



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. 6 - 10:00 a.m., THURSDAY, 19 APRIL, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 19 April, 1984.

Time — 10:00 a.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 First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is not a formal ministerial statement, but it is one of a non-political nature that I would like to make at this time. Mr. Speaker, I think all Manitobans, not just all Manitobans but all Canadians, must feel a sense of pleasure this morning in regard to the announcement that Brian Dickson is being appointed the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

The Manitoba community particularly is quite conscious of the abilities and the experience of the due to be appointed Chief Justice, Brian Dickson, as having served for a number of years as Justice in the Court of Queen's Bench in the Province of Manitoba. Born in Saskatchewan, having served as a veteran during the Second World War, served on the Manitoba Bar and, as well, serving in the Manitoba Courts. He was noted as one that was a progressive in the writing of his judgments, moderate in style, humanitarian, tended to rely upon the spirit, the sensitivities, rather than the literal interpretation of law, one that was highly respected in his work in the Supreme Court of Canada and, I think as Manitobans, we can be justly proud of the fact this morning that a native son of Manitoba has been appointed the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of all members on this side, we certainly wish to associate ourselves with the remarks of the Premier in welcoming the announcement of Mr. Justice Dickson's appointment as Chief Justice. Indeed, if not a native of Manitoba, certainly a transplanted Manitoban who practiced law here and was first appointed to the bench here in Manitoba, he is one that all Manitobans can be proud of and I'm sure that all Manitobans, as well as all Canadians, welcome this appointment and are indeed supportive of the words of the Premier in making that announcement today.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Placement of science and engineering students

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund and it follows on information that has been provided to the House, I believe, within the past week or so by both the Premier and the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund with respect to the effectiveness of the portion of the Jobs Fund that assisted in the placement of science and engineering graduates. My question to the Acting Minister is, is it intended to extend that part of the program to 1984 graduates of science and engineering from Manitoba's universities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Employment will take this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, that matter is now being looked at by our department and it was a very successful program last year and we are hoping that, if all goes well, we may be able to extend it. We are now having discussions with various people in universities and business organizations to see what we might do in the way of a program for the coming year.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the headline in a recent article that indicated that "Future looks bleak for the U of M's class of 1984," and further the article quoted the University's career specialist as saying, "the majority of the University of Manitoba's Class of 1984 face unemployment or underemployment," but ask the Minister to pay particular attention to the obvious needs that are there in the employment of university graduates, and ask him when we might expect an answer on that particular matter?

HON. L. EVANS: I would hope that we would be able to be in a position to give the House some more definite information within the next week or two. As I indicated, we are having discussions with various organizations and universities and we are looking at various professional categories beyond engineering graduates, people in business administration, various applied sciences and so on. We think that the program has been very well received, has enabled people to get permanent jobs, has indeed helped Manitoba business at the same time and it is worth exploring and extending. When we have something more concrete to advise the House, we will certainly make the appropriate announcements.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could indicate what proportion of those who were employed under that particular program resulted in permanent jobs.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the conditions of that particular program, as I understand, was that the employer had to be offering the employee, the graduate, a position that was of a permanent nature, that was expected to be ongoing after the program was concluded. So ideally, all of the - ideally I underline - would be kept on in permanent capacities. However, that is something we can check out. I certainly will check out exactly how many were able to stay on in accordance with the ideal outline of the program objectives; and certainly if we do anything again in the next year, that would be a condition of consideration because we're talking about a fairly long term type of employment support, unlike Careerstart or some of the others, which tend to be of relatively short duration.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate how many people were able to be employed under that program last year, how many engineering and science graduates?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and get the precise information for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Memorandum of Understanding re power

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the First Minister, a question that was directed to the Minister responsible by my Leader yesterday and answered in the negative, but nonetheless I ask the First Minister, whether or not he is not prepared to give some very serious consideration to the fact that shortly the Manitoba Hydro utility will be appearing before the Standing Committee of Public Utilities, a utility that may be embarking on one of its most significant construction jobs - to quote the Minister's figures, \$3 billion - is it really his intention of forcing the Opposition to go through those hearings without being able to ask Manitoba Hydro about that project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: It's certainly our expectation that the Opposition will want to question Manitoba Hydro, the officials of Manitoba Hydro, with respect to the project announced; expectations with respect to possible resumption of Limestone.

Mr. Speaker, we will be anxious to provide all the information that we can that's available to us to provide it to members of the opposition. We want to be as open as we can with the provision of information as long, Mr. Speaker - and it's very very important - that we not jeopardize present delegate negotiations that are under way in other areas pertaining to Manitoba Hydro.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has as long a history in this Chamber and knows the importance of that Public Utilities Committee meeting in meeting with Hydro. Regrettably he also knows that the history has not always been all that good. Sequence of construction has been of major concern, as it should be.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, my question is just simply to ask him, will he supply us with all the information necessary for the Public Utilities Committee to come to the decision, supportive of Hydro if we can be, about the rescheduling or the scheduling of the largest construction job in Manitoba in the last decade? Will we have the Memorandum of Understanding before us at the time the Public Utilities Committee is called?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer that question. We are very anxious. Unlike some of the concerns that are expressed by the honourable member, this government is very anxious to provide all the information it can during the hearings. We will be very very reluctant not to provide information. The only information I could think of us not presenting at this particular point, presented later, - I'm sure honourable members would agree with this, and I know that Manitobans would agree - that any information that would jeopardize delicate negotiations would not be presented.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the assumption that a possible acceleration of Limestone is being generated by the successful conclusion of a power sale to Northern States Power . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'm not assuming anything.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . if that is the case, then surely at issue are the parameters of it, the way the sale is being negotiated, is it in the interests of future Manitobans and of the Manitoba Hydro utility itself?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister would deal with this, but I would not know what question the honourable member would be intending. I would think we would want to provide all the information that we could, and would be available to Manitoba Hydro at that time, to the Legislature as to possible resumption, and what basis possible resumption, we would want to indeed assist . . .

MR. H. ENNS: That committee has been lied to by the Executive Officers of the Hydro and it has gone through . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. We would want to assist honourable members as fully and as completely as we can so that we could remove what I think would be unwarranted suspicions they might have. The Honourable Minister might want to respond further to the question.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate that the contract would be signed in early June. At that particular stage, we will provide material for the Legislature. The committee review of the Public Utilities

which reviews Hydro can in fact deal with it at that time. There are other matters that may be of interest to committee members that Hydro deals with as well, but certainly we will provide that information, Mr. Speaker. We made that commitment yesterday that we would provide the information; we said that the contract would be signed and the material would be provided.

The people of Manitoba have given the government the mandate to undertake negotiations and negotiate contracts. We do that on behalf of the people of Manitoba. That is the mandate which we received in November of 1981; that is the way in which government operates. We then provide the information to the public; we provide it to the opposition. They can make their judgments as to whether they think it's a good deal or not.

We have said, Mr. Speaker, that the deal is for in the order of \$3.2 billion over 12 years . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Manitoba Hydro has \$500 million wasted in Northern Manitoba right now . . . that's got that on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised. They ask me a question and I'm trying to provide an answer and all I hear is a lot of negative heckling on the other side. I believe if they ask a question in good faith, I'm certainly willing to do my best to provide the answers. I said that this is a \$3.2 billion sale over 12 years, an enormous benefit to Manitoba and significant profit to Manitoba. It is tied to the price of a non-renewable resource in the United States; ours is a renewable resource. We stand to benefit enormously from this. It is a major breakthrough for Manitoba, I would hope we would all co-operate to see that it in fact be achieved.

Child abuse case

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services and arises out of the Ombudsman's Report into a recent celebrated and infamous child abuse case in the jurisdiction of CAS Eastern Manitoba and I would ask the Minister whether, on the basis of the conclusions and recommendations coming out of that report - a report by the way with which I do not quarrel and a report on which I commend the Ombudsman for his fairness - whether the Minister is taking steps and if so, what steps is she taking to protect children at risk in Manitoba against a recurrence of that kind of failure to follow through on responsibilities to children at risk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to answer a question about an issue of deep concern to all of us with the rising awareness in the public of the extent of child abuse and increased channels by which children are reporting such cases. There is a growing need to

educate, not only the general public, but the social workers in the field in procedures to handle these cases. Therefore the member opposite will be, I'm sure, pleased that last Friday I and my colleagues, the Honourable Maureen Hemphill, Larry Desjardins and Roland Penner did release the new child abuse guidelines that will give procedural assistance to people in the field in the area of education, health, police and community services. There is a lot to be done in public education but we think by the publication of these guidelines we've given strong evidence of our will to develop the service and protect, wherever possible, that kind of abuse to our children.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I appreciate the response of the honourable Minister but did I miss something here? Would it be possible for the legislators of this province, the 57 elected legislators of this province to be familiarized with the guidelines on protection against child abuse to which the Minister just refers? All we've seen is a press release on this subject.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will ensure that each member receives a copy.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can I ask the Minister, in view of the fact that we're heading into a temporary legislative hiatus for the Easter weekend and as a consequence I wouldn't expect we'd be getting much material from her in the next two or three days, can I ask her whether those guidelines lay down procedures by which social workers, case workers in the child abuse field and their supervisors are given new assistance, new guidelines, new directives in terms of direction on the basis of how they should respond to children who summon up their courage to report child abuse? I'm sure the Minister is very aware that it takes a great deal of courage on the part of an abused child to report the situation. Most of them are terribly frightened and embarrassed by the situation. When they summon up that courage, are case workers and supervisors going to respond to it in a more active and alert fashion? Do the guidelines cover that aspect of the question, Sir?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is an area that gets specific attention. One of the difficulties in the past, apart from the general difficulty that many people have had in recognizing the existence of many kinds of child abuse unless they have been directly involved in it, has been the concern that if they reported it and it was not verifiable, they might be liable for incorrect allegation. What we've done in the guidelines is say that anyone who suspects that there has been child abuse is to report it and that gives comfort to people in the field.

Now it would go then to a committee made up of representatives from the different fields and they would then determine the next steps to be taken. But it takes some of the ambiguity or concern away from the individual in the field and encourages them, because of our prime concern for the well-being of the individual child, that they are to report and then a team approach will be taken to the issue.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I am pleased to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to acknowledge the Minister's assurance on that point. Can the Minister now assure me and assure members of this House that copies of those guidelines will be available to us and in our hands by an early date next week? And also, can she advise us when the legislators of this province will be given an opportunity to look at the Kimelman Report, another important document in the field of child welfare with respect to which we've only had the most superficial of press release coverage?

HON. M. SMITH: I have already given assurance on the first instance. The other report is available and if members wish, if they contact me directly, I will see they have a copy.

Request for Address for Papers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: I would like to direct a question to the House Leader concerning an Address for Papers that I made three months ago, asking for copies of correspondence between the province, the Federal Government, Franco-Manitoban Society, Manitoba 23, etc. Could the Minister indicate when that response will be received?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Address was agreed to when it was moved in the House. Certain clearances are required and at that time I stated that those clearances would be required from third-party interests with regard to some of the documentation, that those clearances and the documentation are being put together. I would hope that the Address will be tabled as soon as that information is available and I'll give the member that assurance. As soon as I have the information and the documents and the clearances, the Address will be tabled in the House.

O/C 362 - Bilingual education grant

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education with regard to some of the Orders-in-Council passed March 28, 1984.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask about Order-in-Council No. 362, a grant to the Manitoba Association for Bilingual Education, the amount being \$163,000.00. I would ask the Minister, knowing that this is a group of parents of students of, I understand, Hebrew, Ukrainian and German background who are concerned about education in those languages, if the Minister could tell me whether it's an exclusive group or whether there will be an openness to other ethnic groups within the province. And secondly, what was the funding last year relative to the amount passed in this Order-in-Council?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer the question. Although it might more appropriately come up in Estimates, I can say that there wasn't a grant given to this organization for this purpose this year. They have just been developing the program themselves and put their proposal in that we reviewed very seriously.

To his first question, does it preclude groups other than the few that were listed? I am pleased to say that it does not. There are a number of positions - I believe it's 10 - for people to be out in the field. We have identified about six or seven of the positions in terms of categories in groups, the Ukrainian, the German, but we have left open some of the positions for what you might call the emerging groups, the new groups, the ones that are just getting organized, who may not be as organized as the larger groups but may be just as interested in having that kind of support and help.

So the positions are not all determined and there are openings and opportunities for the other emerging groups to have the same kind of support.

MR. C. MANNES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell us specifically what the objective is of this association?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that they have a very wide-ranging number of goals and objectives and of course one of the large ones that they try to meet in many different ways in different programs, would be the maintenance, the support, the encouragement, the enhancement, the promotion of their culture, in many many different ways . . .

MR. C. MANNES: In schools?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: One of the ways of promoting and keeping your culture is to promote and keep your language, so that would be one of the goals, I think, of this organization. There are many others. I think perhaps very detailed questions about the organization and the grant would more appropriately be answered through the Estimates process.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I then ask the Minister whether this association is going to require government funding on a yearly basis.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that this is a program where they want to support a program that is just developing, and to do what we all want to have done with important new programs like that, and that is to involve the parents in the community.

I think that one of the important elements, not just of this program but of others, is that parents know about the programs, they have them explained to them, they agree, they support them and that's one of the ways we're going to increase the public confidence in the schools - by more involvement of the parents in making decisions about programs.

So I think that they would see this program as being in place through the development period of a program, when they're getting it going, when they're explaining

it to parents, getting parents to understand and support it. But I don't imagine they would see it continuing once the programs are in place.

O/C 359 - Seine River grant

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, a different line of questioning, though dealing with another Order-in-Council, that being 359, passed March 28th, a grant to the Seine River School Division, No. 14, not to exceed the sum of \$41,936 for a development grant to help offset the additional costs associated with the setting up of the new French or Immersion school in the province.

There are number of questions, Mr. Speaker. The first one, the sum of \$41,000 - I believe this is for operational costs in the first year of the new Ile des Chênes school. Could the Minister tell me whether all new schools have the opportunity to apply for grants of this nature in their first year of operation?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, in the regulations in the legislation that presently exists for the establishment of new schools of this nature - and I might say not brought in by this government but in place when we took office - there is a grant that has a criteria for the development, a sort of a seed or a development grant for the establishment of schools like this. That legislation, I believe, was brought in by the members opposite, I think it was in place when we took office and I think it came in in their term of office. What it meant was that there was recognition that there would be some additional costs when you are establishing a school of that nature, when there are materials and supplies that aren't ordinarily or easily available and that may have a significant extra cost. There is a criteria established for that and the criteria gives them, or entitles them, to an additional \$41,000 as an establishment grant for getting the new school going.

A MEMBER: That sounds all right.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I will have the opportunity at Estimates to pursue the criteria in a little more detail at that time.

I would then ask the question, Mr. Speaker, as to whether now all immersion schools in Manitoba are going to be called French schools. I've never seen that type of labelling before. I believe that immersion schools in many cases cover other languages also. Are now immersion schools going to be known as French schools, are schools in Manitoba going to be called French schools?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. C. MANNES: I'm sorry I didn't hear the answer.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, all immersion schools will not be called French schools.

MR. C. MANNES: Is there a correction then to be made in the Order-in-Council, Mr. Speaker?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably an appropriate term for that as an individual school.

Bankruptcies of farmers

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

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable First Minister. Mr. Speaker, in support of the resolution of mine which is on the Order Paper today, in light of the serious escalating numbers of farmers that are going bankrupt in this province, I wonder if the Premier and his government have any plans of any kind whatsoever to get involved in this issue and hopefully save some of the problems that's in the second page of today's Free Press, "Manitoba Farmers Walk Away From Risky Business, Farmers Forced From Land Grandfather Broke From The Bush." The numbers are escalating almost on a daily basis and I am wondering if the First Minister and his government have any plans to get involved immediately due to the urgency of this problem.

A MEMBER: No farmer will be allowed to go bankrupt.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me assure the honourable member, and I thank the honourable member for his question this morning on this very important issue, similar questions were raised a couple of days ago which the Minister of Agriculture has already indicated his direct involvement on behalf of the government; and certainly insofar as this government is concerned, we are prepared to take additional steps because, Mr. Speaker, the initial price for grain that has been proposed by Ottawa to the farmers of Western Canada, in our view, is inadequate. Mr. Speaker, the prices respecting the grains of Western Canada are very much subject to concern on the part of this government, as indeed I assume the part of all prairie governments and the extent of the impact that the announcements can make on the western agricultural scene, the impact on the rural communities of the prairies, Mr. Speaker, it is an issue, it is a concern, I think, of all western farmers, western rural communities, western governments and they will be - and the honourable member may rest assured that there will be every opportunity undertaken not just by the Minister but by myself and by others - to bring clearly to the attention of the Federal Government that, in our view, the initial payment is too low, that there is an overly cautious approach on the part of the Federal Government in respect to the announcement that has been made in regard to the initial price of grain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell. I hope he is not going to anticipate something which is set down for debate.

MR. W. McKENZIE: I beg your pardon? I didn't hear you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I trust that the honourable member does not intend to ask questions about a matter which is put down for debate.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: That's correct, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to deal with the resolution which is on the Order Paper in my name today.

I would like to deal with the matter of farm bankruptcies with the First Minister. I am going to ask the First Minister if he is prepared and is his government prepared to set up a committee of Cabinet, or a committee of this House to immediately go out and tour this province and let's get to the heart of this problem and see if we can't save some of these young farmers today that are walking off their land, or being forced off the land. Agriculture is the No. 1 industry in this province, Mr. Speaker. I look at this Throne Speech, I look at the programs of this government, I don't think we're doing half enough for agriculture in this province.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's question, in fact, does dramatize the extent of communication that has taken place by members on the Treasury Bench, the rural areas of this province, touring, communicating, responding to the concerns of Manitoba farmers. And, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to - though I'm tempted to - spend some time listing the various initiatives that have been undertaken by this government, important and crucial initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member may rest assured that, in fact, this government, its Minister and all the responsible ministers, will be pursuing this matter with a vigour that will be unparalleled insofar as the lack of vigour that was demonstrated previously when they had responsibility for agricultural affairs in the Province of Manitoba, when they were the supposedly leadership and representative of the farm community in the Province of Manitoba; when they, Mr. Speaker, provided do-nothing leadership insofar as the farmers of Western Canada, despite the difficult times that continued for the Manitoba farmers throughout that period of time, as well as at the present time.

Careerstart applications

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, in light of the shoddy performance of this government and the programs that have failed miserably across rural Manitoba, can I ask the Minister of Employment, what happened to the businessman in Gilbert Plains who put in under Careerstart for four people, three unemployed people in the village and one student and when the application came back it was turned down and he was granted one-half a person? I wonder can the Minister of Employment tell me what happened in that case in rural Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Tell them about the overall program, Len.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member that we have had thousands of applications from small business and non-profit organizations throughout Manitoba for assistance under Careerstart, and indeed it is turning out to be a very successful program this year. It is simply impossible

to give every businessman, every business, the amount of money they might like to have and we think it is prudent to spread assistance around as much as possible. Therefore, in some cases, we can't accommodate the business person involved, the small businessman involved, to the extent that they might like.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable members of the House that we'll be putting thousands of young people, thousands of young Manitobans to work this summer who wouldn't necessarily be working otherwise. I think in the process we're helping the small business people of this province enormously, including in the good Town of Roblin.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, a final question. It wasn't the Town of Roblin, it was Gilbert Plains. Can I ask the Minister if he supports the arguments of his staff in the Dauphin office that the reason that these unemployed people and these students can't be put to work is because there's no money in the fund?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we have made available, or are making available more or less, approximately the same amount of money that was made available last year and we're doing our very best to ensure that we're accommodating the demands from the business community from all over Manitoba, whether it's in the North, whether it's in the Parklands region, Eastman, or wherever else to do our very best to help young people obtain work this summer.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Well we've got lots of figures. I can assure the honourable member that we'll have as many young people, if not more, working this summer than we did last summer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the questions that the Honourable Member for Roblin posed impinge very much on the whole of the business community of Manitoba because I think we are all in agreement that the No. 1 business in Manitoba is, indeed, agriculture and everything else stems from that.

I would like to point out to the Member for Roblin and members opposite that about 10 days ago I gave a speech to the dairy co-ops in Manitoba wherein I zeroed-in on the very issue that the member raises and indicated at that meeting that probably what is needed in Western Canada is a coalition, an effort on the part of all political persuasions to make some fundamental changes to The Western Canada Grain Stabilization Act. Members opposite will recall the act that was brought into the House of Commons by the then Minister for Agriculture, the Honourable Alvin Hamilton, some two decades ago and, under the provisions of that act, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — No it's not a speech, it's an answer to the question that the Member for Roblin posed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Is the honourable member addressing the Order for Return of the Honourable Member for Roblin? Is he debating that?

HON. S. USKIW: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the member's point of order. The Minister is obviously, as a designated acting Minister of Agriculture, providing further information to the Member for Roblin-Russell about a question that the Member for Roblin-Russell views as a very serious question and the concerns that the Minister of Business Development and Tourism shares.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The House is hearing the answer from the Minister of Business Development who will not, I'm sure, turn the answer into a speech.

HON. S. USKIW: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. I simply wanted to remind members of a good piece of legislation that was put on the books by the then Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Alvin Hamilton, good only to the extent that there was a willingness on the part of the Government of the Day to exercise on that act whenever the need arose. The tragedy of it was, however, that very few Ministers wanted to use it to its maximum in order to support agriculture when agriculture was in crisis from time to time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had brought in a new act which we now contribute to. The problem with that is that it is not adequate to deal with the volatility, if you like, of agriculture in Western Canada.

MR. H. ENNS: Otherwise known as the peaks and valleys.

HON. S. USKIW: Very good point that the Member for Lakeside makes. The fact that we're dealing with international pricing mechanisms, the fact that we have an inflationary factor that has been very severe on agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I would like to invite members opposite, in response to the questions put by the Member for Roblin, I would like to invite members opposite to participate with us in redressing that issue through pressures on the Government of Canada to indeed make very important changes to The Grain Stabilization Act.

Weight limits on bridges

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, there are some large number of bridges that cross provincial roads within my constituency, and I'm sure many constituencies within southern Manitoba, that have 14 ton maximum weight limits imposed on them. I'm wondering if the Minister can tell me whether in fact there is any long-run plan, in effect, that over time will see increased the maximum carrying weights of these bridges.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, I think the honourable member does not presume to believe that we're going

to have a way of increasing the weight limits on those existing bridges. They're going to need replacement and if that's what he's saying, if we have a plan of replacement, certainly there are a number of those that will be included in the construction program this year. When it's tabled in the Legislature the honourable member will be able to question that in detail during Estimates process. We are also looking at a long-term program to deal specifically with bridges because we realize that that is a growing problem out there across Manitoba, not only in the area of provincial bridges but certainly under provincial responsibility of the Department of Highways, but also under the Department of Natural Resources, water resources bridges, as well as for a number of municipalities as well. We are looking at ways to assist the municipalities as well as our own jurisdiction with regard to bridges because we realize that that is a problem that is growing across Manitoba and one that is very difficult for them to cope with.

Cankerworm infestation

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

MR. G. MERCIER: I have a question for the Minister of Environment if he is the appropriate Minister to answer this.

Mr. Speaker, it is reported the province is going to be facing the worst cankerworm infestation in a good many years, could the Minister of Environment indicate whether the Provincial Government will be providing any assistance to the City of Winnipeg for spraying, and whether any spraying will be undertaken by the province outside of the city?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've had a meeting with the representative for the Environment from the City of Winnipeg last week and, at this point in time, there has been no request made to that effect. Perhaps a future meeting will take place soon as it is becoming increasingly evident that we will be facing, in fact, in some areas I understand, as stated in the paper today, that in some areas the problem is already occurring. At this point in time, as happens on the yearly basis, the City of Winnipeg submits its previous years spraying program, a report on the spraying program for the previous years, and the projections of what they anticipate doing for the coming year. That's basically the purpose of the meeting we had the week before last and there hasn't been at this point in time any discussion with regards to the cankerworm problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, and the amendment thereto proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Member for Inkster has 28 minutes remaining.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I dealt with some of the skulduggery that the opposition is trying to perpetrate upon Manitobans of economic performance of this province.

This morning I would like to start off my comments in addressing something that I feel is a sickness in the province called hate literature, propaganda against individuals, against persons, against racial groups, against linguistic groups. It is a campaign that has been financed from forces outside this province largely, I believe, some forces within the province as well. We have evidence, and we get it regularly in the mail, of literature more recently focused against the Roman Catholics of this province and of the world.

We have focused particularly against Pope John Paul and there seems to be very little concern over where this literature is coming from, over what is being done in the Province of Manitoba, to try and refute and to show utter disgust that this kind of campaign is going on in this province.

We used to perhaps laugh a bit or cry, more appropriately, at some of the anti-Semitic attempts and attacks by groups such as the Christian Defence League, such as the Canadian League of Rights against jury citizens of this country.

We have a party on this side that is committed very strongly to the respects and the integrity of the individual and of groups on religious basis, on racial basis, on the basis of their individual beliefs. We have never heard any condemnation of that by members opposite. They seem to hide from it, to try and ignore it, hoping that it will go away. Well these kinds of racist attacks, this kind of hate literature and hate propaganda does not go away when you ignore it. It is much better to address it and hit it face on and attack it for what it really is.

There has been a shocking increase in the past year in Manitoba in dealing with hate literature. The people who feel it the most and who are aware most of what this can imply for a society I would say are generally the visual minorities, of which I am not one. The minorities who can be identified by visual means note very clearly that they will take the brunt of the attacks, if they are against people for intrinsic values and non-visible attacks, then they certainly will follow suit to have a tax upon themselves.

By fanning distrust and negative anxieties against one minority or against one visible minority or against any intrinsic minority, you threaten all Manitobans and all citizens. The visible minorities can see so clearly of the impact on this. When a group's constitutional rights are questioned and threatened they say, what kind of rights does one have when they are not necessary guaranteed in the Constitution? If constitutional guarantees are rejected, what grounds does one have basis of security on even those measures which are constitutionally guaranteed?

We have seen the rise of right-wing groups in this province, exploiting the divisions that have been created in this province, the divisions that I would say flatly have been created in this province and exasperated in this province by the party opposite, by making every attempt they can to make cheap political gains out of

issues that are of perhaps some underlying anxieties that the public may have or to fear that the public may have, and by appealing to those fears and those anxieties, one fans them not only against that group but to all other groups and all other minorities.

The Conservative cry during the last debate when we were talking and condemning them for the ringing of bells incessantly to thwart the process of democracy, and when they called that freedom is bells, Mr. Speaker, they had resounding cheers from the far right in our community, and they called it again and again and again. Those bells were fundamentally anti-democratic. They were fundamentally anti the British parliamentary system.

We had the involvement in their campaign of the Canadian League of Rights and Ron Gostick. We had the involvement as well of a Conservative member and a Conservative reeve and a Conservative delegate to the last convention, Reeve Dennis Heeneey from the R.M. of Elton, who actually participated with this group in hiring and renting halls for their use to spread their hate and their propaganda from their vicious attacks against minorities - religious minorities in particular - in this province. Not once did we hear condemnation from a Conservative member or of Mr. Heeneey and his practice of renting halls. The Member from Minnedosa has run against him once or twice and I understand defeated him and I'm glad that he has defeated him. I think that he does not reflect the people in his area, and their opinions whatsoever.

We had the Grassroots organization sprung up with that ironic name, all of a sudden denying that there is any involvement of the Canadian League of Rights, even when the Canadian League of Rights brought in several thousand signatures, to try and deny that they even had any participation in their campaign of skulduggery and hate-mongering in Manitoba.

We now have evidence from the report that was in the paper the other day of the involvement of the Ku Klux Klan and if one looks at some of the quotes that came from Ann Farmer who is their - what do they call her - their chaplain or spiritual leader. How that can be a chaplain or spiritual leader is beyond me. But she says that Manitoba clansmen remain active in Grassroots but do so as private citizens and are not under the sanction of the clan. With the French language issue it's a problem whether the clan people are working on their own accord. There are so many Grassroot right-wing groups emerging and people who are clan belong to other groups as well. But these are the sorts of people that you draw out, the people that you draw into the province as well in the sort of campaign that you ran last year or during this past year, this is the kind of results that you get, and you deny them. Your silence in **effect** is a condemnation on yourselves. The silence and **racism** and bigotry by the advocates of racism and **bigotry** is seen as acquiescence and support.

We have groups like the Citizens Coalition, another organization made up of extreme right-wing businessmen, or a couple of them mostly financed by one person, I believe, out of London, Ontario but with the support of many others and recently the support, disgustingly so, of the Ontario Medical Association in their attack of the Medicare system with full-page advertisements in the Globe and Mail and other newspapers across the country.

We have garbage sent around to us. We got this in the mail last week from an organization which quotes from a true Conservative, an Edmund Burke, on their masthead, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." And then they run out this kind of anti-French propaganda that is an insult, an absolute insult, to Canadians. It's put out and myself being an English-speaking person, it is an embarrassment to have people trying to use the English language as a basis for attacking French in this country. They call themselves The Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada. — (Interjection) — You've got one. You may quote from it, Dave. I hope you don't. I hope you have better sense than to quote from the thing. You can refer to it and condemn it, but don't quote it in any kind of support for your cause. — (Interjection) — I quoted Burke, yes. And Burke said, and listen again, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil," - and propaganda and hate is evil as far as I'm concerned - "is for good men to do nothing." And I consider myself to be a good man and I'm not doing nothing, I'm standing up and I'm condemning. They obviously are not good men; they do not pay any attention to their masthead, for they propagate evil and they propagate hatred.

We have, in the Conservative Party just recently here - they found themselves having a little family feud. If you do not belong to the Canadian family, I don't know how you can have a feud within a family if you do not believe in what Canada fundamentally is. Maybe the Member for Portage la Prairie probably knows this gentleman well, I believe he was the president of a PC organization in that area, his name is Doug Edmondson. I heard on the radio yesterday or this morning that he has now left the Conservative Party to join the new version of the Western Canada Concept Party, WCC, which is under a new sheet today and it's calling itself some Western Regions Concept. Well, the sheet will not deny them, the sheet still has holes in it.

We had Tolliver in Saskatchewan going off on similar tangents and he eventually moved towards a position that I think unfortunately some of the right-wing elements of our society would like to see and that is an assimilation of Western Canada into the United States. It's something I reject totally as a Canadian.

This new right-wing Tory philosophy that we have perpetrating not only Canada, not only Manitoba, but the U.S., Britain, to some extent other areas of Europe as well. One has a constant use of the old Goebbels' techniques of the big lie, the bigger the lie the more likely it will be accepted. They start producing this kind of absolute garbage with innuendo in it, half-truths - not even half-truths, it's more like tenth-truths - in their PC report. They talk about farm lands ownership and they state that it discriminates against Canadian citizens by prohibiting them from buying more than 10 acres of farm land in Manitoba. What a pile of garbage. If someone reads this and has no background and no understanding about this, it means that I cannot buy farm land, that some other Canadian anywhere in this country cannot move to Manitoba and buy farm land. It's that sort of quarter-truths that there's a skulduggery, unfortunately, that the Conservative Party has sunk to. We saw it before; we saw it in 1977. If you remember the election campaign in '77 and the ads that the Conservative Party put out in 1977 - it was the same

kind of low-base technique that they used. They used it successfully then; this shall not be used successfully this time, it will backfire on them.

They talk about election expenses in this garbage as well, as if the NDP is the only party that's going to be financed in an election, when all political candidates who get over 10 percent of the vote will receive contributions to help pay for their election expenses. They don't talk about that. They just make an allegation as if it is only the NDP that is going to be financed in an election, when they are as well. During the debate, when we questioned them whether they would submit their expenses for reimbursement, they said, of course they will if that is the law of the land. Yet they put this kind of garbage in this here. — (Interjection) — The Member for Steinbach said that when I questioned him when he was speaking, and he said he would claim if it was the law of the land of the time, that he would be submitting his claim as well, that they would not refuse to submit their claims. So don't . . .

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

MR. D. SCOTT: There's no point of order.

MR. D. BLAKE: The member is making a statement that members on this side of the House are on record as saying that they would take the reimbursement of their election expenses. Members on this side of the House are on record as saying, we would rescind that bill. We're telling them, don't spend that money because we will rescind it when we come into office after the next election. So don't spend it — (Interjection) — retroactive.

MR. SPEAKER: That was a clarification, it was not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Perhaps he should go back and read Hansard, and I don't have the date or the Hansard copy in front of me now, perhaps I'll be able to dig it up. It was a question that I asked of a member opposite whether he would refuse to take those funds, to submit for the reimbursement and he said if it was the law that he would do it, that he would not reject the public funding for his election expenses.

There was a time, I believe in the past year - and I could be misquoting him, but the intent of his comments - this is the Member for Charleswood - when he said that the trouble with you socialists - and it was some time in the last year - the trouble with you socialists he said, accusing and looking at us, is that you believe that man is inherently good. He laughed and he said, well, we know that man is inherently bad. That is what this kind of campaign, this kind of skulduggery, this kind of duplicity is aimed upon. It's going after their version of the inherent bad in man, appealing to their lowest emotions. They did it last year; they did it all during the fall; they did it during the winter months; they did it last summer for months on end of trying to appeal to man's fear, to man's distrust, which will lead to those people, whether they have it themselves or not, but the creation of hatred in those people who are afraid and who are distrustful.

This kind of sick Tory fabrications that we have here in this publication - I'd like to run through a couple of them. They talk about capital investment in manufacturing being down in Manitoba. One of the things in shipping - I believe they have a little chart here with shipments - one of the things that determines shipments, for the Member for Sturgeon Creek's information, is previous investment. When we were down in 1982, in 1983, that is because of a lack of investment in their years of office in manufacturing.

What we have now is a province where projected investments for Manitoba for 1984 are up 33 percent, No. 4 in the country. Where the jobs in Manitoba in the last year in manufacturing increased by 1.7 percent - 1.7 percent more people working in manufacturing in Manitoba, whereas in Canada as a whole, the jobs in manufacturing decreased by over 2 percent.

In total capital investment for the whole province, public and private sectors, Manitoba for 1984 is projected by Statistics Canada to be No. 1 in the country. Saskatchewan, the province that calls itself open for business, is only one-third our rate of investment growth for next year. Alberta is expecting a decrease of over 8 percent; B.C. a decrease of almost 6 percent in investment next year. In private investments, Saskatchewan is high at 9.6 percent; Manitoba is right behind at 7.9 percent. The other western provinces, B.C. down almost 2 percent; in Alberta, down almost 9 percent. In private investment in Canada, private investment decreased in '83 over '82 in the past year by 5.5 percent, in Manitoba it increased 15.7 percent. Those investments by the private sector and by the public sector - and the public sector has a role of investment in our society - it has a role, and you can see by the decline of the Manitoba economy, from the increases and the start of increases in unemployment under the Conservatives where they proudly stated in their Budget Addresses that they were not going to be investing in the public sector of Manitoba, that it was not a role for the public and government in investment in our economy.

They talked about it here - this is a press release from six years ago, April 14, 1978 and this is Don Craik, their great Minister of Finance at the time, talking. He says, "It was the government's intention to improve Manitoba's comparative position by limiting both direct and guaranteed capital outlays to the greatest extent possible." In other words, reduce capital spending in the Province of Manitoba on behalf of the Government of Manitoba. Get the public sector out of business, is what they said. Well, they got themselves out of office by getting the public sector out of business. The public sector in this province above most other provinces has a very strong role in the economy and will continue to have such.

They talked about reducing their debt burden to bring it in line, and yet as I showed last night, the Tories ran to an election and when they published materials, they don't even have the colours right of what years were their Budgets and what years were the NDP Budgets. When their Budgets started going and the deficits started going high for them, they called a snap election in the fall so they would not have to return the following spring with a Budget for the following year showing the kind of performance after four years, showing the state of the provincial economy that they had left.

We have the capital manufacturing intentions of the largest investors in Manitoba. In capital investment alone, Manitoba ranks number four in the country for 1984 with the expectations as published by Statistics Canada. We are up 33 percent in capital manufacturing investments versus a decrease in Saskatchewan of 4 percent and a decrease in Alberta of 5 percent.

I've dealt already with the issue of employment and manufacturing in particular, which the Member for Sturgeon Creek - although I don't think he's ever been involved in manufacturing - seems to claim to have a great knowledge about it. We actually have 147 more people working in manufacturing in Manitoba this past year than they did in the year previous.

The Tories talk - and in here there is mention of a sales tax increase and they go after department store sales in particular now when Manitoba is right at the top in Canada in retail sales increases - Manitoba is up 7.7 percent - slightly higher than a Canadian average. Saskatchewan, their retail sales only increased last year 6.4 percent; Alberta 2 percent; B.C. 2.7 percent. Manitoba is at a rate three times the growth of the Province of Alberta in retail sales and yet they put in here in item number 6, Manitoba ranked third lowest in all provinces in percentage changes in departmental store sales. That, Mr. Speaker, is skulduggery. That is trying to manipulate, it's a lack of information, trying desperately to pick out one little tiny aspect of a positive picture that could potentially be negative. In my feeling, it is a very positive thing because what it shows is that the retail sales, the small businesses are getting a better shake from the consumer. They have a larger percentage of the consumer sales now than they did previously because they are up substantially. Department stores for one month, the month of December, may be down, but overall retail sales are up so that means that the smaller retailers that you guys like to say you support, are actually doing better. But you won't show that. You also won't show figures of the changes in the population growth in Manitoba; you won't show the positive aspects of us. You won't show - and I'll table some of these, Mr. Speaker - the change in population.

You can see a decrease in population under the Conservatives and increases under the New Democratic Party years. When they came into office just down, down, down, right down to negative growth. When they left office, there were fewer people in Manitoba than when they took office, fewer people in Manitoba when they left office after four years than when they took office.

In two years of our administration, we have increased the province's population to the highest level yet at 1,047,000 people, whereas the population decreased some 6,000 under the Conservatives' four years, in our first two years, our population has increased by over 20,000 persons.

We talk about capital investment by province. And capital investment, as I tried to explain to them earlier, it's capital investment which begets manufacturing shipments, which begets employment in manufacturing. We have Canada, percent change '84 over '83 published by Statistics Canada in their projections - the highest total capital investment of any province, the highest. Yet the opposition squawks and tries to give the impression that the Manitoba economy is not on the

rebound, that the Manitoba economy is doing somehow worse than other provinces when our economy is performing better than any other province in this country. In particular, when one relates it to the western provinces which are most closely linked in terms of the makeup of our economy, we are doing far better.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Conservatives by these attempts, are lowering the art of politics, lowering to cheap skulduggery modeled after - I hate to say it but it's true - because they use the same techniques and you go back and you look at the growth of fascism in Europe and you see the same sort of techniques were used there to propagate their evil as the Conservatives are using now to try and propagate their policies. Goebbels' group voted, Goebbels mastered it and the other people are now imitating it. The bigger the lie, he said, the greater the likelihood it is to be believed.

When one sees reports such as this, what else are they following but that basic premise? If you repeat the big lies long enough, often enough, some people will start to believe you and there they come to their other adage of Orwellian newspeak that ignorance is strength and if you can keep the people ignorant, if you give them garbage, if you lie to them long enough or often enough, if you put out falsehoods often enough to the people, you'll start getting some of them to believe you. The only hope that we have and the only thing we have to be thankful for is that the right-wing Conservatives we have in this House are not in Ottawa, for their anti-democratic and neo-fascist bells-of-freedom claim could lead to the destruction of our British parliamentary system of government in Canada.

When their chosen few would rule Canada into the ground and Orwell's last infamous newspeak slogan of freedom of slavery would be upon us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

I've been disappointed this morning as I sat and listened in this House to the speech from the Member for Inkster. I don't think it worthy to dignify some of those remarks by even referring to them and doing, as is often the process of debate, of some back and forth discussion. I think that it ill-behooves any of us to perpetuate some of the remarks that he has passed by deigning to repeat them. Otherwise, it's a pleasure to enter into this debate in this new Session of the Legislature of Manitoba and to put on the record a few remarks concerning the Throne Speech and how it will affect my constituency, the constituency of Gladstone.

Before I get into remarks on the Throne Speech I would like to say a few words to my constituents. I would like to express to them some of my appreciation for their support during the last Session of this Legislature, through the long Session of the last Legislature, for their comments to me regarding the various pieces of legislation that were dealt with during the Session, and their encouragement to me during the days and months of the language debate. Many of them phoned me and wrote to me and visited me

and expressed their views on the subject and it was very helpful to have their input.

The Constituency of Gladstone weathered the last year's extensive heat and drought problem in varying degrees throughout the constituency. Some communities did have fairly good crops, while in other areas the heat took its toll and caused a great deal of hardship. Many of the farmers are having difficulty getting financing for this year's crops and you would notice, in a quick glance through any of the weekly newspapers from the various areas in the constituency, that even the most casual observer would gain the knowledge that many farmers cannot manage to stay in business any longer. There are numerous ads, much advertising of auction sales to advertise machinery and equipment, and this I find a sad note on the saga of agriculture in this province because it is sort of a weathervein, you might call it, of the economy when there are a lot of auction sales in a farm community in the springtime. It's an indicator that a lot of people are having trouble.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in studying the lengthy document read in this House on the 12th of April, one searches in vain for any real indication of what is really going to happen in this province during the current Session and in the year to come. I'd always been under the impression that a Throne Speech was the indicator and outline of what the government's plans or intentions were for the coming year.

A MEMBER: What direction are they going to take us.

MRS. C. OLESON: This Throne Speech deals mainly with the past, it's a history book. It's a history of what this government has done, or thinks it has done since it was elected in 1981. Instead of hearing something new all we heard was old news; old news about this policy or that; not anything definitely new or a new direction. This government tells us that they'll bring forth great things for the people of Manitoba, but they don't tell us what the things are.

As a representative of a rural constituency I listened intently for promises of agricultural policy, to alleviate the severe problems of agriculture. What did we hear about agriculture? Very very little. On page 4 we find the government referring to agriculture as the backbone of Manitoba's economy. Just that reference, nothing more. On page 7 we find the headline "Investment in Agriculture". Following the headline is further vital information that this government recognizes that the farm community is important. Going on to page 8, the government deploras the low moisture levels and dry weather conditions. A promise is made to bring us up-to-date on the moisture situation from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, in a speech which refers to the much touted Jobs Fund at least 18 times or more, why is it that we must be treated to the promise to help the backbone industry of the province by giving moisture reports from time to time? That is an insult to the farming community. I know that the constituents of Gladstone expect more and they're entitled to more than their Provincial Government, their Minister of Agriculture, telling them when it's raining and when it's not.

In the heading under the Highways Department on page 12, I quote from the Throne Speech: "Program of northern road construction planned by Department of Highways to provide improved access to remote and Northern communities." Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we're all aware that the condition of roads in Southern Manitoba need attention as well. We are very happy to see much needed northern road construction and we know that the North needs road development, needs it vitally. We also know how neglect can cause major problems with the road system in Southern Manitoba.

One of the problems which has beset roads in some areas, of course, is the fact of rail line abandonment. There's much much more heavy traffic on the surrounding road system. When these roadbeds were designed and built that problem was not there and, as a result, they deteriorated faster than would normally be the case. I was glad to see that there is some indication in another publication, by the Minister of Highways, that he intends to deal with the Federal Government on that problem.

It's very important that we preserve and improve the road systems throughout the entire province. It is the lifeline of the economy and the social life of the province. We cannot afford to neglect it. Our future depends on it.

The Manitoba Highway News of March-April, 1984, crossed my desk the other day and I was leafing through it looking for something interesting and I came upon a double-page article on the thoughts and aspirations of the new Minister of Highways.

A MEMBER: It must have been a short article.

MRS. C. OLESON: Oh, no, it was fairly lengthy. Most of the article was taken up with photographs of the Minister, from this angle, that angle, I hadn't quite decided which was his best side but they were good photographs.

Several of the topics he discussed related to problems that constituents of mine have mentioned to me. For example, regulation of the trucking industry. Farmers have expressed concern over licensing of farm trucks and the use of purple fuel. They are concerned that this government may bring in legislation which was cause them to pay a great deal more to license their farm trucks.

The Minister will have to pay close attention to this aspect if he does as he states in the article that he intends to do, is to come up with a definition of "farmer". He will have to be careful that he does not penalize the farmer who has to get part-time employment, or other off-farm income, in order to remain in the business of farming. Of course, that is a problem in the Assessment Branch as well. Many farmers find themselves in this position, in order to be able to afford to farm they have to have income from somewhere else and they get caught in the definitions and the bureaucracy and it ends up costing them a great deal of extra money.

Now the question of hauling of dangerous goods is another one of concern to my constituents. I realize that the Minister must work this out with his federal counterparts and I hope that when he negotiates this he will bear in mind that all the regulations in the world

dealing with loads, and when and where they can be hauled, will be of little value if the driver, who is driving the rig, does not have adequate training and a responsible attitude to what he or she is doing.

One of the problems mentioned to me by truckers in my constituency is that the smaller trucking firms have a great deal of difficulty and they're in a no-win situation when it comes to training drivers. As soon as they have invested the time and money in training a driver he or she is hired by one of the larger trucking firms and the investment is lost. Perhaps the Minister has some suggestions to help in this situation. Small trucking firms provide a vital service to the smaller centres in the province. Many businesses depend on these services for they are the lifelines to small communities, since the railways are not hauling the type of freight they used to, and the trucking industry is a very vital part of this province so, of course, we go back again to the problem of highways. So it's all intertwined in importance and one relies very heavily on the other.

In the Throne Speech that dealt with Employment Services and Economic Security, I noticed on Pages 8 and 16 mention of plans under way for training programs to assist people who need retraining while they are employed already, and to assist welfare recipients to be self-sufficient and to assist others to upgrade their skills so that they can obtain jobs. Now this could not really be fairly called new initiative. That sort of program has been going on for a long time. It's to be hoped that the people being trained or retrained will actually be able to have jobs to go to when they come out of this training. I think we've certainly heard, this morning during question period, we read in the paper and we note from personal experience, that a great many people are having difficulty finding jobs; and if we're training people for jobs we must have some sort of assurance that their particular expertise will be of value to them when they get out of the training. I know we all know of stories where people have been retrained through these programs over the years, through the community colleges and so forth. When they get out they can't find anything related to that particular job and someone who has, for instance, taken a great deal of training at public expense to be trained as a plumber, for instance, finds himself working in something totally unrelated, if they can get a job at all. These are the things, of course, that are difficult to predict, but which certainly merit the study and time that could be taken to study them. There's no point in having all this expertise if you have nowhere to apply it.

Now, also, on Page 8 of the Throne Speech, in reference again to the Department of Employment Services, I find the quote: "My government will increase its efforts to ensure that both institutional and job related training are accessible on an equitable basis to all Manitobans." I'd hope so, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would hope that these jobs and this training is handled on an equitable basis. In this context all the government is really saying to us is that they're going to comply with The Human Rights Act. Surely, they don't need to put that sort of thing in a Throne Speech. That should be a foregone conclusion. If you have a program then there is going to be equal access to it. But then again, you know, there may be some merit to stating these

things once in a while, even in Throne Speeches, because perhaps by example, because it is stated someone will read it and maybe the education process in human rights will go on.

I think one major goal of that sort of organization, that sort of commission, is that some day they will work themselves completely out of a job. We all live in hope of that sort of thing, but I think it probably is a long time coming, human nature being what it is and there is a great deal of education and perseverance needed in that department.

I really cannot find a great deal more to say on the Throne Speech. It was long on words and short on substance. The only ones to applaud it were its authors. The NDP members certainly tried valiantly to give the impression that this Throne Speech was the answer to all their problems. The Member for Inkster didn't really try all that valiantly because I don't think he referred to it, unless of course he did in the earlier part of his speech last night, which I unfortunately missed.

I hope for the sake of Manitobans that the government is right. We, in Manitoba, the people of Manitoba, do need something cheerful to hear about and I hope the government is right in their enthusiasm over this Throne Speech. But as I say, the only ones that I have heard applaud it are themselves.

Let's hope as the days go by and as announcements are made in this House and elsewhere and as the Budget is introduced that the people of Manitoba will hear some definite policies and some evidence of real plans for the future of agriculture in this province, some real plans to encourage small business, and some hope for the students coming out of our universities, some hope for long-term employment, not just cheering about the Jobs Fund in its short term, make-work jobs.

It's very frustrating for young graduates as they look for jobs, jobs that aren't there and they get frustrated by continually looking and knowing that there probably are no jobs there. As they're going about searching, they're continually bombarded by - mind you I haven't heard them so much lately on the radio - but they're continually being exposed to signs pronouncing the marvels of the Jobs Fund and the glories of that, beautiful green signs that attract your attention. But I know that if I were looking for work in vain I would be just a little annoyed at the money that's being spent on those signs, to say nothing of all the other advertising, if I were looking for work and not able to find it. The spending on the Jobs Fund advertising will soon seem to many of the students and others, as it is seen to many of us, that if it were channeled into actually the creation of jobs, if a great deal of that money that's being used for advertising was creating jobs, then more people could find work. I guess it provides work for the advertising people and sign putter uppers, etc., but it certainly doesn't help the many people, many students and others in this province who are searching in vain for employment.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the opportunity to address some of these topics and concerns which are of interest to me and to my constituents. I look forward to discussing some of these probably again and other subjects after the Budget is introduced. There were a few topics that I will be mentioning.

I know that many of my constituents are phoning me and writing me and sending petitions concerning the

lotteries department. It seems that with further intrusion into the social life of the communities, the changes in the regulations concerning bingo is causing a great deal of concern, particularly amongst senior citizen groups, and I think we will, on this side, be asking a lot of questions and probably speaking on that during the Budget Debate and other debates that come through this House. I look forward to the rest of the Session. I look with anticipation to what will be happening in the way of legislation. I'm anxious to see some of the bills that have been promised us.

I think it was in the Throne Speech, I can't remember for certain now, that there is legislation coming in to deal with heritage buildings and so forth. I'd be very interested to see that and to see how it will affect some of the cultural and heritage groups and buildings throughout the province because that is a very interesting area. So we will look with anticipation to what is coming and hope that there is something to be of benefit to all Manitobans. But of course, I will be looking particularly that will benefit my own constituency.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I, too, rise and am looking forward to contributing to the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I extend to you and to the Speaker the customary courtesies at the beginning of the new Session and assure you of my co-operation in completing in an efficient way a most productive Session.

This Session, our third Session, will be heavier on the program side than on the legislative side. I think the Throne Speech did outline in general for a more detailed presentation later as the Session unfolds, the broad outlines and the philosophical base for the programs that will be forthcoming.

I would like to comment first on what I think are the qualities of the overall strategy. I think the first quality that must be acknowledged and which I think is absolutely essential, given the problems that face Manitoba, the economic and the social problems in a rapidly changing world, is the quality of realism. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the analysis of the real problems that face us as a community, the changing economic conditions in the nation of Canada, indeed in the rapidly changing international system, require a lot of rethinking and a very realistic facing of the underlying facts and the real, not only opportunities for initiative in development in Manitoba, but also a realistic recognition of the limitations of a Provincial Government acting in a broader national and international scene. That is not to present an attitude of helplessness or a lack of commitment, but merely a realistic definition of what areas we can work in effectively together and what areas we can only press political jurisdictions at other levels to alter some of their policy direction and actions.

The other quality, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think is important in the program is the quality of balance, the desire to promote a strong economic thrust, but to do so in co-operation with the major groups in society. It

is not an approach that says only one side has a major role to play, that somehow the other people, the unemployed, the less skilled, the people who to date have not been major decision makers in the economic development field, must only stay, cap in hand, and wait for the crumbs that may fall their way. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the programs build in increasing opportunity for all the people, all the major actors, whether it's workers, whether it's government, or whether it's business, private sector, to play a role in this co-operative effort of building a stronger economy in Manitoba.

And this is done, Mr. Speaker, not only because we think it is fair and ethically correct to include everyone in and to develop a co-operative process, but because we think it makes good economic sense. It's an illusion to think that an economic development program which concentrates solely on the initiative of the people at the investing end of the operation will necessarily generate the best benefits.

If there continue to be a large number of people who are unemployed or disaffected or undertrained for the new economy of the future, they will still be a cost to society. They will be a cost without any parallel opportunity for their input. That's crazy economics. It only makes sense to include everyone in and to build programs that enable all the groups to make a contribution to that development, not just to be what some people call a freeloader, but in some cases people are not given any option, but to live on assistance, to live without hope, to live without the appropriate training they require in the changing economy. So those are the qualities that the government program has.

When we get down again to the economic program, we have looked at the fiscal realities. Again, a Provincial Government does have certain opportunities and certain limitations. We may not like it, we may wish it were not so, but we do have a dependency on the credit granting and credit rating forces in the country and in the country to the south of us. It's a fact of life and we must conduct ourselves with some weighting of that reality.

Another key reality we must look at is the business cycle reality, the fact that there are ups and downs in the business cycle, that the heavy increase in expenditure in government that was appropriate when we were at the trough of the business cycle in 1982 and in 1983 is not necessarily the most appropriate strategy and approach for us to adopt now.

The other economic factor, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we must pay attention to is the structural weakness of the Manitoba economy and the things that need to be done not only to address the historical weaknesses, but some of the weaknesses that are emerging as Manitoba's role in the national and international economy is undergoing change. If we do not look honestly at what those are and seek out conscientiously the new opportunities, Manitoba may well drift off into being a backwater on the Canadian scene.

The way that we believe this economic development can occur, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is at all points in our initiatives, to build the partnership, to identify clearly that there is a role for business, for investment and innovation and seeking out of special new marketing opportunities. There is a role for government as a

balancer, as a catalyst and in some cases as an initiator. And there is a role for workers, not just as passive hands or feet who are employed to do what they are told, but as people with ideas, with energy, with creativity to contribute to the development of the province and who must, in the decision making and in the benefits of the development that occurs, be active partners.

On the social side, because the economic strategy must be balanced out with what we are doing on the social side, we must look at the needs of the groups who are not always able to assist themselves. We must continue to reassess the way we spend money in the social programming to assess its efficiency and its effectiveness and the maintenance of these programs when the economic times are as difficult as they are now and when our fiscal capacity is not growing as rapidly as we would like. It's not just a question of keeping the lid on but of continually reassessing how we deliver those programs, whether there's a better way to spend the current dollars, and whether we can involve people more in helping themselves.

I think the social programs - we do talk a lot about maintaining them, but I don't think it's maintaining them in a static state. It's a question of looking internally within those programs as we are doing in health, in education, in community services, to keep seeking out better ways to package the programs, to involve people at the community level and to get the most effective result from the dollars spent.

Mr. Speaker, when we work on the specifics of an economic strategy it is important to know where, as a province, we've come from, what the external conditions are and what the future opportunities are, and then to define the roles for each of the major actors. Historically, Manitoba did develop from the natural resource end, but not in a vacuum. Much of the early development in agriculture was completely dependent on there being government initiative, whether it was a matter of setting up transportation links, giving grants of land, assisting with the early provision of money to get the land cleared and to get started, it was a partnership at that level. One of the difficulties that has emerged in that sector is that from an early day, perhaps because we did have such a well developed transportation system, we became very dependent on exporting our raw materials out of province and not always doing the processing and the value-adding here.

We also imported the inputs too, whether it was agriculture or mining or forestry, we imported too many inputs from out of province. As a result, although we have have relatively more manufacturing value-added activity in Manitoba than is developed in the three provinces to the west, and that's been accountable for our relatively stable passage through the recent recession, still we have an unbalanced economy in Manitoba where our exports are falling sadly behind our imports. That kind of imbalance in the structure of the economy is not going to disappear overnight, but it is going to require careful attention on the promotion of export, on the import substitution side, on the promotion of business formation to serve our local industries here. What we have put together is a total integrated program to deal with all those very important factors in the economic development process.

As I said, the current situation does confront us with imbalances. We are importing a great deal more than

we are exporting. Our past reliance on exports of raw materials, whether it was minerals or agricultural product is in jeopardy as it never was before, and not in jeopardy because we don't still have those products, but because the growing competition on the international level is altering the price structure. So the prices that we are able to secure for those materials do not automatically sustain the existing cost of production and, in some cases, are presenting us with major policy issues.

I am pleased when I hear the members opposite raise the issue of the problems in agriculture. I look forward to the full debate on agriculture during Estimates when we can look in detail at the kind of programs that we can actually have in Manitoba.

I think one of the painful difficulties for a Provincial Government in agriculture is that we have a big package of programs relative to our size. A great deal of money is put into the agricultural sector to assist it, whether it's in dealing with the drainage problems, soil quality, water; whether it's dealing with crop insurance; whether it's dealing with marketing aids, technological development, management skills, assistance in credit. There are a lot of programs there, but the major problems that they are addressing are often beyond the provincial boundaries and those major problems will have to be addressed if they are to be addressed at all at the federal level.

So although I think we should continue to do all we can for agriculture, it's a delusion to think that we can solve all the problems here, or that money from the provincial coffers will alone do it. What often results from more and more provincial money being thrown into the agricultural sector is that we merely aggravate the problem because the high prices of all the inputs and the marketing issues, the things that need to be dealt with nationally, the decisions about how much, if at all; the agricultural sector should be subsidized by the general revenues of the country in order to keep us competitive with other nations. Those are problems which must be dealt with federally.

So, although I believe we must continue to do what we can selectively, to move into more value-added crops, into more processing of food, into managing our land and our water resources as well as we possibly can, it is a delusion to think that we can solve all those problems at the provincial level.

On the manufacturing side I, too, feel disappointed when I see hard-won gains in manufacturing slipping a little, but I think to say that that is something that can alone be solved by a Provincial Government is, once again, to ignore the very market system that the manufacturing industry depends on. There has been a decline, as the Honourable Member for Inkster pointed out, a decline across the country in production, in investment.

There has been international dislocations and partly for a good reason on an international level because there are emerging countries which are finding that their particular mix of large populations and developing technological skills is enabling them to mass produce many of the manufactured goods at less costs than the so-called developed world. It presents a problem for us but it does not mean that we must turn our backs on development and manufacturing. There are improved technological approaches, there are tremendous

advances that can be secured by the new technologies and by much more strategic management, looking at the global markets. And there's no reason why, with the kind of technological supports that are continuing to be there from the technology centres that will be coming our way with the new federally supported research centre, the kind of management development skills that are continuing to be offered by our business development department, that Manitoba cannot maintain for itself a share, a reasonable share in the manufacturing area.

It's not a question of government taking full responsibility or credit for the ups and the downs, it's a question of determining the roles. What can government most effectively do to promote manufacturing? What can private business most productively do? Are there entrepreneurial immigration programs which we can develop? Certainly we've had some initial success from the Hong Kong groups coming and bringing, in some cases from a different background, a labour-intensive way of producing, but very market-sensitive, a very internationally-wise approach to development, they are coming here and looking at appropriate technology for this setting and I think have a lot to offer us.

There are emerging opportunities, some of them not necessarily in producing hard goods. In the knowledge service industries, there are emerging opportunities that I know you're going to hear more of as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology presents the details of his programs and in co-operation with the Minister of Education, talks about the new technology opportunities for local business development that relate to those two departments. Each component of the program is not huge and glamorous, but there are interconnections and spinoffs among them and I think we'll find as the technology program is presented that we are going to have the benefit of some of the most forward-looking and appropriate types of initiatives for Manitoba that we have yet had.

Again, the financial service industry is one that has been promoted primarily from the private sector in this area, and I guess this is perhaps one of the points I find most frustrating in the total debate. Somehow when we talk about what the roles are for the different actors in the economic field, we get the feeling that it has to be one group only, and if you're saying that there is another actor, then you're against that group. We are told we are anti-business and pro-labour. I've never heard anyone on this side say we are anti-business. What we are is pro-partnership, pro-workers, pro-government and pro-business and what we want to work out is the roles for each of those groups. What we are against is a lopsided approach to economic development where we say business is the only actor, that the only way to get development and investment is to cut taxes and provide incentives and we'll just hope and pray that the benefits will trickle down and provide the jobs. We know that's an important component. We do have an investment encouragement program that will again be elaborated as the Estimates unfold.

The Jobs Fund is shifting its emphasis as we're moving out of the economic downturn in the cycle to a more long-term investment role. Again, we will not be saying that Jobs Fund does everything. If it can be

a catalyst, if it can be a stimulous, if it can play a complimentary role in different investment initiatives, that is its role. We're not looking for saying, we're doing it all and without it everything would fall down. But we do believe very strongly that had there not been a Jobs Fund this past year, we would not be seeing the improved unemployment stats that we are seeing.

We're not proud of 8 percent unemployment; 8 percent is more than twice as high as it should be. But it's the fact that we're inching in the right direction when other jurisdictions are going the other way that gives us confidence that the synergy effect of having the Jobs Fund assisting, stimulating, promoting, encouraging other investments, that it's the combination that works.

In addition to that improvement, I hope by next year we'll start to see a little reduction in that import-export balance. I think if we can see that closing of the gap starting and if we're able to do it by keeping many Manitobans employed and getting the new training and retraining for them as old jobs disappear and new jobs come to the fore, I think we can be very proud of what we've accomplished here in Manitoba.

That's where we've come from as a province and I think the strategy for the future is based on that recognition that we do need growth, we do need investment, there needs to be thrust toward development. But there is a role for an activist government in helping on the technology side; in helping on the management skill side; in helping on the trade promotion and the import substitution side; promoting tourism; on the natural resource side, where we're dealing with renewable natural resources, ensuring that there is protection of land, soil and water quality for agriculture, that there is reforestation going on for forestry so that we're not just developing an industry for today, but keeping the potential of that industry on so future generations can benefit from it.

Along with our preoccupation with growth, will continue to be the preoccupation with fair distribution, not just on a sort of shallow compassion, but because what is the purpose of an economic development strategy, what is the purpose of economic development if it isn't full employment for people, if it isn't training so more and more people can have access to the jobs created. If it's going to require more progressive taxation so that the people at the bottom aren't getting hit in all respects, then we will try to move in that direction.

If it's social assistance so that it's at a level that enables people to live in some dignity and with some hope, and if we can link that with programs that help those people to get the training so they can become again contributing members of this society; if it's a close-the-gap policy on the income side where in difficult times, wherever possible, we're able to see that the people at the lower end of the scale aren't the ones who are paying the entire cost of tough economic times; if we can build in those distributional elements along with the economic growth and thrust, keep the balance in the economy and enrich it with all the cultural programs that give vibrancy to the everyday life because people do not live by bread alone, they do need the richness that comes from cultural expression and I submit that this is not a one-sided or simplistic approach. It's not a trickle down, cut taxes, leave it

all to the private sector, don't worry about distributional issues till we're all rich again; it's a practical and compassionate and tough economic strategy based on the realities, willing to look at the problems and the weaknesses and address them patiently, thoroughly and with real hope and vision for the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I arise today in support of the amendment to the Throne Speech which was presented by my leader and I daresay it's not very difficult for me to rise in my place and debate this Throne Speech, one of the most shallow, barren pieces of paper I have ever seen in my many years in this Legislature as being offered to the people of this province as their future destiny for the rest of the term of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the first part of my leader's amendment says the government's failure to provide a rational long-term view in dealing with the economic and fiscal matters of the province is a concern on our side, and I only have to cite to the honourable members is the problem of the Jobs Fund is mentioned some 20 times in that document. If that's the future destiny of this province, God help Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, maybe before I do comment, I would like to wish you well, Mr. Speaker, in the year ahead and during the Session. I am not known as one that rises in my place very often to quarrel with the way you handle the decorum of the House. I'm from a pretty quiet type of area that are not known to upset the decorum of this Chamber so I certainly wish you well as we proceed through this Session.

I also would like to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the motion. I enjoyed both the addresses and I've read them very carefully. I was somewhat humoured by the Member for Wolseley's conversations with taxi drivers as she toured our great country. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if she's ever taken the time to ride in a taxi in Winnipeg and see what they think of this government. I did take that opportunity during the last Session on, I think, three occasions just to see what the feeling was of that elite group, the taxi boys. Generally, Mr. Speaker, they can tell you what the actual facts are and what the general consensus of the public is more than anybody I know of. I have yet to find a taxi driver in this city, our capital city, that has any good words to say about this government, which is most unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rupertsland, I was keenly interested in his comments. I wished he had taken a little more time to explain in more detail to me what he is talking about in this matter of the different forms of government that the aboriginal people and the Metis people are seeking. I have heard the comment addressed time after time after time but I still don't understand what are you talking about, this form of government that you are seeking. Well, Camperville used to be in my constituency and I know - I guess he'd be the Prime Minister there - Mr. Ferdinand Guiboche, real well, a long-time friend of mine. He was a liberal

but we still got along when I was the MLA. I notice comments from Ron Richard in one of the newspapers, who was another long-time friend; he was mayor also. I understand the problems of Camperville because that form of government under these Northern communities has never worked well and they certainly have problems in Camperville. All the time I was their MLA, they consistently drew to my attention the many limitations of that format. I don't think that's the type of government that my learned friend, the Member for Rupertsland, is talking about. I would sincerely hope that some day, Mr. Speaker, he will arise in his place and elaborate to us in the House what the aboriginals, the Indian people are talking about with this form of government that they are striving for at this time, because I have a lot of people in my constituency asking me. Unfortunately, I am not able to advise them in detail what the matter is all about.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to what I was talking about, the motion by my leader, the first part of it was the government's failure to provide a rational long view in dealing with the economic and fiscal affairs of the province. I have a hard time finding any economic and fiscal guidelines for the future because of the fact that they've built their whole future on the Jobs Fund. As I said earlier, the Jobs Fund is mentioned in that document 20 times. Can you imagine that that's the best that this government can offer for the people to build their hopes on and build their futures on, that this Job Fund is going to lead us out of this terrible, economic fiasco that we're facing at the present time?

The second part that my leader mentioned, Mr. Speaker, was the government's continuing failure to demonstrate any commitment to deal with the serious problems that exist in the agricultural sector in our Manitoba today. That came out loud and clear in the question period this morning, today's newspaper. The second page of the Winnipeg Free Press is filled with people that are having problems and going bankrupt in the farming operation. I'll deal with that later on in my comments.

The continuing failure of the government to attract private sector investment for the establishing of meaningful long-term jobs in Manitoba. I raised that this morning, where this dedicated business man in Gilbert Plains who has built his business up to some 13 employees, manufacturing agricultural product, makes an application under this Careerstart Program for four people, three people that were walking around the streets of Gilbert Plains unemployed and one student. What answer did he get from the staff in Dauphin? His application was turned aside because they don't have any funds. You talk about a government with all it's advertising and the blips and the big stories that they're telling with people coming on television saying, what a great thing this Careerstart is for the people. It's a farce. I asked the Honourable Minister to call my friend in Gilbert Plains - I gave him the phone number - and try and convince him that the Careerstart Program is working in this province. It's not. It's not working. It's all window dressing. So I have no problem, Mr. Speaker, in supporting my leader's comments on that subject matter.

The next thing it mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that we're concerned about is the government's contravention of the statutory provisions of The Financial Administration

Act. We are, by this government going into the Cabinet room there, voting themselves a \$1.5 billion Special Warrant, the highest one ever known in this province, without the legislators being allowed to discuss it or debate it in any way, shape or form which was understandable because the House was not sitting - but not a Special Warrant of that magnitude. Certainly they can go ahead and do it. What if they do? The next time, Mr. Speaker, what if they vote three-quarters. They've got the guts and the courage now to vote \$1.5 billion to themselves without Parliament. Supposing next time they go and spend 75 percent of their supply money for the year ahead and the next year they go 100 percent. We don't need democracy; we don't need this House; we don't need this Legislature. That's my concern about this, because I know there are a lot of MLAs and a lot of Ministers over there, Mr. Speaker, that don't support the British Parliamentary System that we practice in this House. That's what scares me about these characters that called themselves a government, Mr. Speaker. I'm scared next year there'll vote themselves half the spending program for the year and the next year and finally we will have them voting themselves the complete spending program for the year in the Cabinet room.

Mr. Speaker, the last part is that, by virtue of its failure in every field of endeavour charged to its responsibility, this government has lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, on that last part of our motion, we only have to go back and look at the language debate that we had. Eighty percent of the people in this province are ready to tear this government apart piece by piece. That's how bad it is out there. That's how bad it is.

This seat belt legislation, I know the Minister of Agriculture was in Roblin the other night dealing with the Annual Meeting of the New Democratic Party and I guess he had himself a ball there trying to deal with all the questions that came from the members about seat belts. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if in fact the Minister here is going to enforce it because I see a lot of people defying him to take them to court on this issue. I have a lot of people in my constituency who normally were law-abiding citizens, always felt that they could manage these things by themselves. They don't need the big hand of government to come and tell them to wear a seat belt. They are annoyed and they are unhappy and they are deliberately leaving their belts off in hope that this Minister will take them to court.

We have the motorcycle people of course, as well, and he's got the problem right in Dauphin because I get letters from some of his constituents in Dauphin who leave their belts off and they drive right by the Minister when he's home on the weekends and flout his law, his seat belt law. I'm waiting for the day he takes somebody to court and see what happens in Dauphin, especially in Dauphin.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also concerned, my poor friend Bill Chornopyski. Look what he says today. The NDP tells my friend Bill, "Do as we say or get out." Now where is that coming from, not from the Member for Rupertsland, he wouldn't make that charge to our learned friend the city councillor. Who is the group over there that have got all this courage and their audacity screwed up to go and tell this learned man who has been the city councillor for many many years, either

you do it our way or out. Bill said he would like to do it his own way, and can you blame him for that? The Member for Brandon East, the Minister, he always likes to do things his own way. But you can't do that if you're a New Democrat, you can't do that; you have to do it their way. I wonder how the Minister of Education fits into that sort of a philosophy, that she can't do things the way that she would like to do them, but I'm sure she's caught in the same web as our friend Bill. Either you do it their way or you're out.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the polls are riding so low on this group across and the New Democratic Party in this country today when you have that kind of jargon being printed in the newspapers across Canada.

Can you wonder why any ordinary citizen would want to stand up and support an MLA or a Member of Parliament who can't stand up and fight for his own people, who can't deliver the wishes of his people, who can't represent his people because, after all, if he does like Bill did he is told to get out; he is told to get out.

What about our friend Skowron? I think he's trying to crawl back in the back door at the present time as somebody told me, but maybe the Member for Inkster will help him to get back in that Caucus, in that select group. That is strange.

I'd like to see one of these Dear John letters that Bill and Alf got. I hear some of my friends out in the rural areas are getting these Dear John letters now because of the fact that they've got their dander up over the languages. It's strange, but yet they are the government in this province, that same party, that same group. Well it's an interesting story and I feel sorry for citizens like Bill, 18 years in the party. Great man, a great Manitoban, a great Canadian and, all of a sudden, because he's doing what the people in his ward told him to do, the NDP moves in and says, do as we say or get out Bill. So Bill got out, like a lot of others got out and are getting out every day.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with this matter of agriculture that I raised in the question period this morning. One of the most serious problems that we have in this province today is the economic future of our agricultural industry in this province. Agriculture is No. 1 and all the years that agriculture was healthy and able to produce grain and get a fair price for their product, everything flowed in this province. The industry wheels turned, people had money in their pockets, we built highways, we built hospitals and this province boomed with a healthy agricultural industry. We, Mr. Speaker, as legislators, had better listen very very quick to these problems that our espoused today all across the Winnipeg Free Press because they're real, they're serious and they're not going to go away unless we do something.

I'm thankful that my friend, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, came and spoke this morning briefly after the question period. We can do lots of things; we can present a resolution here, or dispatch 8 or 10 of us in the House to move down to Ottawa tomorrow and give them their support to trigger the Stabilization Fund. We can do that; we can go and meet with Alberta and Saskatchewan and set up a lobby, a western lobby, to show those eastern people that we are out here, we're alive, we're real and we've got a real problem. We're growing food, clean, wholesome, healthy food and you

can't make a buck at it, they're going broke. What's wrong? Fertilizer prices are up 15 percent to 25 percent already this year.

What are the priorities, Mr. Speaker, of this government in this Throne Speech about agriculture? All they say is, buy crop insurance. That is sickening, it's an insult to the farming community in this province. But I know, and we know on this side, what a high priority agriculture has in the caucus of the members opposite. It's a way down near the bottom if, in fact, it's there at all, because one only has to look and read that Throne Speech to see if all that this government has to offer for the farming community of this province for the year ahead is buy crop insurance, then we are in real trouble.

I just ask the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, if we happen to have a dry year in this province, this coming year, we will have a disaster on our hands. Farmers walk away from risky business. Can you imagine if we don't get an average rainfall in the year ahead what kind of headlines we will have in this province? That's our No. 1 industry. Don't forget it. That's what makes this province tick. Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, can you see a forty-year old farmer from Goodwins walking off the farm today and go into the undertaking business? That's what he's doing. Can you see all these other farmers here - Mr. Maguet from Ste. Rose, a long-time friend, I know the Maguets well - forty-year old farmer forced from the land his grandfather broke from bush. Do you mean to tell me that those are not competent, able, efficient farmers - the Maguet family? They are. They've been there since day one and they've got a problem. They've got a serious problem. What are we getting out of this Throne Speech for those kinds of people? Buy crop insurance. Buy crop insurance.

Mr. Speaker, we can do lots of things. We can do lots of things. We can set up a lobby of people here. We can get some of the taxes off their backs. We can go out there and deal with the matter, but we're not doing anything I gather from this Throne Speech. All it says is, buy crop insurance. What a sick government. It's supposed to have some understanding of the industry of this province.

What about the cattle industry? The feedlot operators are closing their doors in this province. The reason is quite simple. The finished cattle are going across the border to be finished. You mean we can't do something about it? The problem wasn't there before. You are the government. Where's your Minister of Agriculture? Let him clean up the problem.

The Brandon packer says they're only running at 70 percent. What does he want to do? Go out and talk to the farmers, they'll tell you what to do. But we're not doing that, Mr. Speaker.

I like what the Member for Lac du Bonnet and I discussed with the Member for Morris this morning that we can get unanimous consent in this House early next week and trigger a resolution here in this room to have some money paid out under the Stabilization Fund - we can put about \$15,000 in every farmer's pocket. That's one thing we can do. Why aren't we doing it? This is the government that is supposed to be leading and guiding us. Here am I in the opposition, standing up and prodding them and telling them what they should be doing and they call themselves government, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Business Development on a point of order.

HON. S. USKIW: I want to leave on the record that the government isn't doing anything because we had just invited the opposition earlier on today to participate with us in an effort such as the member is suggesting.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I raised it twice. I congratulate the honourable member and we're all prepared and all fired up and we can surely set up a condition in this House between House leaders on Monday that we'll put that resolution through here bang bang and get some action. That's not going to be hard. But they drag their feet over there, Mr. Speaker.

We met with Alberta and Saskatchewan in Regina two months ago on the very same subject matter to try and get some motivation out of this government and try and get the western provinces to work as a team. We did. The Member for Arthur, after we had the meeting with the Ministers from Saskatchewan and Alberta we did turn out a press release on that meeting. What happened? About a month later the Minister of Agriculture here comes out with the same press release. He's supposed to be leading. He's supposed to be the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to next week to see if we can't do that and lots of other things, or set up a special Cabinet committee or a committee of this House. If you want to find where the problems are, Mr. Speaker, I just tell the Minister of Agriculture, go and talk to the auctioneers in this province, they'll tell you how serious the problem is. They'll tell you how many farmers are going bankrupt everyday and there are a lot of them. There are a lot of them who aren't going to be able to put a crop in next year for the simple reason they're not getting enough money for their grain. Why is that? Well, because of the tax load that's imposed upon the farm community. They're doing the best they can, Mr. Speaker, but they can't produce all the food in this country alone, by themselves, and be asked to pay all the taxes that they're paying. If they were in a luxury item business, if they were producing goods and services and fine clothes for wealthy people, I would not be concerned, but they are producing clean basic wholesome food, and that's where we should be putting our eggs into our baskets and support that industry. It's our No. 1 industry in our province and I hope the First Minister, and the Minister of Agriculture, will finally recognize that they need help and they need it badly out there.

Mr. Speaker, I should also comment on this tragedy of my constituent Rodney Checkowski at Rossburn - TB in his herd. Herd quarantined in his yard since August, 1983 and they were still there until about a month ago. All the sequence of events that took place for that poor young farmer, it's a nightmare, it's an absolute nightmare. I could put it in the record today and spell out some of the many things that have happened to that poor unfortunate farmer. He still has those cattle out there today, Mr. Speaker. That is most unfortunate. I was called into the scene in the middle

of March, March 20th, and I immediately wrote a letter to Whelan, to tell him it's a federal matter. We haven't had a TB outbreak in this province for some 20 years. We thought the province was clear.

I got called into the scene and Checkowski tells me, Mr. Speaker, that in the Spring of 1983 he put his cattle out, he leases Crown land from the province, he put his cattle out in the pasture, went back to look at them the following week and two or three were dead, I'm not sure, but in that interval he found all these dead carcasses of hogs, cattle, horses, dead carcasses strewn all over this pasture land. He immediately got hold of the Minister of Natural Resources, or the staff from the department, and espoused this problem of where did all these dead carcasses come from that were scattered all over his property, his leased land. Mr. Speaker, he found out there was somebody who is in the business of outfitting bear hunters in the area. They went and brought these carcasses in from someplace and scattered them all across there.

Since then they've had vet after vet out there. The federal vets were there, the provincial vets were finally the ones that told Checkowski that his herd was infested with TB. The federal people finally in March of this year released the quarantine on his cattle, but in the meantime, he's lost 25 head of cattle, Mr. Speaker, 25 have died and his buildings, his farm yard - the place is still infested with that type of tuberculosis. Nobody seems to want to do anything about it. That's why I've raised it here in the House on several occasions. In the last week to see if Whelan and the Federal Government are not going to go in there and help this farmer clean up that serious problem, then the least we can do is have our Department of Agriculture and staff in this province and the Minister of Health go in there and see if we can help to clean up the problem.

The people are concerned about the human beings being infected in the area. I asked the Minister of Agriculture here and he said the other day that with this type of tuberculosis, cattle are not known to die. Well, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the Minister of Agriculture, 25 cattle died there. Now who's kidding who? The Minister of Agriculture says, cattle are not known to die from Avian Tuberculosis. Well, he lost 25 head of cattle while they were quarantined. What was it? Why can't we send our vets out there to tell the man what the problem is? You haven't told him why his cattle are dying.

The other thing, what about the human beings in the area, the people that live there? I've got petitions here, Mr. Speaker, of some 300 people in and around that area who are scared stiff that this disease is going to infect them, not now, but at some future date. They have no assurance, they have no guidelines whatsoever. It is most unfortunate.

Now, of course, as I said the other day, the Federal Minister has thrown his Swan River hat, that green one, into this leadership contest. I wonder if in fact he's going to get any help at all, because as I stand in my place today, nothing has been done. But the tragedy in this for the people in the area, Mr. Speaker, is this terrible bait that's been spread around the area for bear hunters. Local people have taken that to the Ombudsman and to the Minister of Natural Resources to try and clean up this distribution of infected bait. It's likely infected or why do these animals die in the first place?

Finally, the other day I noticed by the regulations, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Natural Resources will not admit to any guilt in any way, shape or form, or that his staff were negligent or that there was any possible chance of this cattle herd picking up the disease from those dead carcasses. Now, the regulations of the Department of Natural Resources say that if you put bear bait out on Crown lands or private lands, you must put your name, your address and your phone number on the bait. That's how quickly the Minister of Natural Resources has responded to this problem. So if the bear wants to come up and eat the meat now, he at least knows the phone number and the name and address of who put the bait there. But that still hasn't addressed itself - did the infection come from those carcasses?

A MEMBER: That's not true, is it?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, we don't know. Nobody knows. There's my friend, Mr. Checkowski, still sitting there today waiting for somebody to do something. I've asked it in the House here. I have my letter, a copy I've sent to Eugene Whalen and, Mr. Speaker, that shows you what a wonderful government we have, what drive these Ministers have and how they take these issues and go out and solve them almost immediately. Mr. Speaker, they're a farce. They're a farce. Go and ask Checkowski, go and ask him. Go and ask the neighbours of all the letters and phone calls they've made to try and clean up this TB infection. That is TB. Why can't they go in there and compensate the herd. The cattle right across the border in Ontario who were infected at the same time as his, they came in there and destroyed the herds and they were fully compensated. Clean up the yard, clean up the infection.

A MEMBER: Cleaned it up in 24 hours.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Right on. But instead it's still there today. The cattle are still infected, calves are being born, they are infected and the disease is prevalent all over that whole area and we're not doing anything.

Mr. Speaker, the Union of Municipalities has addressed a resolution on the subject matter and nothing has happened.

So that, Mr. Speaker, in those two communities would give you sort of an insight into what a great government we've got. I talked about jobs, I talked about agriculture, I talked about the way they handled infections and diseases in this province, I talked about the health of my constituents where an infested herd of cattle have been there since August, 1983 in that yard and nothing has been done, nothing, and they're still there today.

Mr. Speaker, there's no wonder that the people out in the country are fed up with this type of a government. Why couldn't we go out there and send the Minister of Health out there with some of his staff to check the people - why not? Is there anything wrong with it? No. Check the human beings in the area.

There was a threat of an outbreak of TB on the reserve there last spring which the Minister of Health and I dealt with, and it was no problem to get the staff

to go out there and check that one out, but for some reason, this time, it's not the same. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the money problem which the Minister of Employment is facing, they can't hire the guys to go out there and do it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm most excited about the visit of Her Majesty, Prince Philip and Pope John. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that the visit of those distinguished people to our province will create more good will and more dollars in the treasury of our business community than anything that's in that Throne Speech. I defy any member opposite to stand in his place and defy that comment, that the visit of those distinguished people will bring more good will and more dollars in the cash registers of the people of this province than this Throne Speech, by far, because there is nothing in here. I look forward with keen interest, Mr. Speaker, to the visit of those people. We've had the privilege of having Her Majesty here before on one other occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about the lack of initiative in my constituency. I ask the First Minister or the Minister of Business Development or Employment, what have you got in mind for the Roblin-Russell constituency for the year ahead? What economic thrust, what new businesses, what are their projections for the year ahead? A number of them, I've sent them copies of this document and they come back scratching their heads wondering, wondering what has it got for us. Is there anything there for the roads in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, where there are stones almost like footballs standing out of those PR roads in Roblin constituency. There are literally stones nearly as big as footballs jutting through the PR roads in Roblin-Russell constituency today and we're not doing anything about it because the programs are all cancelled.

I ask the Minister of Highways and Transportation to take a drive through these PR roads in my constituency. And if he doesn't, believe me I'll take him and show him where these rocks, that size, that you have to drive around as you drive down the highway from one point to another because they're not doing anything in road construction in our province. How can we survive out there with those problems that we have today when we have roads that you have to dodge around the stones on? We had that problem before with a New Democratic Party Government in this province. Road construction and road improvements are away down low on their priority list and it's there again. Now, maybe the Minister, when he comes with the Estimates, will prove that I am wrong, but I fail to see anything in this Throne Speech to assure these people out in Roblin-Russell constituency that there is going to be something done about the PR roads that they're having so many problems with today. I noticed last year, Mr. Speaker, that they did come in and put a bridge in one area, but the road construction apparently is set aside.

Yet what does this document say, Mr. Speaker? They say Manitobans have good reason to be proud. Isn't that something? Do you think my friend, Rodney Checkowski, is proud? Do you think the guy from Gilbert Plains that is in the business of manufacturing these vacuums is proud? Do you think that the whole community out there is proud of the achievements of this government?

To the Member from Ste. Rose, do you think Mr. Magy is proud today? He knows Magy better than I

do, and there is the story. "Farmer forced from land, grandfather broke the bush." That's his constituent. He knows all about it, but he's not doing anything about it. I don't see one mention - Magy doesn't mention his Minister or his MLA once in that article, that he even offered to come to his rescue or even offer the help of government, because that is a longstanding family in this province, the Magy family, and one of the great families of our province. They are going down the tube and this Minister sits over there, twiddling his glasses and wondering what we're going to do over here to try and help the Magy family. Well, I'll tell you, if we were government, I'd be in there tomorrow morning and I would get some action, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's unbelievable how this government like to pat themselves on the back and praise themselves because nobody else in the province is patting them on the back - nobody, absolutely nobody. So they have to take the initiative in this document to pat themselves on the back and on the shoulder and that is a strange thing that socialists like to do because they can't basically in this province find anybody that is even speaking good about them. Maybe taxi drivers in some other provinces who don't know them like we do, which the Member for Wolseley said says the odd good thing, but the taxi drivers in Winnipeg are not speaking.

I ask the Minister of Government Services, I ask the First Minister - Manitoba's Jobs Fund future, is that the future? What does it say? "The Manitoba Jobs Fund - investing in our future." That is the future for Manitoba, the Jobs Fund. Are you kidding? Are you kidding that that is the only initiative and that is the future destiny of the people in this province, that we're going to have to live and die by the Jobs Fund. I'm shocked. That is a sign of a sick government, that they're putting all their trust for the year ahead and they're going to move and motivate the economy of this province through the Jobs Fund. The honourable member must be joking; he can't be serious. He can't be, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you can go on through page after page after page. I wonder what happened to the potash industry. I wonder what happened to all the other things that were supposed to happen in Roblin-Russell. They've all been put on the back burner, or they're all now being channelled through the Jobs Fund.

Main Street Manitoba, what happened to Main Street Manitoba? Roblin tried it and they still haven't got the program under way because they couldn't get along with it. Roblin's got a very respectful bunch of businessmen and I'm sure they're prepared to pay their share. Why didn't that go ahead? I don't know. Is it again the government's fault? It's certainly not the problem of the people of Roblin.

So, Mr. Speaker, very quickly, very briefly, I and the people in my constituency and our caucus, are very very unhappy with this type of a Throne Speech that we are dealing with in this House today. It's sick, it's barren, it has no direct help for the people of this province. It doesn't say anything about how we're going to save our No. 1 industry in this province - agriculture.

I think the longer we leave these people in office, Mr. Speaker, the worse it's going to be for the people of this province. I think we should call an election at the earliest possible date, move them out and let's put

some people in there that know how to make the economy of this province tick and understand the problems of the people at the grassroots level.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment and support the Speech from the Throne that was delivered a week ago today. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, because I know it was a speech that was not just idle words, but a speech which outlined a bright future for Manitobans.

I would like to congratulate the Member for Wolseley, who is the Mover of the speech, and the Second, my seatmate, the Member for Rupertsland, who have made a positive contribution to the Throne Speech.

The Province of Manitoba has much to offer its people and the reassurance that Manitobans are beginning to feel the enthusiasm is shown in the statistics that were released recently. Statistics can often be manipulated, Mr. Speaker, and it's hard to argue with statistics that show the population of our province has been increasing. It has shown the increase in the past two years has been higher than in the past 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are coming back to this province in record numbers. In 1983 Manitoba's population growth surpassed the Canadian growth for the first time since 1919. However, Mr. Speaker, in spite of this large increase in our labour force, Manitoba has consistently held the second lowest unemployment rate in the country and very recently took over the No. 1 spot as was released last Friday, we have taken over first place from Saskatchewan which had previously had the best unemployment rate.

Our Throne Speech for this Session in many ways illustrates the approach this government has taken in every aspect of our mandate. The theme of co-operation is seen over and over again in major initiatives of our government. Perhaps one of the best examples of this kind of co-operation has been in the ERDA Agreements. Our government has worked hard and long to negotiate these agreements and Manitobans will be getting the benefits of these agreements for many decades to come.

An example of the ERDA agreements is the agreement that was signed last Friday, the transportation agreement, which will improve the Port of Churchill, a port that the Member for Morris was saying that their time was still 20 to 25 years away. I'm glad to see that there are people at the federal and provincial levels who see that the time for Churchill is now and not in the future as he has suggested.

In that same agreement, Manitoba Hydro will be extending the hydro line to deliver an uninterrupted source of power to the Port which will also help to enhance the Port and give them a cheaper source of power than they've had in the past.

The railroad was also going to be improved. There are funds towards bringing up the grade of the railroad to this terminal. Also in the same agreement, there is a further commitment to the passenger rail service in Northern Manitoba and also in revitalizing the terminal here in Winnipeg.

As a Northern rural member of this government, I am pleased that our government has recognized the

resource potential that exists in that area and is moving toward developing it. Recently there were reports completed on Polder III, which concludes that it is viable or feasible to bring this piece of land into agricultural production. The farmers of the area have been saying that the area needs to be expanded for agriculture in order to attract the necessary services that are needed in that area and they're not available. I'm sure that this will help because it's a move in the right direction to bring this land into agricultural production.

The Member for Roblin-Russell says that this government hasn't done much for the agricultural industry in Manitoba. He is wrong because this government has made a greater contribution to the agricultural industry than any government has made in the past.

An example of this the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation has approved 675 loans to farmers valued at \$44 million - 675 loans - and this is aimed primarily at the younger farmers who they say we have been chasing away from the industry and it also has helped to consolidate their debts. I think farmers have to take some of the responsibility for the difficulty they are in right now. I think that is one of the areas that is really lacking because of the lack of management skills. The Department of Agriculture has made a concentrated effort to give the farmers the necessary assistance to try and consolidate some of the debts they have undertaken.

The Interest Relief Program for farmers has provided emergency assistance to \$6.9 million and it has helped 1,300 farmers in this province, and possibly some of these have been going bankrupt as well if that program hadn't been in place.

The Guaranteed Operating Loan Program has assisted over 400 farmers who are in financial difficulty and they have helped them secure loans up to \$22 million. The Interest Rate Reduction Program has assisted 640 farmers through the MACC. There has also been the Beef Stabilization Program which has, not only helped to stabilize the beef industry, it has helped to stabilize the processing industry in the province as well.

The Stabilization Program for Hog Marketers was introduced in May of 1983 and over 50 percent of the hog producers in the Province of Manitoba are registered in this plan. To date over \$7.5 million has been paid out to farmers from this program.

In my home community of The Pas has lived under a cloud of uncertainty for several years because of the uncertain future of the forestry complex in The Pas, Manfor. During the 1981 election the Premier of this province, while he was campaigning, made a commitment that the pulp mill would be upgraded. The opposition at that time was saying that the \$40 million upgrading would not be sufficient, they needed \$400 million for it. Well I'm glad to say that we have delivered on this commitment that we made during the election and a \$40 million package has been put forward to modernize and expand the plant at The Pas. This will help secure the future of the complex at The Pas and also the people of the community are looking with a more optimistic view to the future of the community. We are fortunate to have a Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Northern Affairs who recognize the importance of the Manitoba Forest Industry to the

provincial economy. It's important to the economy of the province and particularly to the North. In The Pas it employs up to 2,500 people and in 1981, for example, the shipment of the forestry sector amounted to \$440 million.

I am proud of the contribution which Manfor and the people of The Pas are providing to the economic strength of this province and I am looking forward to a strong and continued role for the people of this area.

Mr. Speaker, the northern areas of our province have a tremendous potential for growth and benefit for all of Manitoba. The recently announced export power sale is of particular importance to northerners. The construction of the generating station on our northern water systems will secure the economic future for many Manitobans. The Limestone dam alone will create 7,000 person years of employment. Our province is indeed fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in having an abundant hydro-electric resource which continues to be owned by the people of Manitoba for the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, just as important as promoting hydro development is the need to ensure that the North receive the maximum benefits for such developments. One key factor in this regard is the need for a clear policy of northern preference for hiring of hydro workers in the North. Recently my colleague from Thompson and I raised a concern about the fact that northerners were being bypassed for existing hydro contract work. I am pleased that the Minister responsible for Hydro has responded to our concerns by indicating quite clearly that the northern preferential hiring clause applies to all aspects of Hydro, including hiring, layoffs and recalls. This will help ensure northerners get a maximum benefit from hydro development.

Mr. Speaker, this government and this Throne Speech have certainly not ignored the needs of northern and rural Manitobans. There has been, and continues to be, a major investment in a number of crucial areas in the North. We remain committed, as I mentioned earlier, to the development of the Port of Churchill which, in the past, has been neglected and in studies that were made by the Conservative people were saying it should be shut down. We continue to improve the port and also the rail line and highway construction will also continue to improve and the access to remote and northern communities. All of these major investments will create long-term jobs and also the permanent assets will help economic opportunities for people living in the northern part of the province.

But, Mr. Speaker, the economic security and opportunities is only a part of the special needs that northern and rural Manitobans experience. It is also economic justice, and here I am referring to our Aboriginal peoples. Although the outcome of the First Minister's Conference in March was a great disappointment to many of the people who are my constituents, this government will continue to work with the Aboriginal organizations in order that they may advance proposals for recognition and protection of their Native rights in their Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to take seriously the concerns of all Manitobans, especially in the area of job creation. Our government has worked hard to develop a northern jobs creation project. There was \$4.68 million which was allocated through the Department of Northern Affairs for a northern job

creation project to stimulate employment and to create long-term community assets for many of our northern communities. This money was provided to 109 projects to generate 953 work weeks of employment.

It isn't only creating employment in these communities, although of course it is a primary concern, money is used for projects that will contribute significantly to community development.

There has been construction projects, housing relocations, cutting of firewood for some of the elderly citizens, ice harvesting, also improvements to some of our traditional means of employment and of the fishing accommodations and the trapping facilities which are located in Northern Manitoba.

There has also been some larger projects, such as, the water treatment plants which is carried out in communities which will improve the living conditions of many of our northern citizens. Mr. Speaker, northern job creation efforts have enhanced life in Northern Manitoba. It demonstrates that we are a government that takes the concerns of the North seriously, a government that is concerned for all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a part of this government and I will be supporting the Member for Wolseley during this vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure to take part in the Throne Speech Debate on behalf of the people of my constituency in Kirkfield Park. I, too, would like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder, the Mover from Wolseley and the Seconder from Rupertsland, for being honoured by their government to take part in the Throne Speech. As a first term member, the last Session is one that will long be remembered. It was the lesson that should never be forgotten, either by members of the Legislature or by the people of Manitoba, that amendments to the Constitution must be by consensus. It certainly makes even the most apathetic voter, it may be even the most apathetic voter, aware of our history. There is hardly anyone that you talk to that can't go back in history to 1870 and give you some background. One of the things that was always sadly lacking in our own education was Canadian history, and particularly Manitoba history, when I went to school.

But now it's time to get on with the business of the province. I really did look forward to the opening of the new Session. Although I wasn't expecting too much from the Throne Speech, I didn't think the government, even this government, would draw out a speech that, by rights, should have lasted half an hour — (Interjection) — Correct, someone said 20 minutes - and turned it into one hour and 15 minutes and, as the Member for Arthur suggested, it's going to be hard to give away invitations for the next opening.

As a Manitoban committed to the well-being of our province, although we didn't get much in the Throne Speech, we welcomed the announcement of the sale of power to the Northern States Power in Minneapolis. We would be remiss in our jobs as opposition members if we didn't try to find out what this government is

actually committing us to. Quite frankly, it makes me a little nervous when I read, and it was in the article in the Sun that said, a spokesman for Northern State Power said: "It was the company's intention since 1976 to purchase power for Manitoba if a deal could be reached." Now, is this a government that is so desperate, after the last Session, after what they went through in the language issue, that know they're down the tube, that they will grab at anything. This has got to be a real concern for Manitobans.

We want to know, not the delicate details, but some of the details of that agreement. I think it's only fair that they should be laid on the table before the final agreement is signed. That's like locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. I believe that a government that has had the sad track record this government has had, they managed to throw away Alcan - and they're expanding everywhere else, but not in Manitoba, and that's sort of strange because they say the deal is still open, but we haven't seen any sign of it. If this government is opposed to that kind of business in Manitoba, I wish they would come out and say that, that environmentally they don't like that type of industry coming into Manitoba, come out and tell us that, but that doesn't seem to be the case. They threw away that deal and now they're trying to get another one in here. So then the potash went down the tube, then the Western Power Grid, which was really our hope to have a mega project. But, all of a sudden, a mega project with the States is better than one that is created across Canada so that the jobs are in Canada. I want to see your green signs in Saskatchewan and Alberta, not down in Minneapolis. If we have to see them at all, better that they're here.

I feel that this government has not had a good track record and so we would be remiss in not protecting the rights of the people in Manitoba, as much as we want this because this is something that we have all been wanting for our province. You can't have been a Manitoban and not wish to see something happen in this province.

So, to come out and say that we are being negative about it - not at all. We just want to make sure that you're not grabbing at straws, anything to get re-elected, because that isn't the way things work. I know the Minister of Energy and Mines spoke that we are being very negative. But then I look at the editorial in the Free Press today, it doesn't have a name on it, it says: "Power sale questions." And it said, "Mr. Parasiuk himself posed one of those questions when he dealt with the previous government's plan to join Alberta and Saskatchewan in developing a power grid." It said, "I guess," Mr. Parasiuk said then, "the fundamental question is, should Manitoba have to provide a subsidy to sell its power? I question whether this province should indulge in the kind of "quick fix" sale or development, even in a recession, knowing that there will be heavy cost exacted in the future."

These are legitimate questions. I'm sure they were legitimate questions when they were asked before. Now when we're asking them, all of a sudden, by cracky we're out to scuttle the deal - not at all. What we want to find out is, is it going to be a good deal? Because we're going to be in government after the deal is signed and we're going to be left to deal with this. So we want to make sure that we have the best deal. People are

not going to forget in a big hurry and I think that with the kind of record that this government has had, in almost any kind of negotiations, that they always seem to come out on the short end of the stick, so it does make us a little bit nervous here, and I think rightly so. I think that the people of Manitoba, after the last year that we have spent dealing, they know how they deal. I think the people of Manitoba know how this government deals and they've had some experience in working with this government, they know how well they listen no matter how much in the Throne Speech, they talk about caring, they talk about any kind of issue.

I think with the track record that this government has it's worth repeating. When we are asked, on the part of the opposition for answers, we're not asking because we're just curious, I think we owe it to the people of Manitoba to be in opposition, to ask questions, otherwise if we just sit back and say, "Oh, that sounds like a great deal, just go ahead boys and girls" I think we would be remiss, and that's not how an opposition is to work.

So I think you owe it to the people of Manitoba to just give us a little inkling of what actually is going on. Don't tell us afterwards or let us find out in 1992 that we've been sold down the tube, that's a little late. I think that it's time for you just to give the information that's asked, rather than wait.

In the Throne Speech, they talked about health care and the quality of health care in their Throne Speech. The NDP, in elections, have always used scare tactics. You talk to any senior that's in a senior citizens' home and there has been somebody at their door telling them, vote for us or you will be out on the street. They're going to bring in premiums, they're going to bring in everything. It's always been the big scare tactic, that has been their campaigning from Day One, and it was a great disappointment for them to find the federal Conservatives even agreeing with the new health program that was coming in.

When they were out of office, they indicated they were going to restore the health care in this province. Then when they got back into government, they were happy to be doing as well as we were in the health care. Everything was well, you know, it's just as good as you people were. But, now what we find in health care is what I think, in their perception on the street, is that there is a serious deterioration in the health care in our province. People are having trouble getting into hospitals; they are having trouble getting a bed. When they get one they're tossed out on the street just about as quickly as possible.

We had a scare in the care of our newborn babes, and that came about quite soon after the closure of the Obstetrics and Gynecology Wards at, I think it was Concordia and Seven Oaks. The planning, I believe, of this government has been out of whack, and if something like that was going to take place, surely they should have given time for the major hospitals such as the Health Sciences and St. Boniface to enlarge their facilities first.

We have the nurses complaining. They're starting to keep track of all the problems that are going on in the hospitals because of the serious understaffing. This isn't what I call restoring the confidence in the health care program of our province. I think that maybe something this government has learned is that if you

throw money at it, which they did at the beginning or said they were doing at the beginning, it soon gets gobbled up with new programs which then they come back and say, oops, now it's time to cut back, you can't get quite as much, you'll get 3 percent which, as school divisions found out in lots of cases, turned out to 1 percent.

So I believe that this government has got a problem just in dealing with the supposed cutbacks that they're talking about. So when I read in the Throne Speech, talking about the key objectives, and one of them is the preservation of health care, well, I should hope so because when they campaigned, they were going to be restoring the health care of the province, and now it's a case of preserving it. I would suggest that that is one of the things that Manitobans expect out of their government, so they are looking for that restoration.

Another problem that's come up recently, and I think it came because of what is considered the language issue. Now people are starting to become worried about Remembrance Day, and I know there was a question in the House and I believe that the Minister said he wasn't planning to change it to Peace Day. But they are not going to be believed until they come out and put up a sign because people are not trusting this government anymore, especially when it comes to traditions. They want to change tradition. They're not happy with things the way they were, they don't care, they don't want to preserve the old unless it's an old building. But traditions with people, they come hard and they die hard. So if there's any thought of this government changing, if the backbench is urging them to change the name of Remembrance Day to Peace Day, as I believe was mentioned by one of the members on our side of the House, believe me, it would be just like the language issue all over again. I don't think they want to get into that.

I noticed that in the . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I interrupt the honourable member to direct the attention of members to the gallery. We have 60 students from the William S. Paterson School under the direction of Mrs. Phillipson. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Housing.

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

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech, they highlighted practically every segment of the population and I noticed that one of the areas was the International Year of the Youth, which is starting January 1985. I can see there's going to be a big focus on the youth in 1985. The problem is the youth in '84, and it was mentioned by my leader in the question period, and that's the article in the Free Press where it says the future looks bleak for U of M's Class of 1984. The article goes on to say, "The majority of the

University of Manitoba's Class of '84 face unemployment or underdeployment." And then goes on to say: "While expectations aren't generally high many feel angry, disappointed and apathetic about job prospects after their years of study." And I don't blame them, Mr. Speaker. This government has been talking about the Jobs Fund, all the jobs they're creating, everything that's happening in this province, and yet our youth aren't finding that. Most of them, while they're in university, are feeling that will they get a job. This is the big thing, what will happen? And if they get a job in their respective fields - and it said this in the article - that even if it's only part-time or poorly paid, they're delighted. And this is true, but it's a sad commentary on this government, not because this isn't happening right across Canada, but because they're crowing about everything being so wonderful. Well, what's happening is when these young people are looking for jobs they're not finding it so wonderful. They're finding it a damn mess in most cases. And so, Mr. Speaker, I can't speak enough that the fact is that they are trying to raise expectations.

I want to just move on a bit to the Jobs Fund where we have 47,000 unemployed. I think - what was it? - last year, was it 52,000 or something? Fund, it says they've had 21,000 people employed in the Jobs Fund and yet there's 47,000 unemployed still. Now I'm having a bit of problem with that. Is that one person working in separate little jobs one day at a time? How many people are employed - 365 people getting one job?

This is the sort of thing that makes this government not only not credible but incredible. I think that when they see this type of statistic, 21,000 jobs, that's got to raise their - I would think that when I came out and I know that there's 21,000 jobs out there somewhere, I should be getting one of them. How come it isn't in my field of endeavour and that I can't get a long-term job? Even in the program for science and engineering, which was a good program for those students because it did give them a job related to their field. I think that was one of the things. Mind you, some of those students I know were hired unfortunately just for the duration of the grant but at least it gave them experience in their field. But what happened with that grant - and it was brought up earlier - is that the students that couldn't get jobs from 1982 were left out in the cold. That happened to one of my constituents who was on his second job interview and really almost assured of a job and then this program was announced and he went out the door and a 1983 grad moved in. That's what happened, because all of the students were unemployed. I think if some common sense had been used in that program, what would have happened is that they would have said, look, the ones that haven't been employed from 1982 surely would be included in this. Don't make it like the window where if you're lucky to have your birthday between May and June or something then you're able to retire. Have a little bit of common sense in this program.

That should have been expanded to include these students who graduated in 1982. That was sheer nonsense that they were out in the cold and the '83 grads got the jobs. So I really do feel that when they found this and I can see that maybe no one thought of it at the time, but it must have come to the fore fairly quickly and that should have been adjusted. That

wasn't a big adjustment. We're not talking in that particular area surely of hundreds of students. So when they do these programs, I think that they should be made so that they can be adjusted to fit the times and to fit the people. That's probably one of the things that you find the man and woman on the street doesn't understand about government. There doesn't seem to be common sense that comes into programs and I think that's very sad.

The other thing that the Member for Roblin-Russell brought up with the Careerstart Program - there's a lot of publicity. I know that, as a member, I received a number of copies of the Careerstart Program to send out to places of employment in my constituency and I assumed that we all received those. Now if I sent all those out in my constituency and everyone sent them out, you're raising expectations in the business world and even in the community clubs, that if they come up with the program there's going to be someone they will be able to hire and they'll have assistance. That doesn't seem to be too far out of line. But what has happened with the particular job opportunities that the Member for Roblin-Russell was talking about, and if this is widespread at all, you will have small businesses that will make plans based on the program, and then find it's more advertising than substance. Or possibly what's happening is that these jobs are going into the NDP constituencies in the rural areas rather than the Conservative. Possibly that's something that we're going to have to look at to see if it's the same way as in the Federal Government, where the Liberal members had most of the grants.

So I do believe, in spite of the yawning from the other side, that some of these programs must be overadvertised. If you have a Careerstart Program and you are sending these applications all over the place and you're telling everybody to come in, you would almost assume that anybody who applied, if they have a legitimate reason for getting them, that they would get some staff. Now for someone to apply for four full-time or four adults and one student and to get half a position, there must be something wrong with the program. So possibly it is more advertising than substance and maybe there is a little red sign that goes outside for the Careerstart Program and we'll have to start watching for that. But I do find that some of these programs that this government has put forward are more advertising than substance.

The Member for Wolseley said she visited different centres, Vancouver, Regina, Montreal and Toronto, and how much worse the problems were in these centres and how lucky she is to be a Manitoban. Well, I have always felt Manitoba is a great place to live. We were transferred out of town for about eight years and we chose to come back. We took the tack that our standard of living coming back here for my husband probably wouldn't be as high in the long run, but we chose a way of life. Manitoba is what we wanted, not just because it's worse in other places, but because we love our province and this is where we wanted to bring up our children. I don't consider that this is a good criterion for saying your lucky to be a Manitoban.

My brother lives in B.C. and our economy has never experienced the extremes that a province like B.C. has, where his home went from \$90,000 to \$265,000 in over a year and then back down again. That does not happen

here. During that period of increase, he was phoning me to say, is this a good time to invest in Manitoba because everything seems so much lower in housing here. That was the feeling of people, this has got to go up. Well, we checked around and we said, not if you're looking for a short-time investment, this is not great. So he took our advice, we took our advice and didn't go into that type of housing because this wasn't the route to go. But I do feel that in B.C. now because they've had that height and people are stuck with homes that they bought for \$265,000, they are in extreme dire straits, you might say, in that province. We haven't experienced this and we're darn lucky that we haven't. So, I don't think that to crow about the fact that Manitoba is in a better position, we have never been in as bad a position as some of the other provinces either.

What our province needs is more private investment. Everything that we see in the Throne Speech, although they talk about private investment, what happens really is that it seems to be all federal money, all provincial money and nothing coming in from the private sector. I don't know if the NDP ever thinks about it, but certainly the people on the street do. They know they are the only taxpayer around, municipally, provincially and federally. It all comes out of the one pocket. So when they see all these wonderful things happening, they know who is paying for it - they are. Now, the government is never aware of that because, of course, they can go into deficit financing. If we do that, we go bankrupt, so we have to stay within our budgets. I think that people do wish that the government would keep that in mind every once in a while.

They also went on to talk about justice and protection for women, which I couldn't agree with more. Any advance, any tack they can take that will help with wife abuse, child abuse, pornography, is most welcome on this side of the House because these are things that we must all look at and deal with. I think that the pornography especially is something that must be discouraged in our province and everywhere in Canada as far as I'm concerned. I don't care if it's violent pornography or what kind of pornography, it deals mainly with women and children and it has to be stopped. I do feel that this is an area that this government should be putting a high priority to, because this is something that you can do in many ways without a lot of cost, because they can make laws and they can be obeyed in the area of both wife abuse and child abuse. It's a matter of being vigilant.

I just want to touch briefly on the area of education when it was referring to retraining. We have had an

incident in the area I live in, the St. James-Assiniboia School Division where we have unilingual teachers being replaced with bilingual teachers. Now, what I want to know is, what is being done in this area, because what intensive training is being given to some of these teachers to allow them to teach in the French Immersion setting. I don't know if it's possible, but I think that the government has taken a head-in-the-sands approach on this and not looked ahead, because surely it had to be seen coming that this was going to be an issue. What are we going to do about our unilingual teachers as French Immersion grows? Surely not just out in the street, there's got to be something better than that and I hope that the government will be looking very closely at this and not just saying, well we'll get them when they go through immersion because that's not going to help any of the teachers that we have in place now. I think that all the things that you might do to help teachers to move, to help them to do other things, is not going to help them in this particular instance because this is wide-ranging and especially where the city is concerned.

So I do believe that this is an area that the government is going to have to look at and face for a change. What are they going to do with these teachers? Are they just going to say, sorry you're out of luck; I hope not.

I think that I'm finished as far as the Throne Speech is concerned. I probably spoke longer than I should have on it because there really wasn't that much to say when it came to the speech itself, but I support the amendments put forward by my leader.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, if there's an inclination on the part of the House to call it 1:30 I would then commence my remarks later.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we had intended to do, but I did not want to prevent my honourable friend from making a contribution today if he so wished. If it's his desire to call it 1:30 then I suggest that the House adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 1:30, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday afternoon.