwing darts at it. It's called "pin the tail on the donkey." That's the only meaningful job that has been created that I have seen. He is making a laughingstock of himself and his government, advertising things that really don't mean a lot to the people. I just hope that this government some day wakes up and realizes that the people who really put their ambitions forward and take some private initiative that in the long term that's what

give you stability, that's what gives you the kind of province that I'm sure the majority of the people want to live in.

Let us take a minute and look at what the thrust has been from this present government. Today, the Minister of Energy and Mines makes a big to-do about people doing things, helping people - you know, Manitoba Hydro - as if he invented or created Manitoba Hydro. We all know the story of Manitoba Hydro and all he and his former governments have done was degrade it and destroy it and mismanage it. I'm not against the announcement that was made today, but why in 1993? That's again cold comfort for those people who are looking for a job in the next year or two - cold comfort, nine years of starvation. Yes, nine years of starvation won't be there because we will soon be in office to help to create other meaningful jobs and an environment that will help.

The other major thrust of this government in the resource field, of course, is ManOil. What are we hearing from ManOil? Well, the Minister of Energy comes out and he says, ManOil has to participate in the new pipeline with Inter-City Gas. We have a pipeline being built in southwest Manitoba and I can tell you, he's not going to get off with just building a pipeline and leaving the roads in the condition they are. They're deplorable and there have to be millions of dollars put into the rebuilding and the upgrading of the roads that have already been taken down because of the heavy weights of oil transportation. That is going to cost the government as well and I would have hoped that he would have been able to put the funds that he's now putting into ManOil and now putting into the pipeline, rather than investing it in those businesses that aren't going to do the province a lot of good; put it into the infrastructure that would give you long-term jobs.

I would like the Minister of Highways some day to come forward and tell us how many man-hours of work or woman-hours of work does it take to build a decent highway in this province? That's a long-term, meaningful job. But you know what they're doing? They're taking money out of those meaningful areas and putting it into the Jobs Fund so that they get a gain, a news release out. The propaganda machine says, look at the jobs the Jobs Fund is creating. Well, the jobs are costing us money, and not creating any infrastructure, not giving us a lot of production. We have to get back to basics, we have to build this country from a foundation that is solid and build it on a system of good policies, and they aren't doing it.

I want to deal just briefly with the issue of the pipeline in the southwest. He makes all these grandiose announcements. He has not, to my knowledge, talked to the local people. I know, I'm involved. The pipeline, they shot an arrow and it happened to go over part of my farm. Well, I'm not worried, Mr. Speaker, because they've looked after all the farmers and everybody. They've passed an act, the Minister of Municipal Affairs or one of the government, that they would automatically expropriate everybody's property and then settle with them afterwards. Yes, there's a recent regulation change put in place that expropriation takes place and then they worry about coming to talk to the farmers. I want my colleagues to take a look at that, as the government better understand it - the government expropriation - and then they come and say — (Interjection) — Yes,



it's the old socialist system that you establish a price. Well, I think they'd better walk very carefully with that one because there are going to be some extremely severe criticism come forward with this approach.

Why didn't the Minister of Energy and Mines hold hearings? Why didn't he come out and inform the public? He sat in his office in Winnipeg and said, well, we're giving this pipeline to Inter-City Gas, the government have to be 25 percent owner and we're going to shoot an arrow from Waskada to Cromer. Why didn't they take the pipeline to Coulter, to Lyleton, to Pierson, to Tilson and, on the route, pick up all the oil in the southwest? Or is that part of their plan? Are they going to put a feeder line in? The people don't know. What are they doing when they go across the Souris River, we know that pipelines break? Souris take their drinking water out of the Souris River. Are they going to make a fail-safe mechanism that won't allow any seepage out of that pipeline into the river system?

These are questions that the people want to know — (Interjection) — The Minister says, where does it go through? It goes through Manitoba and there was proper work done ahead of time. They didn't play the propaganda and the press release game, they dealt honestly and fairly with the people. But you have not dealt once honestly and fairly with the people of Manitoba and, if you have, I challenge you to stand in your place and tell us when it is your turn to speak, Mr. Speaker.

Let us look for a few minutes at the agricultural industry and, as this Minister says, he's the best Minister that Manitoba has seen - well he holds the record for the greatest number of farm bankruptcies in the province, 400 percent increase over the past few years, and not stopping, Mr. Speaker, and he's doing nothing to stop it. What is happening to our cream shippers, the small farmer who has decided to go and milk cows and ship cream to our creameries? They've run out of quota. And what is he doing about it? He's just sitting back saying, well, that's too bad, we can't get any more quota. Why doesn't he get more quota?

He makes reference in the Throne Speech to the fact that he has to improve the national marketing schemes. Is he prepared to take the position that if he doesn't get corrective measures within the national marketing scheme that Manitoba will pull out? I challenge him to answer that question. Will he pull out of the national marketing schemes if he doesn't get some improvement for the farmers of Manitoba? That's what I want to know. Will the broiler producers - can they expect him to deal with a tough hand when it comes to dealing with the federal agency? Will he back out if he can't continue to get the kind of response we need for the egg producers? Will he look after his own farm, the turkey producers? Will he go forward at least and make sure they get a fair deal? And if they don't, will he meaningfully offer to pull out of the national scheme? These are questions that I would hope he would answer when he responds to the Throne Speech.

But what are his priorities? He's touring the province now to sell Manitoba crop insurance. Well, the farmers are sold on Manitoba crop insurance, have been for years. He's got one particular problem, Mr. Speaker, because his own farmers in the Interlake are paying a little too high a premium and he's trying to figure out how he can get the other farmers in the rest of the

province to help him pay the premiums - the old socialist philosophy, he's going to try and equalize them. I have no problem with him taking a look at crop insurance and the premiums, but why doesn't he have someone do it for him? He toured through my community, a great idea having the Minister of Agriculture - I think there were four or five - I wish he had let me know and I could have gone and helped add to the crowd. They were really interested in having the Minister come, but he was talking about a subject that they weren't interested in. We'd already done the kind of work on crop insurance and were moving toward the kind of recommendations, so he's now trying to think it's a major priority. It's not a major priority.

I have some other areas of concern as well, Mr. Speaker. They continue to blow and to brag about \$40 million going into stabilization, but we will be putting forward Orders for Return. We will be asking questions as to how many people have been paid for administering the Beef Income Plan; how many cattle have been handled; what is the cost of that total enterprise; what has gone into administration; who has got the money; what farmers have benefited from it?

Here again, I had a call today from a farmer who said, "You know, I joined the Minister of Agriculture's Beef Income Plan and I didn't sell my calves last year because he wants me to keep them and fatten them." But you know what he said happened? "Because I didn't sell my calves last year and I got a surface lease for the use of an oil well coming on my land taking away my crop production," he said, "I'm now in a position where I've got a greater income from off the farm than I have for my farm." He said, "I'm really getting help from the NDP Government. I don't sell my calves and get any money. Now I get a notice that I'm having to pay a tax on my house."

What the dickens is this government doing? Do they know? I plead with them to at least meet with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, with other Ministers, the Surface Rights Board. I plead with them to meet with them, at least give some common sense to the kind of actions they're taking. I've never in my life seen such an ill-advised and misguided group of people trying to run a government.

Mr. Speaker, I know that time eats up very quickly and I had not intended to take the full time because really I'm not speaking about what's in the Throne Speech, I'm speaking about what should have been in the Throne Speech and the direction the government should have been taking.

I have to deal for a minute in the area of health and social programs. How many times have you seen in the papers in the last year, health system in crisis? Life and limb are in danger because of the way this group of people are administering our health services. And what is their priority? You know, there's a hidden line in this Throne Speech, "Reproductive Services." Does it mean we're going to have Henry Morgentaler and his clinic developed in this province? Is that what it means? Tell us, tell us that it isn't if it isn't. Why don't they come forward and tell us what their policies are?

You know, I want to deal again just briefly with the agriculture picture because I would have thought this Minister and his government would have protested a lot more haughtily than they did the removal or the reduction of initial grain prices. I'm extremely



disappointed, as are the people of Manitoba, that there wasn't a word out of them, particularly when the Premier is passing accolades to the Member for Fort Rouge - I'm sorry, what's the federal seat that Axworthy represents? — (Interjection) — Winnipeg Fort Garry. The First Minister comes in and immediately holds his hand and says, oh, you're a great guy, you're putting money into Northern Manitoba and we just love you. At the same time that same Cabinet Minister is allowing the initial grain prices to go down. I can't understand them.

By the way, we have a new Liberal Leader that we see around here once in a while. You know, it's quite interesting that her name is Carstairs - and I'm sure she'll remain upstairs for the rest of her political career in this place. Carstairs will remain upstairs and I think it's very very fitting that she has that kind of name. We've had a former Liberal Leader spend their whole political career upstairs and this one happens to be — (Interjection) — Well, I'll tell you, particularly coming from the mouth of the woman from Wolseley - with that kind of a comment, I'd get nervous.

I want to touch briefly because there is a positive move taking place in the North. I do believe that the Port of Churchill is a major port and has to be developed. I don't believe it's the provincial responsibility to put money into it. I don't believe that the funds that go into the harbour development should be provincial money. I believe it should be federal money and I would hope that this government hasn't been snookered by their friend, the Member for Fort Garry. But we don't have to worry about the Member for Winnipeg Fort Garry much longer, because he's going to be replaced by a very competent colleague of mine, Bud Sherman, who's going to use to his advantage the connection between the Howard Pawley government and the present Member for Winnipeg Fort Garry. That is the kiss of death to the Member for Winnipeg Fort Garry, to hold hands with the present Premier and his Cabinet colleagues - and you just watch it happen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that we, as members of the opposition, put forward positive suggestions and comments for this particular government. The first thing I would suggest again and reiterate, is to try to do something to make the people of Manitoba have a little bit of confidence that there is some form of guidance and leadership at the head of state. I know it's impossible but at least try, because we are in tough times, and at least show some demonstration of concern and common goal. They don't trust you, and I don't believe they ever will.

I believe that the most honourable thing that the Premier of the province and his colleagues could do would be to give the people of Manitoba the opportunity to mark their feelings on a ballot, call an election so they can put forward their wishes and send the members of the opposition in as government to bring things back to some common-sense order in the province.

Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I must say I'm particularly pleased to be able to speak

on the Throne Speech on this particular day, especially pleased because I must say the announcement made by the Minister responsible for energy earlier today certainly has to be a tremendous announcement, not only for my constituents but this province as a whole. It couldn't come at a more appropriate time too, when we're debating the Throne Speech, because I think it shows already just how accurate and how appropriate the Throne Speech was when it talked of the Manitoba economy and the recovery and new opportunities that we have. It particularly emphasized that one of the government's top objectives was to create new economic development initiatives, Mr. Speaker. I can't think of anything that could fit into that category more than that announcement today.

What I'm particularly pleased about is the fact that the Minister is also working on various other potential projects which would involve additional sales of hydro. I think that is also good news because it shows that there is a continuing long-term planning process that is looking, not just at today, but our future in this Province of Manitoba.

Lest anybody on the opposition side knocked down just exactly what we're talking about, let's review what the Minister said only today in this House. He said that we have a \$3.2 billion hydro sale to the Northern United States, that's \$3.2 billion, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a long-term sale, 12 years. It's rather a unique one in Manitoba history. It's certainly something that is excellent news for this province. When we look at it, it means that we can start looking at discussing the resumption of Limestone and let's not forget what that means. That means 17,000 person-years of employment. It means a multibillion dollar investment in this province. It means great economic benefits for the North of this province and the rest of the province as a whole.

Now, I didn't hear that coming from the opposition critic on this matter today in the Legislature. I didn't hear it coming from the Member for Arthur, who just spoke. I heard nothing more than sour grapes coming from him and I think I know why. What better contrast between this government and theirs than that announcement today? They did nothing with Hydro. Pardon me, pardon me - they shut it down. They put the mothballs on Limestone. They shut down the entire North for four years.

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** It is contrary to our Rules to allow deliberate untruths to be entered into the public journals. It is an established fact, established by Order-in-Council, by the then New Democratic Party Government, that shut down the Hydro construction in August of 1977, two full months before a Conservative Administration came into office. So let not the Member for Thompson reiterate that kind of a myth. It was a New Democratic Party that shut down the construction on the Nelson River. It is in the prospectus that the Minister of Finance took down to New York to raise money in 1981 when they came back.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. A difference of opinion between members as to the facts of the case does not constitute a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable member can quibble as he does there. I would like to have him explain that to my constituents. I would like to have him explain exactly what that government did for the North in terms of hydro development or any other economic development for the entire four years in which they were in office. The answer is clear - it was nothing. That's one of the reasons I was elected in 1981 and why five out of the five Northern seats are represented by New Democrats.

As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a particularly significant day today. I think it's a turning point economically for this province. We've been through some tough times. We were through some particularly tough times when that bunch across the way were in office. We were in some particularly tough times when we were hit by the most major economic recession that we've seen since the Great Depression. There were some pretty tough times. The government responded, we responded and we made no bones about it. We brought in some particularly badly needed short-term economic projects, leading up to the Jobs Fund which has created many short-term jobs in this province. We've made no bones about that. We said that that was necessary; it was necessary to cushion the economy of this province from the worst effects of the international recession. It was necessary to get people to work while we could work on these long-term job creation projects which ultimately are our goal and I would hope all Manitobans' goal, and the results I think are pretty clear. You just have to look at the current economic record.

You know, we, for many years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have had varying different unemployment rates, but we've usually come in about third. Under this government, we're consistently second and just two weeks ago we were first - the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. Now they can twist that around any way they want, but it speaks the fact that we're doing better than the Conservative Government of Saskatchewan. We're doing better than the Conservative Government of Alberta. I mention those two governments because those provinces have traditionally been lower. When the Saskatchewan Government was NDP, it was the lowest in the country. Now they have a Conservative Government. Their unemployment rate shot up by .8 percent. Is that their version of "open for business?" That's what the Premier there said when he was elected. They're open for business. I don't know about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think the record speaks otherwise.

Let's go a little further about the exact statistics. We know that we have the lowest rate in Canada. How does it stack up in terms of job creation? We've created approximately 9,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker, more than we had in 1981 when we were elected. That's pretty significant. Let's look at some other measures. Our overall employment has grown by over 1 percent. We had that growth at the time when the rest of the country had negative growth in employment.

Another factor that has to be looked at is the growth of population in this province since we took office. When they were in office, we all know what happened. I know what happened in my community. We went from about 22,000 people down to about 13,500. At that time the Premier, Premier Lyon, didn't even know that that was going on, but my constituents certainly did. Our population just plummeted. But what has happened since and NDP Government has been in? Has it continued to go down, Mr. Deputy Speaker? No. Has it stayed the same? No, it's gone up. Thanks to the programs that we've introduced already, the population in Thompson has increased by as much as 1,000. It's coming because of new facilities, new educational programs, new economic initiatives. It's coming for a whole series of reasons, but I think the bottom line of it is that we finally have a government that is doing something for the North. For four years we had a government that was doing nothing. Now that's only thus far. That's before the announcement today.

I will say now for the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I fully expect that process to continue and to accelerate over the next couple of years as announcements such as the one today and other announcements which I hope to see become a reality in the next period of time bring back that sense of confidence, that sense of growth that we had in the North under the Schreyer Government, that sense that we lost under the Lyon Tory Government. I say that for the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have every confidence that this will indeed happen.

Let's look at some other contrasts. Let's go beyond perhaps my constituency focus to see exactly what difference we're seeing here between the government and the members of the opposition. Let's look at the approach that they've followed the last two years since they've been in opposition. Let's look at some of the comments they've made in the debate on the Throne Speech thus far. Let's look at some of the comments they've made about that announcement today. I think what will become apparent to anybody who looks at the record is that this Conservative Party is wedded totally to the past. They have a conception of politics that extends little beyond political opportunism, Mr. Speaker, political opportunism of the worst kind.

Let me quote one specific example. The Leader of the Opposition, in a speech in this House in February, accused the NDP Government of taking away people's freedom. He had listed a number of things. It's a standard Tory rhetoric that you hear in speech after speech after speech. But there was one that struck me as particularly interesting. He said, the NDP Government had taken away people's freedom by bringing in seat belts.

Now if I'd heard that from the Member for Arthur I would have said that's consistent with what he says. If I'd heard that from some of the other members I would have said that's consistent. Something struck me as being rather funny about that statement. He voted for seat belts in this House; he voted for it along with the Member for Fort Garry. Now he's coming along and saying, oh, the government's done such a terrible thing by taking away freedom. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can be on one side of the issue; you can be on the other side. The Federal Liberals sit on the fence, but you can't be on both sides of the issue at the same

time. — (Interjection) — One of the members on this side suggested there is one member over there who's an expert at being on both sides of the issue.

I suspect that it does go beyond the Leader of the Opposition. I suspect that he typifies the approach of members opposite on this particular issue and on other issues as well. But I really think that is lacking in political integrity. I think it's downright hypocritical. It was bad enough that the Leader of the Opposition got up and made that statement in this House, but only a month later he made the same statement in Thompson. I can tell you, I've told a number of my constituents about exactly where the Leader of the Opposition stood on that particular issue. I can tell you what their response was, both from those who support the compulsory use of seat belts and those who oppose it. They said, that's hypocritical. That's going to come back to haunt the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite in the next little while. That's only one example.

Let's talk about another example of how they are wedded to the past. Let's talk about the Leader of the Opposition's speech just a few days ago - in fact, yesterday - in terms of the Speech from the Throne. Let's talk about the kind of priority he saw in terms of the kind of announcement we came out with today. He said, "I find that interesting," and this is a quote from Page 40, Monday, 16 April, 1984 "because 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." That's a direct quote. That's what the Leader of the Opposition said only yesterday. I quote again, "It's never been that strong an alternative." Maybe that's why they didn't get anywhere with hydro development for four years. Maybe that's why. Right here, the Leader of the Opposition who was a member of that government, a member of the Cabinet, says it wasn't an alternative that they considered to be a high priority. As the Minister responsible for Energy said today, we looked at all the alternatives. We didn't put our eggs in one basket. We didn't go after some of the maybe mega projects that those members opposite talked about. We didn't go after pipe dreams. We looked at all the alternatives. I think that approach, that fundamentally different approach is one of the reasons we have that 500 megawatt announcement today, that sale to the United States and why they didn't come up with anything for four years. That's another example.

Let's go on to yet another one as typified by the Member for Arthur. He just got up a few minutes ago and said how he supported the development of the Port of Churchill but he was against the province putting any money into it. I've heard that before; I heard it from the former Leader of the Opposition. He stated that on a number of occasions. I heard it from various members when they were criticizing our so-called "wish" list. I heard that. They said, we should not be putting money into that. Well that's a traditional sort of approach, I suppose. You can set very strict boundaries between the Federal and Provincial Governments and you can say that's none of our responsibility. You go ahead and do it; we'll talk about it; we won't do anything about it. Well, this government took a different approach.

We realized that to get the Port of Churchill developed, to get those other Northern development

agreements, to make them a reality, we had to put our money where our mouth was. By taking that different approach, we have been able to come up with a package of economic development initiatives of Northern development initiatives that is unparalleled in this province, and it's the model for the rest of this country. I think that's important to stress because it certainly is, I think, unique for this country.

But there are other approaches which typify their approach even on this particular issue as well. The Member for Pembina got up a few months back and said, this is really great to hear this announcement about Churchill but we did so much when we were in office. We held a bunch of meetings. Really, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they held a bunch of meetings. I'm sure they had meetings on a lot of other things but does that member really think that that was a solution? Is he really going to compare the commitment we've made, the real commitment in investment, the real dollar commitment this Provincial Government has made with his meetings? I can understand why he might have had meetings. I know the difficulty that his party has had in terms of the Port of Churchill with such members they have as their federal member, Mr. Murta, who's been on record as being opposed to the Port of Churchill for sometime. Perhaps they needed the meetings just to straighten his own colleagues out. I really think that if he thinks anybody's going to take that seriously that he ought to have his head examined. I don't think anybody in my constituency will take that comment seriously. I mean, if he cares to come up there I think he would be laughed out of Thompson with a suggestion such as that.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Chased out of Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Oh, chased out. The Premier says he'd be chased out of Thompson. I think he and his colleagues were already chased out in 1981 and I think they will be again if they come up with the same sort of approaches.

Well, that's another example, that's just another example of how they're wedded in the past. And, you know, to a certain extent I will say that they have changed somewhat over the last couple of years but, if anything, they've changed by becoming more arrogant. They are an incredibly arrogant bunch right now, you can hear them, the comments they make whether it be in personal attacks or other attacks on this government. They think that they will be the next government, they have this sort of sense that they've been blessed from above, a divine right to govern; that's the word, the divine right to govern, they think they have it.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs points out quite accurately they've lost three out of the last four elections, and next time it's going to be four out of five, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they know that from this point on they have nowhere to go but down, and we have nowhere to go but up. They know that, they know that for eight years under the Schreyer government people recognized that we were the party that could deliver short and long-term jobs. They know that they did nothing for four years on either count; they know that we have already established the fact

that we can deliver on short-term jobs, and they know that with announcements such as the one that has been made today that people will recognize clearly that the NDP is the party that stands for both short-term and long-term jobs development.

So there's a party that's wedded in the past, and my comparison between the NDP and the Conservatives, up to this point in time today, I believe, I have established clearly that they are a party that does not have a vision even of today, let alone the future. They can't even recognize what is happening today. You should have seen the looks on their faces when the Minister responsible for energy made that announcement. My God, there were about three people applauding, three people recognized this as good for the rest of Manitoba. The rest of them were going, my God, there goes my chance of getting in the Cabinet, we're not going to win this election if there's anything more like this. You could see the reaction on their faces.

You know, it was that political opportunism; it works great when you're riding the crest of the waves, but when the tide turns and it starts slipping away that's when it really starts to hit you, and I think the members opposite got hit today. They started realizing that it is beginning to slip away. What seemed like a sure thing in that speech from the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, that sure thing, that arrogance, that divine right to govern, that idea that the Conservatives are going to be back in power, all these guys across the way are going to get those Cabinet posts they want. You know, it started fading a bit, and I can tell you it's going to fade a hell of a lot more in the upcoming months. — (Interjection) — Well, let's talk about it, let's talk about the difference between a party wedded in the past and a party that has paid attention to the present needs of Manitoba. And let's go one step beyond, let's talk about the future.

You know, in the entire one-and-a-half hour speech from the Leader of the Opposition I don't think I heard one mention of the future, I don't think I heard one possible idea that could be construed as a vision of how Manitoba should be in the upcoming year, in the next five years, in the next 10 years. Let's look at it. In 16 years we'll be entering a new century. Let's look at it, in 16 years we'll be in the 21st century. You know, where are we going in that period of time, where are we going. We even had the Member for Arthur say about this hydro sale: Oh, that's 1992, 1993. Little does he know or apparently he's forgotten that to get those sales we'd have to construct something before then and that will mean jobs for them.

But, apart from that, he says 1992 and 1993, let's not talk about it. Mr. Speaker, I say, let's start talking about that, let's start talking about the approach that we have to look at. Let's first of all look at the No. 1 problem in this province and in this country at the present time, that of unemployment. As I've demonstrated earlier we now have the lowest rate of unemployment in the country, but it's clearly too high. What is the reason for that? Well, the reason is obvious. We have structural unemployment, we have structural unemployment both here in this province and structural unemployment in Canada as a whole. In fact, we are not alone, internationally it has become the growing problem of all countries. What it means is that despite economic recovery certain sectors of society do not

benefit from that recovery, certain people, certain sectors of society remain unemployed despite the fact that the economy as a whole develops and grows.

You know it's a theme that has been stressed by the Federal New Democratic Party of sharing in that recovery and it really comes down to the same sort of root, the fact that we are leaving a large group of people behind, even when we do get economic recovery.

So let's talk about that, let's talk about that No. 1 problem. Is it unsolvable? I don't think so, I don't think it's unsolvable at all if we take an innovative look at work, if we take an innovative look at the workplace. Now the government has started in this area, we've started in a number of significant ways, we've started in terms of setting the example within the Civil Service in terms of flex time and job sharing, which is a very innovative way of looking at working time and sharing of jobs between people. We've done the same in terms of emphasizing the need for better training because that is certainly part of it, you know, recognizing the fact that people may have to work at two, or three, or more careers during your lifetime.

We've emphasized the need to look at pensions, in particular early retirement, because of the fact that it provides a just return to those people who have given their life working for this province and at the same time opens up new opportunities for young people. That's what we've started to do in terms of work, terms of the workplace. We've emphasized our feelings that there should be greater co-operation in the workplace between employers and employees, of getting greater participation of the employees in the functioning of that enterprise.

Really what we've talked about is what some people call industrial democracy, I prefer to call it economic democracy. And, you know, lest anybody think that these are dangerous new ideas, or these are particularly radical, I think you just have to look at some countries where they've begun to introduce these things in a much wider scale than we have here to see just how valuable this creative approach to the problem of unemployment can be.

I'll just show you one example, and this I think is particularly indicative of the kind of creative problem-solving approach you can have when you talk about structural unemployment. In Europe they have one program whereby they take a person who is over 55 who might consider early retirement, other than the fact that he or she might face financial penalties; they offer that person a compensation for whatever financial penalties they would pay for early retirement. What they do is they take that job and they take two unemployed young people and they put those two unemployed young people into that job, splitting the work and for the rest of the week those unemployed young people then are put on a training program so that they get both experience and training. Now what happens for society as a whole is that there is an additional cost in terms of the subsidy to the person who has retired early. That is a cost. But on the other side you also have two young people who might otherwise be on the equivalent there of Unemployment Insurance or welfare who now are not being a burden on society and who are getting the kind of experience and training they need. Now that's the kind of thing that we should really be looking at here in Manitoba.

That's the way in which we can really solve the problem of structural unemployment. It's not with any one panacea, but with a whole series of new approaches based on a flexible concept of the whole question of unemployment. That's one area of particular concern. Let's look at some other areas.

Let's look at the whole area of education. Right now, we have a fairly well-developed education system in Manitoba. We have three universities; we have our community colleges; we have our secondary school system. But there are some serious problems - and I hate to use the same term again - but I would suggest there are some serious structural problems in the access to education despite the fact that we have these facilities. I just look at the situation in my own constituency. The percentage of young people in my constituency and the percentage of adults who are able to continue their education is far below that of people in the City of Winnipeg or the City of Brandon. Despite the fact that we are perhaps even somewhat better off than people in the rural areas because we do have some programs available, we still suffer from a major problem in having that access to education. Now what is the reason for that? Well, it's pretty simple.

If you're in the City of Winnipeg, you can stay at your parent's home and go to university for about \$1,000 a year, if you include tuition, books and bus fare. If you're from Thompson, it costs you \$4,000 a year because you also have to pay for your living costs and your transportation costs. For rural people, there's a similar cost; while transportation is not as high, people from rural areas are also faced with the same barrier. As a result, they just don't go.

I can say that one other factor which is also causing a major problem is that many people are now having to call on their parents. When I graduated from high school, I worked at Inco. I made my money at Inco during the summer and I could go to university and just about break even at the end of the year. That opportunity has not been there in recent years. In many rural areas, that opportunity has never been there. The result is that many people who would otherwise go for a university or community college education just don't go. Now, that's in terms of young people.

Let's talk about adult education. Over the last year, there's been a major change in terms of adult education in this province and across this country. There has been a far greater number of part-time students, of adults, mature students continuing their education than there ever was in the past. In fact, it's gotten to the point where there are as many part-time students in continuing education as there are in full-time studies from young people coming after high school. Now, that's in the city. Working outside of the city, it doesn't work that way.

If you're in rural Manitoba, there is nothing except correspondence courses and even then you can only take two courses at a time. There's no access for other kinds of training either. You just don't have that chance. It's the same thing in the North. We have in Inter-Universities North, for example, which offers a very limited number of courses and you'll virtually never be able to get a degree program.

Does that have to be the way, Mr. Speaker? That's the question I ask. The answer I come up with on that is no, because there are some innovative ways in which

we can offer further education to people, but it has to be based on two premises. The first one is, instead of taking people to the education, taking the education to the people, a very simple concept but something that is badly needed. What I'm talking about is decentralizing our community college, decentralizing our universities, being able to offer courses in communities. It extends further to having mobile classrooms. We can always offer upgrading for technical courses right at the work site. We have the technology there, we just need to follow through and use some of that technology and the innovative ideas.

We can go further, talk about distance education and thanks to satellite technology, we can now offer courses in virtually any community in this province and it won't be simply a videotape type of course. With satellite technology, we can take one professor in Winnipeg, we could have students across the province taking a course who would then be able to take the lesson and ask questions of that particular professor, much in the same way as they would do if they were in a classroom situation.

There are also other technologies that can be used, for example, computers. There are many courses which could be run as computer-assisted courses with a professor, at a central location in Winnipeg offering those courses to people throughout the province. When I talk about it, I'm talking not just about the North, despite the fact that we probably face some of the biggest handicaps, I'm talking about the whole province. I think the idea of the Inter-Universities North Program should be expanded both in terms of its area to be basically Inter-Universities Manitoba, and in terms of its ability to offer programs using some of the technology that I have mentioned.

I think, given that kind of a new creative approach, we can bring rural and Northern Manitobans up to the same level of access as the rest of the province. I think that's important. We're talking about young people getting out of high school. We're also talking about people who, because of their marital situation or because their roots are in a certain area, just can't move to Winnipeg to get a university course or to get a community college course. I personally think they deserve just as much opportunity for that access as other people in this province. That's one area.

Let's talk about another one. Let's talk about health care. For years we've concentrate on developing a health care system which emphasizes hospital care and intensive care at fairly major cost to this country and to this province, and I think with some good results. But let's look at ways in which we can expand that. I look at the situation in the North.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Some of us on this side are trying to listen to the Member for Thompson. If his colleagues on the government side don't wish to listen to him, perhaps they should hold their meetings outside the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Well, if anybody knows me, Mr. Speaker, they will know that my colleagues have heard this many times before in the past and they're going to hear it many times in the future.

As I was saying, in terms of health care, when I look at the situation in my particular area, I see once again some structural problems. We have a system which concentrates on transporting people to Winnipeg - at great cost, I might add - because a lot of treatment is not available in the North, not because the budgets aren't there, but largely because we're unable to attract people into our hospitals to act as specialists in those areas. What I would like to see is more concentration on areas such as Thompson becoming regional centres and some pretty significant financial incentives being established so that we can have those specialists and that we can concentrate on having that level of service available to people in that area. But beyond that, I think we have to integrate hospital care with health care and community care in general.

You know, if you look at the budget that a provincial government has for health care and community services in general, you will find that it goes far beyond hospital service even now. If you look at public health nursing, for example, there is just one example where we have a fairly extensive program which is not part of the hospital system.

What I would like to see is an approach whereby that would be brought under a general board or a general advisory council on the community health services so that we could integrate that whole system, and integrate it not just in terms of administration, but in terms of the whole concept. I think that's really going to be the key in terms of preventative health which everybody seems to admit is a growing need in our province nationally. I think that's going to be one of the ways of getting it started. We have some of those facilities there now. I saw them when our daughter was born a year and a half ago, the extensive public health nursing system that is available. We can expand that, I think, and to great advantage.

I mentioned those three areas, jobs, health and education, because I think those are the ones which are of major concern, certainly to me, but also to the people in general. I think they're things that we can really develop, if we do take a very innovative approach to solving those problems.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a particular opportune time to do that since, for example, we're talking next year, about 1985 being the International Year of the Youth. Now I think when you're talking about youth you're talking about the future, they're one and the same. I've spoken to a lot of young people in my constituency over the last few months. I've contacted all my high school graduates from last year to ask them what problems they were facing and what suggestions they had about solving those problems. I think I found some pretty interesting results. People generally were concerned about their future, they were concerned about the lack of opportunities, lack of training and they expressed a real concern about their future.

They also, in talking with them, expressed a certain amount of cynicism about the political process. This is something we, as legislators, have to address. We can sit here, as does the Member for Emerson, and call out, well let's call an election, that's what his last

statement was. I'm talking right now about young people who've never voted in an election and who've told me that they don't even know really where they stand with a political system. They see the Legislature or the Parliament, they hear the noise. In fact, one person said, all you ever hear is yelling and screaming and ringing bells, what is that going to accomplish? We have to address that I think. We have to look at what is a real crisis of confidence in our political system amongst young people today. There's no reason for that, there's no reason if we approach it properly. You know I think the first place we have to start is by talking to the people who are affected the most themselves, talk to young people. You know I got a lot of comments back when I did contact my high school graduates. They said that nobody ever asked me before; I was really surprised.

A lot of people said, basically, we have our ideas, too, we want those ideas looked at. I can tell you, I got some excellent ideas back about ways of solving the problem with unemployment or structural problems, new ideas about education. These are from kids who just graduated from Grade 12, you know, they've got a lot of good ideas. I think the biggest problem we've faced in the past, with a lot of these things, is we just haven't talked with people most directly affected. Every political party that I've heard in the last year or two has talked about youth and the young and the whole bit. I've never really seen a concerted effort to talk to young people themselves about the problems they face, to talk about the future.

That's what I would like to suggest for 1985 International Year of the Youth. I would like to see it focused on, not just young people but the future so that we can involve everybody because I can tell you I get as many comments about issues affecting young people from parents as from young people themselves. You know they maybe have a bit more familiarity with the system. Maybe they're not as cynical, I don't know what it is but I've had as many parents come to me and say, I'm concerned about lack of educational access, or the situation with unemployment, as I have had young people.

So I would like to suggest today that we talk about that next year or maybe have a theme, such as, Manitoba in the year 2000, focus discussion amongst young people and also the general population about where we're going.

Mr. Speaker, I think this has got to be the bottom line of where we go from here, as I said. Politically I think this is going to be a turning point, not just for this government, but from the opposition now. I think it is, economically it's a turning point as well. But I really think that it's a turning point for the population as a whole. It doesn't have to be strictly a partisan-political thing, it really doesn't. If the members opposite can approach the future to suggest their ideas for what vision they have of the future of Manitoba then I think that we can get a healthy debate in this province and I'll be glad to fight an election on that.

I think that while we're far from perfect that we do have a real concern about present problems and future problems, and we're trying to come out with solutions to that. I would hope that they would take the same kind of approach. I think, as I said, that's the bottom line. I have faith in the people of Manitoba. I really



believe that they are going to reject this overt partisanship which the members opposite have used. They will reject the political opportunism, as typified by the Leader of the Opposition who votes one way and then talks another. They will say to them directly: What is your proposals for next year? What are you proposing for Manitoba in the year 2000? Where do you stand on the real concerns? What are you going to do to recapture the faith that people used to have in our parliamentary system of government. They're going to have to think very hard about that. They're going to have to think pretty hard about some of the tactics they've used in this House, such as, bell ringing; some of the tactics they've used in terms of their partisan approach; some of their tactics they've used in terms of personalities because I can tell them that while that old-style politics may still appeal to some people young people today are rejecting it out of hand and so are many other Manitobans, they're looking for something else.

So as I stand here today I really think that this is a turning point for this government, I think it's a turning point for this province. We are moving from a situation where we had strong effort on short-term job creation to where we now have a strong effort on short- and long-term job creation. But it's more than that, it's more than that, we're not talking just about this month, or next month, we're talking into the 1990s with this power sale that we have today and with other things that we are working on now, we're talking about the next century. I really feel that is what people are looking for. I am confident, I am very confident, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly the message that the people of this province, and certainly my constituents, are going to send to members opposite and to this government.

The key thing for us now though is to capture this opportunity, to capture this real opportunity we have with this turning point, to develop it, not just in terms of the next year or two or even the next election, which I am also quite confident about, but to really take it beyond that and start talking about the next 15 or 20 years. There's a lot going for us right now, there's really a lot going for us in this province, it's just a matter of capturing that really opportunity that we have.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's always a privilege and an honour to participate in debate in the Legislature and I welcome this opportunity to speak on the Throne Speech.

At the outset I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech in this Third Session of the 32nd Legislature. I am certain the Mover and the Seconder had a great deal of difficulty in being able to say anything constructive about this Throne Speech. As the Leader of the Opposition, my leader and my colleague, the Member for Arthur before me, who spoke earlier this afternoon, I think adequately described the Throne Speech when they said, never in the history of this Legislature has it taken so long to say so little. Certainly we kept waiting and waiting to hear the meat of the Throne Speech. Everything that had been covered had

been announced at least once or several times in the past, and this made up the long rambling kind of Throne Speech that really didn't have any meat in it but just a rehash of old scraps that have been announced from time to time.

There is no doubt at all that Manitobans look forward with great pride and interest to the forthcoming visit of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness Prince Philip during July of this year and also by the presence of His Holiness Pope John Paul II, I believe he will be in Manitoba on September 16th. The visit to Manitoba of these distinguished visitors, in my opinion and certainly the opinion of Manitobans, is an historic event of great significance. I would hasten to say it could also be one of the greatest economic stimulants in this province during the coming year.

It will of course attract thousands of tourists from not only within the province but certainly from neighbouring provinces and from many of the states in United States. I would expect that we will have an influx of tourists to come and visit the Queen and of course the head of the Catholic Church. Certainly this will create a good economic spinoff, I'm sure.

The Throne Speech outlines two key legislative priorities which I think are commendable, economic development and the preservation of health care. These are, as I say, very important objectives but this government has shown a very dismal record with respect to economic development in the past two years and of course within the eight years they served before the previous Conservative administration. So when they talk about economic development, I think that the people wonder just what they mean by this because their past record has not indicated a very good performance.

The only great saviour of Manitoba has been our concentrated diversified small business operations in this province and this government has kicked every small business in the teeth with their recent introduction of the payroll tax at a time when these businesses certainly needed some encouragement if they were going to employ more people, whether it would be one or two more people in each of these businesses, but because of the payroll tax, people in these businesses were forced to lay off people. They couldn't maintain the kind of employment that they were wanting to and certainly the payroll tax was the straw that broke the camel's back with respect to increasing employment opportunities in many of these industries throughout Manitoba.

Earlier today we heard the announcement by the Minister of Energy and Mines of the negotiations with the American energy sale and certainly all Manitobans welcome this announcement. It's certainly a positive step. It's one that will have economic — (Interjection) — the Premier says, this didn't seem to be the attitude a few hours ago, I didn't gather that. The government was making such — the Premier himself was banging the desk and acted like a school child of about 12 years of age and certainly he wouldn't know or have any understanding of how we felt on this side. Certainly it's a positive move and we welcome that. It's a long range kind of thing and I think it's bidding to 1993 but still these kinds of projects do take a long time and they have to be put in place and certainly, I think that we can look at it with some degree of enthusiasm, it's



not finalized to date but certainly it's a step in the right direction.

Earlier it was also indicated that recent negotiations have been going on with Alcoa and I believe too that this would be very welcome if we could get an aluminum smelter coming into the province where this would require huge amounts of electrical energy. It would create certainly a lot of jobs right in the Province of Manitoba.

I couldn't help but notice the speaker before me, the MLA for Thompson had indicated how, when we were in government nothing every happened in the North. But you know, it's easy to remember the mining exploration that took place in the North in the short four years that we were in power and certainly because of some policy changes that had to be put in place, in order to create this kind of mining exploration - which did happen - the member has certainly got a very short memory because it was a very important move that was undertaken by our Minister of Energy at the time to put in the kind of policy that we could get the kind of mining exploration that this province needed. Certainly, I think that this should be recognized.

The other priority that the Throne Speech indicated in addition to economic development was the preservation of health care and we all know that health care facilities have been struggling but doing a good job in spite of this government. The funding has been restricted and during the last election campaign in 1981 the present government, the then opposition were indicating in their brochure, "Health care, not cutbacks." But you know since 1981 there's just been a rash of headlines in the papers with respect to the medical record of this government. Just to read some of the headlines, "Medical crisis is purely a matter of money;" "Doctor shortage plagues rural areas;" "Hospitals in crisis, Manitoba hospital authorities say the province's 3 percent ceiling on spending" - which was last year - "puts them in an almost untenable financial situation. A three-week examination of the issue by Free Press reporters Cecil Rosner, Christy McLaren and Maureen Brosnahan has found instances of deteriorating patient care that authorities attribute to chronic underfunding. Today rural hospital care is examined." This is the headline "Doctor shortage plagues rural areas." "New Moms tell of Hospital Services Commission bedlam." There's just no end to these headlines that have been in the recent editions of our newspapers. "Maternity ward chaos forces makeshift birth;" "Higher fees urged for rural doctors." They go on and on - (Interjection) - yes, I will. I intend to. "Judge criticizes HSC nursery staffing level, unacceptably low staffing cited in HSC inquest finding." "HSC reviews staffing situation;" staff woes plague many HSC wards; HSC boss calls probe into staffing dilemma; bed shortage cited in deaths of four patients." This was in the Winnipeg Free Press, one of their hospitals and crisis articles, "Heart surgery wait worries doctors;" "HSC doctor links deaths to bed shortages."

So the list goes on and on with the health care and we know that the big push was "Health care, not cutbacks, the headlines that this NDP, the then opposition when they were campaigning in 1981. But we all know that the health care is a problem, it takes a lot of financing, it's not something that can be dealt with lightly. We have to have the kind of economic

activity in our province to get the dollars to be able to maintain the kind of health care that all Manitobans wish to have. In order to talk about continuing health care we have to make sure that we have some economic growth in this province in order to get the money that we need to maintain the kind of health care.

Well, then the Throne Speech goes on, the Manitoba economy, "It is clear Manitoba's economy is turning around." Well, really is it? I question that. We are still an agricultural-based community and all you have to do is talk to farmers today. Are they pretty enthusiastic about the prospects for 1984? A lot of the farmers that I've talked to are not very optimistic at all, they are very down in the dumps about their future and, just recently, with the introduction of decreased initial payments for the next crop year it certainly doesn't add to any of their enthusiasm.

I would say that farmers in my constituency have a very uneasy feeling about their future, perhaps more today than any other time in the past, and we've come through some pretty difficult times in the farming community. I can remember when 1970 was a low point when we were faced with the LIFT Program that was introduced by the Federal Government, which I think was Lower Inventory for Tomorrow proposition which paid farmers not to grow grain. Farmers in my area would be happy to have a good crop this year, certainly there wasn't a lot of good production last year because of the adverse weather conditions. I would say that farmers are certainly in a very precarious position at this time, many of them are facing difficulty with financing their operations and keeping out of bankruptcy situations, and we haven't been hit too badly up until now, but I think that we are still in a very difficult position at this time.

I am certainly disappointed in the government in that they haven't co-operated with us in pressing the Federal Government remove the taxation on farm fuels. Certainly many of the farm people ask about this, and I know that my colleague, the Member for Pembina, has introduced resolutions once, or maybe twice, and certainly we did not have the co-operation from the members opposite to really press this issue and bring this matter home to the Federal Government. I know just recently this question has been raised in the House of Commons and I am not sure that the Prime Minister looks all that sympathetic toward this kind of removal of this taxation. As the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Mulroney, had indicated, I believe, that it would cost the federal treasury some \$250 million, but this would certainly be a stimulus to the farmers, it would give them the added incentive to get on with the job of producing food for this nation.

Well, I wonder how many members opposite have been talking to the farm machinery dealers in their areas. I realize, of course, that not many of them are from agricultural constituencies, but certainly the farm machinery dealers are having a very difficult time in staying in business. I understand, too, that this year we will be probably looking at a record number of farm sales and with the farm machinery that will be auctioned off at these sales, it will further compound the problem of farm machinery dealers, not only in my constituency, but in all of the rural constituencies of this province, and certainly it is not a rosy picture today in my particular part of the province.

The fertilizer and farm chemical dealers are experiencing financial difficulty and they are not able to get the kind of cash flow that is necessary to purchase the kinds of volumes of fertilizer in order to take the volume discount that they can get in order to pass along a better price to farmers. So the fertilizer dealers are in bad shape and, of course, the farmers that would be buying fertilizer will be paying a higher price for this product, and I understand that there may be some difficulty in getting the kinds of supplies that will be needed and this will add further cost no doubt to this year's cropping program.

So these are some of the things in the Manitoba economy - the Throne Speech would lead you to believe that everything is turned around, we're back on the road to recovery and everything is going to be a bed of roses for 1984 and the years ahead.

Just some points that I would like to throw out. Interest rates have started to rise again. We have witnessed increases in our interest rates in recent weeks and certainly this reflects on our recession situation, as well.

Housing construction will fall off sharply, probably, relative to last spring's grant-inspired levels. We all know that the Canadian dollar has weakened, it is now in the 78 cent range and perhaps may even be dropped further. Outlays for a new plant and equipment will continue to decline according to a survey of investment intentions released by the Department of Regional and Industrial Expansion. Corporate profits, it is estimated will be down considerably. Manufacturing is only at about 72 percent capacity. The federal economy is far from strong, and these repercussions will be felt throughout Manitoba as well as the rest of the country.

I wish that we were out of this recession period, but certainly all the indicators would not say that we are out of the woods on this issue at this time.

Quite a bit of reference was made to the Manitoba Jobs Funds investing in our future, and I don't doubt that the Jobs Fund has had the positive effect on our jobless rate in Manitoba. Certainly we have had the best record this past month of all the provinces in Manitoba, but I believe that the Jobs Fund gives some false sense of security, because the bulk of these jobs have been very short-term jobs, and we have been putting in a lot of taxpayers' dollars to make these jobs available. I think this is commendable if it's a short term kind of practice, but the government is talking about a long-range kind of approach in this Jobs Fund, where they are going to feed this fund for years to come, and we all know now that when the money is cut off under this program that jobs sharply fall off and we are in a more serious situation than before we started.

So, that while the Jobs Fund has had a positive effect this past winter, and I know that we've had a number of projects in my constituency and I know the people appreciate the fact that they get consideration for some of these jobs, but a lot of the jobs have been short-natured, work-creating kinds of situations where we've had a lot of scrub cutting taking place and I know that a chap came into my office the other day and he said he was just west of Swan River and he saw a pile of scrub with a big sign on it - Jobs Fund Project. So, this has certainly benefited some of our drainage projects, but the fact remains that these are short-

term, make-work kind of projects which comes very costly to the taxpayers of this province.

Even though it has improved our employment record for the past month, it's certainly not something that is going to be sustained on an ongoing basis. This is, I think, the problem with the kind of Jobs Fund that we have. There is nothing in place that will create many long-term sustaining kind of meaningful jobs for Manitoba.

You know, the Jobs Fund took money away from various departments of government that cut back a number of full-time permanent positions which were important to create additional short-term positions which probably have already ended if they have not already phased out. I know that the Jobs Fund is a short-term cosmetic approach and certainly we need something more sustaining than that.

An example that took place last year in my constituency, the Minister of Resources is fully aware of the cutbacks in roadside tourist camps throughout the No. 10 Highway north from Swan River and through the Steep Rock Lake, Bell Lake, Birch River, Mafeking and yes, the situation where they even went in and smashed up the barbecues and removed them. But you know, I don't know why the Minister of Resources would have cut back on these roadside camps. Perhaps they were not paying their way, but they certainly improve and encourage increased tourism to the area. I believe that we have one of the most attractive parts of Manitoba in the Swan Valley area. We do get a lot of tourism in our constituency and it's probably one of our most important industries. Why the Minister would cut back on the number of these very attractive roadside parks that have been used quite extensively in the past, but they cut back these so they could reduce their staffing by two or three men because it wasn't paying its way properly. So what? If we talk about the Jobs Fund, I would certainly think that keeping these people in place during the summer months to maintain these summer roadside tourist parks would be money well spent and it's certainly an investment in the future to make sure that the tourists will continue to visit, not only Swan River, but other parts of Manitoba as well.

Under the section Investment and Agriculture - if I can just refer to the Throne Speech for a minute - on Page 7 of the Throne Speech, and just to read the second paragraph: "The difficult financial circumstances of many farmers is a major concern of my government. Several years of adverse weather, high interest rates and low product prices have inflicted severe economic hardship on farmers with low equity and on those who recently started farming. My government will intensify its efforts, through special programs and expanded management and credit assistance to assist farmers to recover from the effects of these adverse circumstances."

Well, I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Resources will well remember the very serious situation that we had in the Bellsite area where a community was almost wiped out because of the high degree of rainfall that they received last year. They are just on the east side of the Porcupine Mountains and from the 1st of April until I believe a period in September, they had received over 25 inches of rainfall in that particular part of the province. Of course, with the runoff from the Porcupine Mountains, the estimated 15,000

acres that would normally be cropped in that part of the country was reduced to about 1,000 acres that got seeded. Of the 1,000 acres that got seeded very few acres were able to be harvested and they made a special appeal to the Minister of Resources and the Minister of Agriculture for some immediate kind of assistance to speed up the work as far as the drainage and work that might be done over a long period of time in that area and also looking at some kind of immediate help that they could receive from the Minister of Agriculture.

To my knowledge they have not received any kind of word from either Minister with respect to any programs that might be made available to them, but certainly we will follow up on this part of the Throne Speech to see if there isn't some kind of assistance that will be forthcoming as a result of that paragraph that I have read out. Certainly there are other communities in the province that have had similar kinds of situations happen to them and will need some consideration.

Transportation and Northern Development. Certainly we on this side welcome the fact that upgrading and modernization of the Port of Churchill is going to happen sometime soon in co-operation with the new Canada-Manitoba Economic and Regional Development Agreement. Certainly this is an expenditure that should be taken care of by the Federal Government but in any case if there are some Manitoba dollars that are going into it through the Jobs Fund as I understand it, nevertheless this is important to Manitoba. It's one that requires upgrading and certainly this is welcome news.

We also welcome the news that a new hydro transmission line will be built into the Community of Churchill in the very near future and certainly this is welcome news to the residents of Churchill who have been suffering from a lack of the hydro facility for a number of years. They have been paying dearly for fuel and now this hydro line will supply their energy requirements and will be a big boost to the port facility as well as to the individual community members.

So we welcome those kind of details that have been certainly announced before but it looks like we might be getting a little closer to some concrete action with respect to the port itself and also to the introduction of hydro transmission lines into Churchill.

The Throne Speech made reference to the five-year Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement and the fact that it's now near the mid-point of its term and it mentions an expansion of activities is planned for 1984-1985. Well certainly it's just really hard to believe that this agreement is at its mid-way point because we haven't heard anything that's happened with respect to this agreement since it's been in place. I know that many of the Native leaders in Northern Manitoba have been concerned about the lack of activity because of the high profile of the Provincial Government and the Federal Government at the time of the signing of this agreement.

I attended a meeting in Cross Lake last October at the invitation of the chief from Cross Lake who invited Native leaders from many of the northern communities to come to a meeting in Cross Lake to try and find out from the various levels of government what was happening with the Northern Development Agreement, or why there wasn't something happening that could

be made announcement of. Well, anyway, the Cross Lake meeting, it so happened that I was the only elected official that turned up and the members of the government were conspicuous by their absence. — (Interjection) — The Minister of Co-op Services says they don't attend meetings, well . . .

**HON. J. COWAN:** No, no, you don't. . . your meetings well enough.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I went to the meeting that I was invited to go to and there were a lot of Native people there. They had a lot of questions and certainly the members of the government didn't show up, either this Provincial Government or the Federal Government.

One of the chiefs had gotten up and said, when they signed the agreement back in - I believe it was December of '82 or thereabouts, that there were four or five Cabinet Ministers, including the Premier from the Province of Manitoba. There were four federal Ministers attended this big gathering in Thompson for this historic signing of the new Northern Development Agreement, but when a meeting was called in Cross Lake a year later to see what was happening, where the action was, nobody showed up, just the chiefs and quite a few of the councillors, and you weren't there, Jay.

**HON. J. COWAN:** How come you never mentioned it to me?

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** How come I've never mentioned it? — (Interjection) — I did. I brought this up one other time I spoke in this Chamber, so perhaps you weren't in attendance.

This meeting was held in October of '83 and nothing happened, but another meeting was scheduled for November of '83 at Norway House. I received another invitation to go to that and suddenly the meeting was called off. I haven't been able to find out whether the government has made some big promises to the northern people that they're really going to produce on this Northern Development Agreement this year, but certainly everything has been very quiet since November and I haven't seen anything in the papers that would indicate that there's been much activity in Northern Manitoba as a result of the new Northern Development Agreement that's now pretty well half shot.

Pretty soon we should see some results and I'm encouraged by the nod from the Member for Churchill, the Minister of Environment. We'll look forward to great activity in the last half of the present Northern Development Agreement.

Native rights is another area that has been touched on in the Throne Speech and we've heard quite a bit about Native rights in recent years and I think it's an important item. I was pleased to have had the opportunity to attend the First Ministers' Conference in Ottawa back in March dealing with aboriginal rights and self-government.

It is interesting to note that the Member for Rupertsland, who seconded the Throne Speech Debate, stated that he continues to strive for self-government for his people and I respect him for that. I believe Manitobans would welcome specific information on

what is meant by Indian self-government, what the Member for Rupertsland really is talking about when he is speaking about self-government for his people.

I had the opportunity to talk to several Indian and Metis leaders at the conference while in Ottawa and I would say that many of them did not have a clear indication as to what really was being meant when they talked about self-government; they were not clear on this issue. Many of them did not feel happy about it. Others thought, well, they liked the terminology but they weren't absolutely clear as to what it would entail.

I think it would be helpful for the Member for Rupertsland if he could elaborate sometime during the Session, or the Premier or the Minister of Northern Affairs, or any of the Ministers from the Treasury Bench, to be more specific on this topic because we're not sure of what it means.

During question period today I had raised the question because of the news article in Tuesday's Free Press headlined, "Metis leaders proclaim self-government in town." The Minister of Northern Affairs had indicated that he has had meetings with the people from Camperville, the council, to discuss the issue of self-government. Just to quote from the article, it says, "The mayor of the community, which is governed by the Provincial Northern Affairs Department, said 'Metis leaders have formally proclaimed the town as the Camperville Metis Government: the first modern-day Metis government in Canada.'"

To go on quoting, "We're not going to wait for the Federal and Provincial Governments to keep talking for the next 10 years; we want action right now.

"For the last four years, Guiboche has been mayor and head of a seven-member community council which acts as an advisory body for the governing of the community.

"But he said the entire Camperville Community Council and Camperville Metis Association met April 9 formally establish the Camperville Metis Government. The government has already appointed six Cabinet Ministers and is in the process of setting up offices, designing a flag and formulating a logo, Guiboche said, adding that Federal and Provincial Governments will be asked for funding and to grant status equal to a provincial level of government.

"Eventually, the Metis government might pass laws extending hunting and fishing rights for Metis people, even if these measure conflicted with current provincial or federal legislation, Guiboche said."

You know, it's interesting that Camperville now has proclaimed self-government in their town. I can recall about a year ago this government provided \$80,000 to Mr. Guiboche and the Metis Federation in order to do a study on aboriginal people's rights, self-government and what have you, so they would be in a position to participate in the constitutional meetings which were held last March.

I haven't seen any report or results of this funding, this \$80,000 that the MMF received. The Minister today responded, saying that he doesn't necessarily agree with what Camperville is doing, but according to the news release they have already gone ahead with their proposal. So I'm wondering if the Premier or the Minister of Northern Affairs is going to send in battalions soon in order to correct this situation that he's not happy with. But he's not provided these kinds of answers and

certainly Camperville is only one of some 60 or 70 Metis communities in this province, and so I think that we would be happy to get more information from the government with respect to really what they mean by self-government for Native people.

You know, without a doubt the Minister of Finance and this government has demonstrated that it has really breached The Financial Management Act of this province. They've really broken the law by passing a Special Warrant involving \$1.5 billion. Certainly this government doesn't want to be accountable for their actions; they avoid the democratic process at every possible occasion, whether it be discussing the finances of this province or whether it be constitutional amendments. We just have not been able to have the democratic process followed with this government.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this government is bankrupt of ideas evidenced by this Throne Speech; there is no doubt about that. The people of this province have lost confidence in this government. It doesn't matter where you go, people will ask you, when is the next provincial election? When you say two or two-and-a-half years away, they can't believe it. How can we possibly put up with this kind of government for another two years? This kind of talk is not necessarily coming from Conservative supporters; this is coming from a lot of previous NDP support.

I can go to many parts of my constituency or other constituencies and it doesn't matter where you go, the coffee shop, and people will say, "When in the world are we going to get rid of this government?" So, Mr. Speaker, this is a desperation Throne Speech. Manitobans have a right to be concerned about the future; this government has lost touch with the people; the sooner a provincial election is called, the better.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, it's a delight for me to have the opportunity to once again participate in the Throne Speech Debate. I must admit that following immediately after the Honourable Member for Swan River, it will be difficult for me to become very emotional or very excited about the remarks that he made. He has put me into not a euphoric state, but certainly when he said those kind things about the Jobs Fund I really wondered if I was hearing a Conservative spokesman.

It certainly didn't seem to coincide — (Interjection) — spokesperson, pardon me. It certainly didn't seem to coincide with the remarks of his esteemed leader and some of his colleagues who were whispering in those stage whispers some very critical things about the Jobs Fund. Certainly the Leader of the Opposition is still under that pall, that Conservative pall. He's in that doctrinaire, philosophical fog when he cannot see that government should be actively involved in stimulating the economy.

Mr. Speaker, Conservative Party Governments and typically the Conservative Party in opposition here see government as not playing an active role, but rather reacting to what's going on in the economy. The typical way in which they react is if they see the economy in trouble, then they suggest giveaways, Mr. Speaker,

giveaways to stimulate the economy. That's the kind of economic stimuli that the doctrinaire Conservative approach typifies. Really, Mr. Speaker, they don't learn. They don't learn.

You know, I went through, Mr. Speaker, the speech of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and I thought, well, I knew that having sat through it that there was no ringing challenging rhetoric in the speech, but sometimes lack of emotion, lack of fervor, lack of real concern in his speech nevertheless can mask what otherwise might be some very tough, hard-hitting statements in his speech. I didn't find either, Mr. Speaker, it was completely flat, dull, listless, lacklustre. Indeed, it was, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition characterized about the Throne Speech in here, a speech that was very thin gruel, Mr. Speaker. I looked in vain in that speech, Mr. Speaker, for some very tough, analytical criticism of what this government had been doing.

I looked, for example, Mr. Speaker, at what they had to say about agriculture. We have said, as we indicated in the Throne Speech, agriculture is still the most significant important industry in Manitoba and really all the Leader of the Opposition and all of the spokesmen thus far - there haven't been that many - have all been deprecatory about what we have done in respect to agriculture. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this government has spent more money on agriculture to stimulate and protect agriculture than any government in the history of the Province of Manitoba - specific initiatives, Mr. Speaker, designed to make sure that our agricultural industry has a fair opportunity to compete.

Mr. Speaker, investments in the pork industry, investments in the beef industry, unparalleled in the history of Manitoba - and we had a former Minister of Agriculture in that vacant four-year period that really there will be nothing that historians will write about in that four years - we had a former Minister of Agriculture who did absolutely nothing in respect to those concerns, who now in the Throne Speech Debate criticizes this government for not doing more. Mr. Speaker, Conservatives in office as they are in opposition are long on talk but short on deeds. That's typical, Mr. Speaker, of Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech Debate, the Leader of the Opposition talked about highway equipment sitting around, graders sitting around. Well, you know, under Conservative Governments they don't allow that. You know what they do in Saskatchewan? They cut the highway program and then they sell off the equipment. The largest single auction - and I'm sure the Honourable Member for Arthur would have been delighted to be there - the Saskatchewan Government, a Tory Government, was getting out of the highway business, selling off their equipment on a large scale. That is Tory Government, Mr. Speaker, retrenchment, cut, and sell off government assets at a fraction of their cost. That's the kind of government that they would like to see in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. They would turn everything over to the private sector. Their blind doctrinaire philosophy commits them to that course of action. We, Mr. Speaker, do not follow that route.

Mr. Speaker, turn to another section of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's speech and I'm sure that he'll enjoy the humour of what he said there.

He said, at Page 41, talking about hydro development, Mr. Speaker, "They may be able to deal with them and still retain their philosophical hang-ups about having to sign an agreement to sell a portion of a plant or something like that."

You see, Mr. Speaker, he accuses this government of having a philosophical hang-up of having to sell off a portion of a public enterprise. To him it is just a philosophical hangup.

Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Mines and Energy indicated, this government believes in the use of our hydro-electric development controlled by the province to develop that investment for the good of all of the people of Manitoba and not sell off part of it, bits and parts of it, and do that to the detriment of our ability to plan for the economy of Manitoba, the ability to ensure that the economic potential that energy develops can be used in Manitoba for jobs in Manitoba.

But the Honourable House Leader of the Opposition, in his damning with faint praise about the agreement that was announced by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, talked about "Well, aren't we a little troubled about the possibility of these jobs going south?" Remember it's for a 12-year period; remember that we haven't sold off half of a plant as the opposition would do. That's the kind of arrangements they would make. — (Interjection) — "Oh no," they say. That is the kind of deals that sit happily with them.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the kind of sneer that seems to be implicit in the words of the Leader of the Opposition in respect to the Throne Speech. He says, "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 is raining outside."

Mr. Speaker, what did the Throne Speech say? It says, "My government is aware of the problems that Manitoba farmers may face as a result of low soil moisture levels and recent dry weather conditions. In these circumstances, my Ministers urge farm producers to take advantage of the protection afforded by Manitoba's crop insurance programs." - specific, directional, good advice - "My government will be monitoring moisture conditions across the province on a continuing basis and will be reporting regularly on the situation to the House."

Let the records show, the records of this House - Hansard - record the jackal-like laughter that is associated with my reading of those statements, Mr. Speaker, because notwithstanding the critical soil moisture conditions in this province honourable members laugh at that reference in the Throne Speech. I want Hansard to show that they laughed at our concern - laughed at our concern that we have extremely low soil moisture conditions particularly in areas of the province represented by members opposite. That is the kind of attitude, Mr. Speaker, that members are typical of.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Natural Resources would be so kind as to respond to a question?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, since the Honourable Member for Pembina was one of those who was most loud in his laughter during the course of my remarks, he will have an opportunity at the conclusion of my speech to put a question.

Mr. Speaker, our concern with the resources of Manitoba is contrasted with the indifferent attitude of members opposite when they were in government. No vigorous attempt at conservation, whether it be forestry or soil or water - those are fact, Mr. Speaker - lack of initiatives, lack of concern; and when we, in a Throne Speech, indicate to our No. 1 industry a concern for an area of the province that really needs divine providence by additional rain, but that area can be assisted by a government actively concerned about the situation and not waiting until it is too late, that is the kind of reactive government that the Conservative Opposition would be, Mr. Speaker.

That is the kind of damning with faint praise; it is really a sneering of a concern on the Leader of the Opposition that should haunt him when those words are learned by people in southwest Manitoba. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I note by the irritated remarks coming from opposite that they recognize that they are in trouble on that issue, that their "Tuxedo Kid" leader has forgotten about the concerns of agriculture in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in this Throne Speech we have indicated a government that is anxious to establish a return of a viable economy in Manitoba. But what did we have under Conservative Government rule in that period from '77 to '81? Well for the first three years about they went around talking about acute protracted restraint. Oh, they don't want to remember those words today. Acute protracted restraint - that was the order of the day, Mr. Speaker.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, the economy of Canada, the economies of North America were already starting to feel the pinch. When a government in office should have been trying to stimulate the economy, they were slashing and cutting. Only in their last year prior to the election they went around saying, "Well, we are sitting on our gold mine, don't stop us now." They had press releases about mega projects that they had not completed. Oh, what a fascinating change there was! Mr. Speaker, what they did was exacerbate the economic turndown in Manitoba at that time - completely wrong strategy on the part of a government - and they paid for it. They paid for it.

Mr. Speaker, returning to agriculture, when I hear the Honourable Member for Arthur get up, the Honourable Member for Pembina and the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain get up and ask for initiatives in respect to agriculture, none of them believe in marketing boards, they don't believe that farmers together should have economic strength in respect to the marketing of their products. They believe in the rugged individual, the rugged private enterpriser. They are the people, Mr. Speaker, who are qualified members of co-operative organizations. Very qualified. They really don't like dynamic, collective, organized farm movements because that takes away from that individual importance that Conservatives have. That's their doctrinaire hangup, Mr. Speaker, because they are troubled that people get together and through that

collectively develop strength in respect to organizations like the farm union - very critical of the farm union - because that indicates that collectivity of farmers' strength that they're opposed to. That's the kind of philosophical hang-up that permeates the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, for a moment I want to indicate our concerns in the Throne Speech. Not only are we concerned about the economic thrust that is necessary in Manitoba, just a small portion of which was revealed, I believe, a significant indication this afternoon of the kind of long-term, dedicated effort we have and ongoing under a Minister of Mines and Resources, a Minister of Mines and Energy, that's a tribute to any Legislature in Canada, excellent leadership, but our Throne Speech highlighted another concern and that is health.

We have a lot of lip service from Conservatives across the country in respect to health - not all Conservatives, because, Mr. Speaker, there have been some in Canada who have shown outstanding leadership in respect to health care, but not the new generation of Tories, particularly those who sit opposite.

You'll recall that in 1969 and 1970, when the first NDP Government was elected in Manitoba, what did a Conservative Government then have by way of a health system? Well, we hear a good one by the Honourable Member for Pembina. That good one charged the old age pensioner and the person on \$7,000 or less income the same for health premiums as the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, if that honourable member had \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$30,000 income compared to those other incomes.

That was the kind of system that we had in Manitoba, but we changed that, Mr. Speaker. We changed that and because it was so popular a change that party, when they were in office during that brief period, didn't dare to try and return that kind of a poll tax, but Conservative Governments are in power in other parts of Canada. They're in power in Ontario and they're in power in that wealthy Province of Alberta but they still yinstitute a poll tax in respect to health care.

We had a situation in Alberta where the Alberta Government, through its agency, was going to cut people off from hospital care. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of Conservative ethic; that's the kind of Conservative doctrinaire philosophy that is exhibited by Conservatives across Canada, not all of them but the modern, Reaganite, Mulroney-type Conservative - and I will get to Brian Mulroney here in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, what about the Conservative Party's attitude in respect to health care today? Well, suddenly they did a Road to Damascus in respect to The Public Health Act passed in Ottawa. They saw it would be politically unwise; it would be virtual political suicide to attack a Federal Liberal Government introducing a concern in respect to the devastation to a Medicare Program that would result by doctors being able to opt out, by extra billing by doctors in the system, so what did the federal Conservative Party do? They said, well, we'll go along with that, no problem with it.

It's a problem in Alberta, it's a problem in Ontario, but no problem for a federal Conservative Party. That's the way they kind of patch things up and, Mr. Speaker, they call themselves a national party.

Before that initiative occurred, I want to tell you that the Conservative Party was fumbling, trying to find a



way to deal with this problem because their doctor friends wanted to be able to opt out. They wanted to extra bill, and they're the main supporters of the Progressive Conservative Party and they put the pressure on them and they philosophically are in favour of that kind of system. Those who are wealthy should be able to pay for it and we will dole out, we will assist the very poor. That's the kind of system that they want.

Well, Mr. Speaker, prior to their change, prior to their deciding that they were going to go along with The Canada Health Act or the Public Health Act - I'm not sure of the formal name of the act that was passed in the federal House - a federal Member of Parliament, it was Jake Epp, the Member for Provencher, sent out a questionnaire, a very skillful questionnaire, and I'm sure that some of the Conservative strategists had these questionnaires sent out elsewhere. I want you to hear, colleagues, what this questionnaire said.

The first question was, "How satisfied would you say you are with hospital/medical care plan in Manitoba? Are you very satisfied, quite satisfied, not too satisfied, not at all satisfied, or don't know? To indicate, please check one." Okay, that's not bad, Mr. Speaker, is it? What do you think of hospital and medical care in Manitoba? All right.

2. "Compared with other government services, how important do you feel a Medicare plan is? Would you say it's one of the most important, of average importance, less important than most, or don't know? Please check one." Well, that's not a bad question, is it? It doesn't reveal anything. That's a good question.

3.(a) "As you may know, in some provinces, doctors are allowed to extra bill, that is, charge fees in excess of those allowed under the Medicare plan. How do you feel about this? Do you think doctors should or should not be free to charge patients in excess of the Medicare schedule if they feel such extra billing is warranted? How strongly do you feel about this? Yes, strongly; yes, not strongly; no, not strongly; no, strongly; don't know." Kind of confusing, Mr. Speaker, but still, you know, trying to find out what people thought.

Listen to 3.(b), Mr. Speaker. Here is when we start to get a revelation of a Conservative plan. "If this extra billing could be used as a personal deduction for income tax purposes, would you then favour or oppose extra billing by doctors?" Shall I read that again? "If this extra billing could be used as a personal deduction for income tax purposes, would you then favour or oppose extra billing by doctors? Favour, oppose, don't know."

You notice it's not "strongly oppose." No, it's just, "favour, oppose, don't know." They sure wanted - the authors of this plan - to get an affirmative response in respect to that and you know the answer.

Listen to the next one, 4.(a). "In order to have heavier users pay more for their use of the system - how do you like that one? - would you or would you not support the institution of an extra charge to a patient who makes more than three visits per month to a doctor, that payment being the patient's responsibilities, not Medicare's? Would support, would not support, no option."

You see, Mr. Speaker, the clear thrust of this questionnaire was formulated to develop public opinion that would say, yes, we'd go along with extra billing if we could deduct it from our income tax. Yes, we would go along with a user charge on anyone that used the

health system more than three visits per month - penalize the sick, Mr. Speaker, return to an extra billing, support for that practice, which analysts have indicated would break our health system. That is the Conservative strategy, Mr. Speaker, obviously revealed in this kind of questionnaire.

Now, you know, this came out, this questionnaire, before the Road to Damascus change in the House of Commons, when suddenly a Conservative Opposition that was expected to take a doctrinaire position in the House of Commons and support the doctors' right to extra bill, said no, no, we're going along with this initiative.

Why do they do that, Mr. Speaker? It's not that they haven't got doctrinaire principles that they want to uphold; it's because, Mr. Speaker, in order to attain elective office they are prepared to forget all about their principles.

Mr. Speaker, what you call it is political opportunism, Mr. Speaker, and that's the kind of representation we have in this House, a party that is acute political opportunist.

Mr. Speaker, when I read the speech from the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, it's full of that kind of slick opportunistic language that characterizes the technique of the Leader of the Opposition, not a basic hard-hitting constructive thrust pointing out the different way in which a Conservative Government would approach economic problems in Manitoba, none of that, not one shred of constructive advice or criticism in that speech, all negative. Any bit of praise was couched in language which damned it by faint praise. That's the kind of leadership that we now have for the Progressive Conservative Party in Manitoba. It's shameful, Mr. Speaker. It's flat, dull, lifeless, and shows no challenge at all to this government.

I expected a speech that would come out fighting, demonstrating the way in which a Conservative Party would develop a real different thrust to economic development in Manitoba. None of that, not a line, not a line.

Now we have yet to hear from some of the other members of the Conservative Party, I hope that we will hear something constructive by them.

Certainly, I was heartened to hear the Member for Swan River disagree with the major thrust of his Leader of the Opposition's concern in respect to the Jobs Fund. He frankly admitted that the Jobs Fund had had a positive effect in respect to the jobless rate this past winter and I appreciate the sincerity of the honourable member's remarks. It is commendable, Mr. Speaker, for him to say those things in the light of the kind of speech made by his Leader. He went on to admit that specific Jobs Fund activity in his constituency was most beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in his damning with faint praise the activities of the Jobs Fund criticized, he said, you know, we are taking credit for job creation where we only put a small portion of the money in. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, the kind of strategy they would follow is they would put 95 percent of the money in and private enterprise would put 5 percent of the money in, and then all of the profits would go to private enterprise. That's the kind of thing they would do, that's characteristic of a Conservative Government strategy, economic strategy.



Our strategy is we put the small portion in and we lever the flow of dollars from private industry, from other governments, and yes, we increase the economic activity by using our money very carefully, by using it as a catalyst to ensure greater expenditure in respect to economic development, just the reverse of the kind of thing that the Leader of the Opposition would do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 5:30 p.m., when we next reach this amendment the Honourable Minister will have 10 minutes remaining.

I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.