

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 12 March, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the Annual Report for the year ending March 31st, 1984 of the Manitoba Arts Council.

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's my pleasure to present the 26th Annual Report of the Manitoba Municipal Board for the calendar year 1984.

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

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 25 students from Arborg Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Stratynski. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

There are 30 students of Grade 9 standing from the Alexander Ross School. They are under the direction of Mrs. Morgan and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

Also may I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge on my left, where we have two former members of the House, Mr. Green and Mr. Hanuschak.

On behalf of the members we welcome you here this afternoon.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Life insurance and pension management study - government entry into

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Honourable Minister of Housing in his role as responsible for the Manitoba Public

Insurance Corporation, and it follows upon reports that his department has finally received its long-awaited study on the government's entry into the life insurance and pension management industry of the province.

My question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, what is the recommendation of the report?

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

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, in response to that question, the report that I have received in the last month or so has been a follow-up to the report that was discussed in this House last year. The report most recently received has been more or less a study as to how the corporation would carry out becoming involved in industry, if it should make that decision, but as I have also said, no decision has been made and discussions with the industry are ongoing.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate who conducted the study that lead to the report?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** The study was carried out by the corporation utilizing the services of senior management and, I believe, two outside consultants.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could then indicate when can we expect a decision from this administration on the government's entry into the life insurance and pension management business.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, a decision will be made, I would hope, after we have had some further discussions with the industry. I have a meeting that is scheduled for the early part of April. Following that meeting, I hope to be in a position to make an announcement.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct the question then to the Premier, and if I could ask him if he wouldn't intervene with his Minister and seek to remove the cloud of doubt that's over the heads of about 11,000 people who are employed directly and indirectly by the life insurance industry in Manitoba, people who are nervous about their jobs continuing, if he wouldn't urge his Minister to get on with this decision. It's been almost two years and these people shouldn't be kept in doubt and in concern about their future in Manitoba any longer. Will he not intervene?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The Minister responsible for the MPIC, I thought a few moments ago, indicated that there are discussions that are currently under way with representatives of the life insurance industry in Manitoba to ascertain ways and means by which we can maximize capital investment in Manitoba. It was my understanding those discussions are proceeding

quite well and as soon as the discussions are completed, there will be a report.

Mr. Speaker, just as the Minister of Agriculture has done an excellent job insofar as consulting with the farmers of the Province of Manitoba, the Minister responsible for the Public Insurance Corporation has done an excellent job insofar as initiating discussions with the insurance industry and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition might be quite pleased to know that the discussions are proceeding, and proceeding quite satisfactorily.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could then indicate if the life insurance and pension management industry are recommending that the government enter this field.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, we have no plans to enter the life insurance field.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. H. ENNS:** Now tell your Minister.

**A MEMBER:** Tell John, tell Big John.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Why are you monkeying around?

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

### Manitoba's credit rating - status of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**HON. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, this government has huge borrowing requirements as a consequence of the unprecedented deficits and, of course, they will have even larger borrowing requirements if they proceed with the construction of Limestone Generating Station.

My question to the Minister of Finance is, can he offer assurance to the House and to the people of Manitoba that Manitoba's credit rating is secure and is not about to be downgraded?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There were several prefaces to that question that to some extent are correct, and to some extent they're incorrect. The member suggests that the borrowing requirements of the government are as a result of the deficits of this government. They are obviously partially, but far more of our borrowing has to do with events that took place before we took office including, I might add, a deficit of a quarter-of-a-billion dollars left the last year of the Lyon-Filmon administration and including the Spending Estimates left on our table, at the time we took office, of half-a-billion dollars for the year 1982-83; so let's not pretend that somehow this is a new phenomenon that would have occurred only with an NDP Government. It occurred in every province in this

country, in every single province in this country, bar none, and with the Federal Government.

In terms of rating agency indications, we've kept up our contacts, as governments frequently do, and they have decisions to make based on their criteria; but I want to tell the Member for Turtle Mountain that the cost of a drop of one A from our rating will have approximately the effect of one-tenth of the amount that we have as an impact of the loss in federal transfer payments - one-tenth - and I would like to see, sometime, members of the opposition take some initiative to assist us on those issues instead of just harping on the ones that will have far less impact on our economy; and let's keep in mind as well that the Nelson River hydro-electric system was developed at a time when we had a credit rating much lower than we have right now.

### Manitoba deficit - projection in fiscal'84-85

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Finance advise the House what is the latest projection for the deficit in fiscal'84-85, since we are now very close to the end of that year.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** The latest estimate we have is the second quarter report which indicates that we're roughly at where we anticipated we would be at the beginning of the year.

The third quarter report can be anticipated to be out within a week or so.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Finance. Is the Minister of Finance telling this House that the latest projection he has of what the deficit is, is based on the end of September, 1984?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Maybe I should draw the member a picture. I indicated to the member that the latest public information available is for the end of the second quarter of 1984-85. The third quarter report will be out in due course. At that time, I will provide him with the information if he can't read it.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister was, could he advise the House what the latest projection of the deficit will be? That was all I asked him, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to repeat that question.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will so advise the House when I release the third quarter report in about a week.

### South Winnipeg Vocational School - additional funding

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Education with respect to the South Winnipeg Vocational School.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask her if she would explain to the House why she said in early February of this year

that the extra money sought by the vocational school board was, in her words, incredible, when the Chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board agreed in November of 1984 that \$1,850,000 of the money sought by the school board was an unavoidable shortfall because of increased construction costs due to unstable soil conditions, a loss of the federal sales tax exemption, increase of federal sales tax, inflationary adjustments on construction costs and equipment, reduction in the value of the Canadian dollar, and increased land costs. How could she describe the position of the board as incredible when the chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board had said it was an unavoidable shortfall because of the reasons cited?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said that the request for an additional \$2.3 million for the South Winnipeg Vocational School was an incredible request because that amount is \$2.3 million over what was approved by the Public Schools Finance Board at any time. The maximum amount of money approved was \$8 million. I have a record here of correspondence exchange between the Public Schools Finance Board, myself, Mr. Ramsay and Mrs. Zimmerman of the board, and in every letter we are confirming with them that the school must be built within the allotted \$8 million that they were given.

When they communicated that they needed some additional money - for instance, for the land that you mentioned, the \$300,000, Mr. Speaker - the message from the Public Schools Finance Board was you can use that additional money for the land, providing you can do it within the \$8 million. At no time, in any correspondence or any request to the Public Schools Finance Board nor to myself, did they ask permission and approval to go over the \$8 million that was allotted. There is a procedure that is in place that everybody knows about. We do take into consideration costs that are uncontrollable costs. We have taken the position that we are still fairly prepared to give consideration to those uncontrollable costs, Mr. Speaker.

What we are talking about is accountability of public funds, and when you have a \$2.3 million overrun on an \$8 million project with no approval, we have to say that is not acceptable because school boards cannot submit bills for projects for which they do not have approval.

We have looked at the increases and the overruns and there are some that, in the normal course of the procedure, had they followed it, we probably would have given consideration to: the increased costs for land, the loss of the federal sales tax for equipment, and they had problems with the soil where they had to put in some increased foundation. Those are fair and reasonable and would have been considered. However, they were not.

It should have been done at the time the plans were being drawn. It should have been done before they built the school, and it should have been done with approval. They have come to us after the fact, when the school is built, having expended the money that was allocated for equipment and have said we need an additional \$2.3 million. That process is unacceptable and we've communicated that clearly.

We are still prepared to look at acceptable uncontrollable costs and hope that our federal partners are going to share that with us.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

If a member does ask a question which might be viewed as being argumentative, it might well provoke an answer which is somewhat lengthy and perhaps also argumentative.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board has agreed that \$1,850,000 of these costs are an unavoidable shortfall; in view of the fact that the division's operating budgets have to be approved by the end of this week, students have to be accepted by the end of this month, equipment has to be purchased, personnel has to be hired by April 1, what commitment is the Minister of Education prepared to make to the completion of this project so that this school can open on September 1st?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, we have made our position quite clear in a letter to the board. That position was that they did not follow the proper procedure for getting approval for additional money. That position is that it is unacceptable to be presented with a bill that is \$2 million over on an \$8 million project, but that we are willing to follow the normal procedures and recognize those parts that we believe and would have recognized as uncontrollable costs and we are asking the Federal Government, as partners, to share that cost with us.

We have made our position clear; we are still awaiting an answer from the Federal Government on that, but the position of the Provincial Government on that is quite clear.

I do want to address the point that was made, for a second time, that the Chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board has agreed that some of these costs were uncontrollable. At no time did they have approval to exceed the additional \$8 million from myself, the province or the Chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board. He has said there are some items in there that we probably would have considered as uncontrollable and would have given recognition to and we are still willing to consider them, and that is all he has said, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister indicate the dollar amount that the Provincial Government is prepared to commit to the completion of this project? In answering that question, could she also advise the House whether or not, in signing the funding agreement for this project, that the province agreed to pay any excess costs of the project?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, to the last question, that the province agreed, through me, that we would pay any costs of the project. That would be absolutely ridiculous.

I want to quote from some correspondence between myself and the board.

Minister's approval letter dated June 2, 1983: "... and will not exceed \$8 million inclusive of all fees, land, equipment and furnishings."

Minister's approval for additional land: "I am concerned with the increase in costs for the land over the budgeted figure, as I know you are, and I must reiterate the understanding that this project, including land, furnishings, equipment and fees shall not exceed \$8 million. You will be required to use your ingenuity to design your project to suit the money supply."

Frechette's letter to Ramsay dated October 21st, "In reviewing your proposed cash flow, it became evident that the original estimate for furnishings and equipment had been reduced by \$300.00. The Public Schools Finance Board trusts your board will be adopting measures . . ."

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I wonder if it would not be easier for the Minister to table the letter or to pass it to the member.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I could table this. Yes, I'd be quite happy to, Mr. Speaker, because it shows five letters between myself and Mr. Ramsay where everybody confirms, and they agreed to deliver the project within the \$8 million, every piece of correspondence.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could answer the question. How much additional money is the province prepared to commit to this project to complete it?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to do what should have been done prior to anything happening with the building. We are prepared to negotiate with the board, to sit down and determine those things that we consider to be uncontrollable costs and to give consideration to those.

What they did, Mr. Speaker, was to submit an additional bill for \$2.3 million without indicating what it was for; so we have to sit down and talk to them to find out what the factors are and decide what we believe is justified.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister inform the House whether or not she made an offer of a certain amount of money to Mrs. Zimmerman, the Chairman of the Vocational School Board last Friday? Could she inform the House what amount of money she offered and is prepared to commit as additional monies to this project?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, in the meeting with Mrs. Zimmerman I communicated exactly what I've communicated to the House today, and that is that the \$2.3 million overrun is absolutely and totally unacceptable to this government, and that there were some items in there that we believed were justifiable, that we would communicate those to our federal partners and see if they would agree to share with us, as full partners, those justifiable additional costs. It's in the range of \$1 million to \$1.2 million out of the \$2.3 million.

### **Education System - reliance on property taxes**

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education, based on the remarks of the Chairman of the Winnipeg School Board, who said that the division taxpayers are being shafted by the province and that the province is continuing to refuse to live up to its pledge to reduce education system's reliance on regressive property taxes.

Mr. Speaker, is this the case?

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member, I think, knows that he should ask a question which requests information and which does not argue a point made by someone outside of the House. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I think the language was more succinct than I'm able to put it. I would like to then ask the Minister if she is going to allow a 23 percent increase in property taxes in the Winnipeg School Division equal to \$70 per home, per taxpayer?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there will be a 23 percent increase when the board finalizes its budget. We must remember that they are talking about a budget that is a preliminary budget. They did not have all of the information and all of the projections about the funds that they were entitled to. We have been confirming those figures with the board and my department within the last 10 days. When you change from a major financial system to a new one, it's understandable that it's not always clear on how to calculate some of the new programs and some of the new funds, and in some cases, they did not calculate everything that they were entitled to.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg School Division has a \$1.9 million surplus that they have not made any decision on how to use, so that I think this is part of the rites of spring. At this time of the year, two or three weeks prior to finalizing budgets, many boards put the worst face possible on both the mill rate and the tax increases to press the government for additional money. I think we should wait and see, when they finalize their budget, what the bottom line is, what the percentage increase will be, and I believe it will be much better than predicted in the newspaper report.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the chairman, which I think contradict those of the Minister, the Chairman of the School Division said that unless there is an additional \$5 million provided today, the deadline, there will be this kind of an increase. Could the Minister indicate whether she is going to provide that \$5 million, or what proportion of it is she prepared to provide?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, what we're prepared to provide is exactly what the board is entitled to get under the new program and the grants that are available and what we have provided for them in the last 10 days is up-to-date information between the two that make sure they understand exactly what they were entitled to.

There were some enrolment increases that weren't included; Carpathia School that was previously funded by the Federal Government. They had an increase surplus in there that they did not intend to have in; they did not have their surplus and they did not account for all of the monies that they were entitled to get.

I believe you will find now that they have that up-to-date information and are counting everything they're entitled to, that when they make their final decision on their surplus, that the increase will be reasonable and that the points that were made previously will not be correct.

### Chemical spill - Oakville

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

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I would like to direct my questions to the Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health.

To precede my remarks, my questions are not going to be argumentative at all, Mr. Speaker. I've waited for two sittings for the Minister to make a ministerial statement on the chemical spill at Oakville. I am now going to ask some questions on the chemical spill at Oakville.

Departmental officials are quoted as being reasonably confident that the Village of Oakville's water supply will not be contaminated by a liquid fertilizer spill which occurred last weekend, Mr. Speaker. What is the Minister doing to make absolutely certain that there is no danger to the water supply at Oakville?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Indeed, the statement made in the article the member refers to is made primarily because of the fact that at this time of the year the ground is still frozen and they are having a good deal of success in recapturing or picking up the spilled liquid nitrogen fertilizer. Most of that has already been picked up or collected at this point in time. We have staff on the spot and they're continuing to mop up.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I didn't know that ministerial statements were governed by the state of the frozen ground.

I would like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. I recall the chemical spill at MacGregor, Manitoba. My question to the Honourable Minister is, has the Honourable Minister visited the site and has any outside environmentalist been called in to assist and advise the government on the clean-up?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** For the information of the member opposite, I gather the MacGregor spill has by now been a matter that's been cleared up, it's been soaked up.

As far as . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** . . . my personal presence in Oakville, I haven't been there; my deputy minister has been, as well as a number of persons on staff. I have one staff person who continues to monitor the situation there.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. I'm directing it to the same Minister, although I guess the Attorney-General might be more adept at answering this one.

Vandalism is suspected at the spill at Oakville. Can the Honourable Minister bring us up-to-date on the apprehension of the people who are involved, and if and when some action will be done, and what safeguards are being taken so that the spill will not happen again?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I haven't got the final report in terms of whether indeed the investigation has indicated whether there was vandalism or not.

Now, as to additional safeguards, the owner of the product in this particular case stands liable when there is a spill, as any other such incidents that might occur.

### Foster Children - placement of

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Member for Rhineland addressed a question to me about how many children under the age of three were waiting for placement in permanent foster homes.

Mr. Speaker, I have response from 10 of the 17 agencies, but including Winnipeg, and I would like to report to the member opposite that CAS's Central has no children waiting; CAS of Eastern, no children; homes used for this age group have been empty for at least two years. CAS of Western has none with the exception of a baby with mental retardation one week ago, and there's been a search for an appropriate resource; CAS of Winnipeg, five children are awaiting in short term emergency homes pending a sorting out of where they should be placed; five vacancies exist for birth to six months of age and three vacancies for other children up to the age of three. There's also a newborn program with a capacity of four, and two of those beds are vacant.

So, in total there are 10 vacant beds for foster home placement for children of this age group in Winnipeg.

Interlake, none; Norman-The Pas, none; Parklands-Dauphin, none; Parklands-Swan River, none; DOCFS, none.

### Manitoba Jobs Fund Development Agreement

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

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Trade and Technology and would ask him - yesterday he announced a government program which provides grants for businesses in Manitoba, and

I would ask him since many of us received calls from constituents and small business people who are interested in this program, would he be able to inform the House as to where the people interested in receiving assistance and receiving a grant can apply under this new program?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not aware of any new program that I announced yesterday. I did announce a development agreement under an existing program that was announced earlier this year, this current fiscal year, under the Jobs Funds and if there is anyone that is interested in getting information on that, they can contact me or staff in my department.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Is the Minister now saying that the government's stated policy is that they will be providing grants, loans, and loan guarantees to different small businesses that applied to them for it?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** It appears that we don't seem to be getting information out on programs, so we may have to increase the amount of information that's available.

What we did announce, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a program called the Development Agreement that will allow the government to work with the private sector in the Province of Manitoba that are looking to significantly expand their activities or for new companies that are looking to locate in the Province of Manitoba. Under that program, there can be negotiations on a variety of assistance available from the government, whether it be loans, loan guarantees, grants, training assistance; on the other side, significant commitments from the company in terms of employment level, increased jobs in the province, investment levels, affirmative action, training requirements, environmental issues, etc.

So, that program has been announced and if any businesses are interested in looking at major expansions in the Province of Manitoba, I or staff in my department would be pleased to work with them.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that this New Democratic Government sees nothing wrong in giving outright grants, taxpayers' monies, to large corporations and small businesses in this province on a regular basis and on a program basis? Is he saying that this NDP Government is now ready to give corporations taxpayers' money to locate and stay in Manitoba?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** No, this government is not providing outright grants to businesses in the Province of Manitoba. What this government is doing is looking at providing assistance, through the form of a development agreement, where there are commitments made by the private sector and the government for job creation in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, this latest announcement gives a \$500,000 grant, a \$638,000

repayable loan and a \$1.2 million guarantee. I wonder if the Minister could provide us with the details as to the interest rates on the repayable loan and the amortization on it; also whether the government is charging anything, a 1 percent fee for the guarantee on the \$1.2 million.

Another question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister inform the House whether his department, the Jobs Fund, or Manitoba Development Corporation, will be guaranteeing or supervising the repayment as well as the loan guarantee?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to provide that information. I don't have it all at my fingertips at the present time, but I can say, in response to the latter part of that multi-question, the agreements are being administered by the Manitoba Development Corporation and they're responsible for the actual arrangements of the loan and the repayment thereof. I will provide the additional information to the member once I'm able to have it put together.

### **CCIL Closure - losses to taxpayers re loans & loan guarantees**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On Friday, March 8, the Member for La Verendrye requested some information in respect to the Provincial Government exposure in regard to Co-operative Implements. I informed him I would get that information and return to him at the earliest possible moment.

I can now tell him that the total Manitoba exposure from the 1978 and the 1982 agreement totals \$5.775 million in the form of \$2.8 million of guarantees and \$2.975 million of loan money. However, it must be noted that Co-operative Implements is in the process of restructuring itself and hopefully they will be successful in that effort and hopefully they will be able to provide the same type of service in respect to the depot system throughout the province that they have in the past to the farmers of this province and that money will, in fact, not be lost to the province, but will be used in a manner to improve the economy of the province and the economic health, particularly of the agricultural community and the farmers of the province.

### **School of Psychiatric Nursing, Portage - closure of**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Community Services.

Can the Minister inform the people of Portage la Prairie and the staff at the Manitoba Development Centre as to whether a decision has been made to close out the School of Psychiatric Nursing at that centre?

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, what is being actively considered is the best way to train psychiatric nurses throughout the province. Part of the consideration, since we currently have three schools that are training psychiatric nurses, albeit with different specialties, is if there is a different arrangement of the instruction and the placement that can achieve the same results in a more economical way. That is under active consideration with consultation with all the groups affected.

**MR. L. HYDE:** I have a second question for the same Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Minister clear the air on this question, since it's alleged that the union staff members are of the opinion that the decision has been made to close the school of nursing?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I didn't hear a question. I heard an allegation there. Would the honourable member wish to repeat or rephrase his question?

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Speaker, the question I have to the Minister is, will she clear the air on this issue of closing down the school of nursing at the centre?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, decisions that have been taken in the Estimates process will be announced and will be open to public discussion. At the moment, the issue is being looked at because of the possible economies available in a different mode of training psychiatric nurses.

**MR. L. HYDE:** I wonder if the Minister realizes just what she's putting the people and the staff of the Manitoba School and the people of Portage la Prairie through when she will not make a decision on this.

I would ask the Minister, would she assure this House that no final decision will be made until we have an opportunity in this House to debate this important issue during her Estimates?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I've already said when the issue is appropriately discussed, but I do think the member opposite is confusing the role of the opposition in the government. As government, we have the responsibility to manage the affairs of the province efficiently and effectively and we intend to do so.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same Minister.

Can this Minister indicate whether she has met with the Association of Registered Psychiatric Nurses in regard to the proposed closedown of the School of Psychiatric Nursing in Portage la Prairie?

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Is the Minister prepared to take seriously the very real concerns that the professional

association has about the closing of the Portage school in comparison to the education offered in Selkirk and Brandon, that it will leave a great void in the psychiatric nursing training program which deals with developmental handicapped individuals in Manitoba?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, what I said we were looking at was a rearrangement of the way in which the psychiatric nurses, with the different specialties in mental illness, in mental retardation, in care of the elderly, is being delivered. At no time has there ever been any suggestion that the training and the type of work done at the Portage School was not valued or required in the system.

The question at hand is, what is the best way to organize the delivery of the training and there are many ways in which to deliver the training, Mr. Speaker. We are looking at all the options and will announce when we have come to a final decision.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Would the Minister indicate whether the rearrangement of the training program will result in the closing of the School for Psychiatric Nursing Training in Portage la Prairie?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I think I have already answered that question, that the way in which the training of the nurses is being organized is under review. There are many components to training. There's classroom work; there's placement for practical experience and this can be accomplished in a variety of ways. There are also specialties within psychiatric nursing. Now it's up to us to review the way in which that training is delivered throughout the province and come up with the most effective package.

I think when we have completed the consultation and the analysis we're now going through, that many of the fears that are being expressed will be allayed. I think, again, the fear that we don't value the psychiatric nurse training or that speciality, particularly in the institutional setting of the mentally retarded, is quite unfounded and can be demonstrated so to be.

**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 Wolesey and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I'd like to welcome the new member, the Member for Fort Garry, the newest member of the House. I think he has an awful lot to offer to this House, to the debate of this House. There is no doubt that much is expected of him from his constituents, of course, his parties and the members of the House. I, for one, hope that his arrival here - a new member but one with experience - would help reinstate a little more decorum in this House and maybe enable us to have

more of these debates without so much bitterness, as we've seen these last few years.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, hear.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It is with a bit of sadness I realize that Mr. Sherman is not looking at me from across the row. We've had a lot of disagreements - there is no doubt about that - but I've always considered him a gentleman and I think it is — (Interjection) — well it's not a laughing matter. I think that a person who has spent so many years devoted to a career and all of a sudden, from one day to the next, seems to be gone and has to start all over again, I find that rather sad.

It is with a bit of — (Interjection) — oh, it will happen to all of us. It might happen to you a little earlier than it does to me, but that's the only difference.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes, but he doesn't know that this could take care of . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** If the Member for Pembina will keep quiet a bit, I have a few words for him. I might say that I'm somewhat excited — (Interjection) — he wasn't there, I couldn't see him there. It is somewhat with excitement that I realize we now have a new health critic on the opposition side.

**A MEMBER:** Duck, Larry!

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There's no doubt, we all know him, he's a gut fighter who will ask nor give and he will ask nor seek any quarter, in fact, yes, he does remind me of my early days in this House, and who knows, he might even wake up the fighting spirit in me and we could maybe have some good debates.

I want to say that I expect him to keep me honest, but I also want to say to him that I don't intend to give him any edge either. When he makes statements, I expect him to be able to back them, when he wants more money, I'll expect him to give me an idea where I should get the money, and when he wants savings, he's telling us that our deficit is too large — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I thought I was making a damn good speech, but everybody is making it for me.

There's another actor that I've had to deal with lately, and I'd like to say a few words about him, and that's the Federal Minister of Health. In all sincerity, I must say that I find him very accessible, very frank and direct, and I find him very knowledgeable and I don't imply any motives at all. I have no reason to think otherwise and it's been a pleasure working with him, but I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, though, that I also realize that he is honeymooning at this time and this is the time of co-operation with the provinces and I'll be very anxious to know when it's time for action and I think that this will be very soon, but I hope that I'm not disappointed at the time.

The Leader of the Opposition, you know if you look at him, he's a good looking guy. He's got a nice personality, an angelic smile, he's not a bad speaker. You know he's got a sense of humour, but he's not getting anywhere. He's an angry young man. He shoots from the hip and he sprays everything, not caring or

knowing what he's going to hit, therefore he hits very little. He's too shallow. There's no depth in there at all and that is why you're not making it. — (Interjection) — That took a lot of brains to say that. If you will give me time I will write that down, I'd like to use that sometime.

Mr. Speaker, I say this sincerely, because I think that there is potential in the leader and unfortunately - maybe it was the training that he got from the former leader - he thinks it has to be a vicious attack constantly. It seems to me that if he'd zero in once in a while and make sure that he has something and then hit hard, he'd accomplish a little more.

Now lately he's been talking about the field of health and he tells us that in the resolution, he tells us that it's all being deteriorating. Well I, Mr. Speaker, here in front of the members of this House, challenge him, at any time, any place, on any platform, to discuss health and throw in lotteries because you had a few words to say about lotteries being . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'm reminded that I no longer have the responsibility for lotteries and I'm sure that my honourable friend will have an up-to-date figure, but . . .

**A MEMBER:** No I said that Gary lost the lottery.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Oh, I'm sorry, I lost them too.

Anyway, there's some information that I had that was prepared a couple of months ago. Just to give you an idea, just to advise you to be very careful when you talk about things you don't know - and maybe you can call the Member from Steinbach to help me. You know all the sports they made in 1983, all of them, 2,295,000, this year over 5,000,000. Manitoba Arts Council went to 1.5 to 3.1. Manitoba Intercultural Council from 282 to 793. United Way from 1.2 to 1.3. — (Interjection) — We'll come to bingo in a minute. The Manitoba Community Services, 1.7 million to 2.5 million; Manitoba Association, 285 to 856; Manitoba Heritage from 124 to 351; Festival du Voyageur, who felt that they shouldn't get too much, from 194 to 228 and that's 1984. For the latest information I happen to know the Festival du Voyageur had budgeted for \$150,000 and they got \$300,000 at the last casino. Folk Art Council, 45 to 87; Winnipeg Blue Bombers, 22 to 147. In other words the total — (Interjection) — don't you want to hear this? Don't you want to hear this? In other words, the total in 1983 was \$13 million and it is \$29.2 million in 1984. The profits are spread out much more than they were before. That was one aim we had. There's protection for the public, accountability which we have and I'll tell you the other provinces across Canada are looking at what happened in Manitoba because they're thinking of doing the same thing.

I might say that I'm quite proud of what has been done. Another thing that was said is that I was too busy with bingo - mind you I've never played a bingo game in my life - but I was too busy with bingo and I didn't know what was going on in Health and there was no research or planning in Health. That's even worse than the other one. I haven't got the time unfortunately - I'm speaking for myself, I don't get these chances - but I have here a document that can tell you, just on planning in the department. First of all,



1981 when I took the Department of Health there was zip planners, not one damn planner. Not one. The planning was done by the directors of the programs and they were also doing an evaluation. We set up a provincial planner, provincial gerontologist, provincial psychiatrist. We gave them a team and then they started working.

For instance, one of the things after three years, that they've been given to do, the main one, is the Health Services Review Committee. There they have a bunch of professional backgrounds that are varied and whose organizations include representatives from the MMA, the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, the School of Medicine, teaching and non-teaching hospitals, rural hospitals, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, social and preventative medicine, Manitoba Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. In order to undertake its work, the Health Services Committee identified 16 areas which require considerable review regarding the service delivery system that is in place today and what with the expected shift in the population based over the next 10 years, could be expected in the future.

And now there are teams looking at administrative efficiency, cardiovascular disorders, community health services, elderly health services, emergency health care, Indian health care, intensive care, not-for-admission surgery, obstetrics, oncology, ophthalmology, out-patients, paediatrics. . . but it's time you got educated. If you're going to shoot off your mouth or have your leader shoot off your mouth and say nothing is done, you're going to get it. And I can say that we accept this challenge anytime you want.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There are many challenges, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, there's unemployment, there's the economy, inflation, the high cost of interest, and we should strive to correct those, but let's not kid ourselves. Let's be practical. In a province surrounded by this large country and so close to a country that whenever they sneeze out there, we get a cold here, I don't think that it's realistic to think that everything could be changed. It doesn't mean that we should stop trying.

I'm not saying that we should not address these things, but I am saying that as far as I'm concerned, the main challenge and the most important challenge facing Manitobans at this time, is what's going to happen to the health care, the way things are going.

Now the other things, I don't think you're going to change that much in unemployment and all that, until you've found less materialism in the capitalist system and until you got rid of the dollar sign as the god of too many businessmen. I think if we keep on equating success with profit, of course we're not going to go too far — (Interjection) — well, deep down, there's no doubt I'm all for free enterprise. I have no problem with that at all, but for one minute, I wish I was the Pope because nobody dare call him a communist. He tells it the way it is. He tells you the good things of communism but he tells you what's wrong with capitalism also. That is where I'm situated. I have no trouble with that teaching at all. . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. If other members wish to put forward their opinion, they will have every opportunity to do so in the course of the debate.

As of now, the Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the situation is that I believe in giving some incentive to people but to me, I won't go so far as saying that the good, the right political climate is when you've got people out of work or people working for nothing and cheap labour. I don't like that at all.

**A MEMBER:** That's the Tory way.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Anyway, as I said, I think the important thing is the challenge of health care, because I still think we have one of the best - if not the best - health systems in Canada and therefore, in the world, and I don't apologize for that at all. Now, I don't think that a government can do it alone. If any government thinks that they can look at the future and the challenge that we have in front of us and feels that they can rectify that alone, they're sadly mistaken.

I certainly would like to invite the members of the opposition to participate, to work together on some blueprint, in some planning that we're doing, and I'm not suggesting for a minute that you should be muzzled and that you can't make your Brownie points, there's always time for that. But I think, in general, we've got to work together. We have to work with the providers of the services. We have to work with the consumers, the administrators, the hospitals, the people delivering the services, the professionals and otherwise.

I'm very pleased to say that things are going quite well. We've had the best relationship now that I've ever seen with the MMA, who have a letter of intent - I won't have time to read it now, but you'll see what they're ready to do, working with us. We're working closely with MARN and also with the communities. I might say that with the studies and these reports that are coming through, probably soon, the intention of the government, of the Cabinet is to have the department and myself prepare a White Paper that will give us the blueprint for the future in the health field and again, I'd like to invite our people to participate.

Now, one of the things that you like to do is talk about certain money and now your trick this Session is "you're spending money for advertising." The money I'm spending for advertising, I haven't got any of those people there that advertise for you.

Now, my honourable friend, I told you I'd keep you honest. My honourable friend wanted to know how much we saved when we increased the deductible for those over 65 to \$20 each - it was 1.4 million. If he thinks for a minute that went for advertising, let me tell him how much is still needed. If he thinks that paid - and there was some surplus - let me say that in his days in 1980-81, the actual spent on Pharmacare was 10.6 million, and in 1982-83, 13.6 million, and this year it will be pretty close to \$29 million. We'll have to get a lot more money before we start advertising.

When this work is being done, there are going to have to be some very, very tough decisions to make. You have a choice. You can play games, you can be

on every side of every issue. You can do like your Leader did yesterday. All of a sudden he was talking about a few years ago, he was all in favour of what we were doing for obstetrics, at least the Health critic from the party was, and yesterday he thought it was awful. But you're not going to get anywhere by that, and you're not going to have any credibility because these are some of the things that you'll have to do and face — (Interjection) — I never say anything but the truth. Sometimes it hurts, but I always tell the truth.

I'd like to give you another example of one of the things that happened and how we dealt with it because there was an awful lot of ink on that and I'm talking about the chiropractic benefits. There was an inequity that existed where we were penalizing and we were discriminating against single people and against large families. Some of the people by accident of being married and maybe having a dependent - not because of need, not because of the money they had - were receiving quite a bit more than others, so that inequity has been corrected and that's done and that will stay done. Having said that, and while doing that, we saved \$600,000 or so. We did.

Now we looked at these benefits across the nation. Saskatchewan has no limits at all; Saskatchewan is right on the top, they recognize the chiropractic services as fully insured services. Five of the ten provinces and the two territories, that is Quebec and the Atlantic provinces, and the territories, do not cover chiropractic services at all. So that leaves Alberta, B.C., Ontario and Manitoba. Alberta had allowed for 17 visits; B.C., 12 visits for those under 65 and 15 for those over 65; and Ontario, 18. We felt that we were quite low in the visits, so what we did was to take some of the money that was saved in correcting this inequity, not all of it, and we are working now with the Commission to get up with the - at least, not the same level as those other three provinces and carry the load, and we intend to increase the visits to 15 from 10. That is the initial visit and 10, it used to be; now it will be 1 and 15, or an increase of 50 percent, and I think that we have corrected an inequity in doing it, and we still save a couple of dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the paramount problem for the government is how to effectively prevent preventable disease, and also how to make modern medical skill available to everyone. We haven't got all the money we would like to have, and it's a little difficult because of the economic situation, especially when we are told and are encouraged to economize in all the departments.

This is also quite difficult, particularly so with health, where costs have risen faster than in any other sector of our national economy. Perhaps the most perplexing question facing policy makers in the health field today is, how can the money that we have be spent responsibly and get the best for our money.

To be charged with the allocation of health dollars is to assume the burden of deciding, and again I remind you that some decisions are not always easy. With limited resources, this means placing emphasis on an aspect of health which automatically means that you'll have to take from somewhere else. Now, we can plan together on that, we can see that we spent our money wisely, or you can wait, and as soon as we do something, of course, it reduces somewhere, wave the flag and start yelling.

**A MEMBER:** What about making the pie bigger?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** What? The pie bigger. Let's go to the pie. Let's talk about the pie.

In 1970, the cost of our hospitals was \$98 for every Manitoban. In 1982, it was \$474.00. In other words, hospital costs and the pie increased by 385 percent in one decade. Those are kind of sobering thoughts, aren't they? You know, there's so much you can do with a pie.

Let me say that if we kept on, just with the average increase that we've had in the last 10 years, which is 12.98 percent average increase, in 10 years, do you know what the budget of just the Manitoba Health Services Commission would be? It would be \$3 billion, 44 million - and that is only the Commission, not the department. \$3 billion, 44 million. Now it's approximately \$1 billion. And that is just what we're doing now, just 12 percent. If we did nothing, no increase in salary, no new staff, no new equipment, nothing at all, just to have the same guidelines to take care of an aging population, in 10 years from now, that would increase the cost by a quarter of a billion dollars.

And if we just add 5 percent, and we know that's impossible, a 5 percent a year increase for health care, then we would double our budget in 10 years. So you see, it's fine to have fun, but I think it is a sobering thought to see where we're going, because we do have the best health care in the world, but we cannot keep on the way we're doing.

And besides, in answer to the last question, where he said, get a bigger pie, the Canadian Medical Association, in their survey, made it quite clear that that wasn't the answer. I think we have to change the system. I think we have to change the motivations of the consumer, to start with, the doctors, the medical profession and others. Somebody said, intervene. And I'm glad he mentioned that, because that comes up quite often. If you don't send somebody a blank cheque, you're intervening. They don't even want you to carry the cheque, send the cheque. Send the cheque. We'll send you a thank you note later. Intervening. There was an accusation in the paper that we were intervening with the medical profession because the Peer Review Committee had called a doctor on the carpet and asked him some questions. We knew nothing about that, it has nothing to do with us, it is a committee of their peers, and thank God that that committee is there, because I don't think there is anybody at all that feels that we're above everybody else, that we have a monopoly on honesty and goodness. We don't need that because we're honest. We need these things, and we must have that with the high cost of health care.

I'm very proud of the profession that we have here, and I say that most sincerely. I think we have some very good, clever and dedicated people and I would not subscribe for a minute to the thought that they're just interested in money, in general. There are some - and that's their choice - there are athletes who make a million dollars, they want to sit it out to see if they can make \$2 million, that's human nature.

My aim, as Minister of Health, is not to see how I can get Joe Blow \$2 million, but to see that we take care of the people that need the help. And when I said we have the best health system, I have no doubt about

that at all. I'm talking about now, for the population in general. There might be 5 percent or 2 percent in the States that get better health, I'm talking about universal health, a universal health system because all our people are pretty well treated the same, as much as possible. Then when we can't do it, we try to compensate for that. If we can't give the same service up north, we go and get them in a plane if we have to, so that's why we brought that next program. And there are other facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I had a list of things that we are going to do in the department, I wanted to answer some of the questions that were asked. I don't know exactly how much time I have; I don't think I'll be able to finish. But the important thing is that in all the fun that we're having here, and I'm not averse to that, you know that, and I say this most sincerely - and you can take me seriously now - I say to the Leader of the Opposition and I hope he's listening, and to the health critic, that if they want to get together with me to see if there's something that we could work out, to put our heads together, I'm sure we can do that, because I don't think there will be any losers in that. I don't think you can win.

Look at the situation in the last federal election. Look what could have happened. You had a Liberal Government who didn't want to spend money, who abdicated their responsibility as a partner, because they are partners, they were partners - we started Medicare and hospitalization together - and all of a sudden they decided to cap their contribution. No discussion, nothing. They just capped their contribution, and then they start telling us we have to have better standards, and they start to tell us that we had to take care of the mentally ill, to which they've never made any contribution at all.

It was less than honest because they didn't want to talk about anything else. When I wanted to talk about - fine, extra billing is something, but that's not the most important thing. Why don't we talk as partners about the financing of that. That was always a different actor. They pointed to the door of the Minister of Finance, federally, and say that's not us, different actors. We've asked to have meetings between the Ministers of Health and the Minister of Finance and that was never allowed.

Then the Conservatives stepped in and politically it was great, politically it was a terrific move by Mulroney. He didn't fight it. Everybody expected him to fight it. The medical profession thought he would fight it. He said no, in fact he went further. He said we'll go back, we're certainly ready to go back to cost-sharing. We will look at the regional disparity. We will also look at the situation of prevention, of the aging population, of research. These were all things that were said. It became a non-issue. In fact, I think he took the play from it. Now, it's a little harder because they're saddled with an act that I don't think too many and certainly many of the provincial Ministers of Health don't believe in it all. We're ready to say we're finished, we can't afford it. But, credit should be given when it's due and the present Federal Minister is trying his best but he's not going to be able to deliver. He's already told me, fine, that he recognized it was a commitment about this cost-sharing, but there's certainly no views in going in that direction at all.

We talked about regional disparity. We reminded him of regional disparity and it seems to be the opposite

now until we find out what's going to happen to that \$72 million and instead of encouraging and saying hey this is a country, and this a program for all of us. If it's going to be left to every province to do his own, what the hell's the point. The idea is that you've got to have at least a minimum of services that every Canadian could have. That makes it difficult when one of the partners who started that, when you start in good faith - I'm blaming the Federal Liberals for that who started and then pulled away - but these are some of the things that we're looking for now; for research and planning. In all fairness, we have quite a few plans in front of the Minister and he's committed to consider that and come back to us.

The important thing, I said again, you know this has to be sobering for everybody. When I make a statement like this and I can prove that statement if you have any doubt - just the same increase as we had, average yearly increase we had in the last 10 years, if we follow that for the next 10 years that the Budget just for the Commission, not the department, will be \$3 billion, \$44 million. Well, I think we need some help. I think we have to work together because I don't think anybody will profit by it politically - maybe on a short run - and then whoever forms the government, no matter how, will be faced with the same problem. It's something that I'll tell you that the people of Canada and Manitoba are not ready to forget or to drop. They want this service. Now there will have to be some tough decisions.

I haven't even spoken about the moral issues. There will be all kinds of moral issues and that bothers the people right now. Are you going to say that the public will pay for the heart transplant for somebody 96 years old? There you go. I don't know. I wish I had the answer. I think, fine, nobody's going to get between the doctor and the patient. That's not what I'm suggesting, but should the public pay for that? Should we go on and pay for certain things and say well all right, and we get some examples. It's the news and then we're told how cruel we are. There are certain things that we're paying now, for one patient over \$300,000 a year. Can that keep up for one patient? I mean, do we do that and then take money away from home care or some of these problems? This what we're faced with and that's why I say it's so important. The former Minister of - the one that's coming to his seat now - Agriculture said yesterday on another issue that has to be above partisan politics.

I do believe certain things should be above partisan politics. If there's one — (Interjection) — well, you know you can talk to him. I talk to him occasionally. — (Interjection) — Agriculture is not my strength, just in case you didn't know that before today. — (Interjection) — What the hell did I mention him for, now I can't even make my speech again.

Mr. Speaker, I say if anything should be above party politics, it is trying to preserve the great health care system that we have here. There will be an awful lot of change. I know, you want to laugh. You don't want to take it seriously. That's your problem. That's not mine. — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Minister indicated that we wanted to laugh at the serious situation in the health care system. What we are laughing at is the hypocrisy of the 1981 New Democratic health care promises laid on the people of Manitoba. That's what we're laughing at.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That was not a point of order.  
The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, there is no hypocrisy at all. There's been an awful lot of change. There certainly was no planning in 1981. Not a damn bit of planning. Not one planner. Didn't even have one planner. . . .

**A MEMBER:** We're waiting six to eight months . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** You're waiting all right. Then you closed every place . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** . . . you closed. You put a freeze on every construction of personal care homes and we're paying for you. We've got these promises. You weren't taking it down the hill, there's no doubt about that. You can live in the past all you want. I think there's a lot of things that we didn't know a few years ago because of this lack of evaluation and planning.

What I'd object to is when I'm giving a very serious message and challenging you to work together with all the members of this House, and you're talking about 1981. — (Interjection) — You want to talk about 1981. That is the bloody reason why you're sitting there because your former leader never forgot 1981, and you're living like Rip Van Winkle in the past. Why don't you look at the future for a change?

You know, you don't have to go to a convention to do your work. At no time was I — (Interjection) — eh?

**A MEMBER:** You don't even caucus with them . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** You know I don't caucus with them.

**A MEMBER:** Because you're here when they're in the caucus room.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Is that you that's sneaking at the door? Mr. Speaker, as long as I carry my load and do my work, I'm happy. I'm not a damned bit embarrassed. I don't agree with everything that everybody said. I don't care what side of the House they are. I'm not going to apologize for that. I wasn't built a robot or a rubber stamp and I don't intend to

be. I try to find the party that has more in common and if it could work, I'll work with them as much as possible and I'll fight him on things that are against the dictate of my conscience, and I'll keep doing that. — (Interjection) — Yeah, you had forgotten that for awhile.

Remember when you used to say leave him alone, it's the dullest speech in the world. I liked it when you — (Interjection) — What's that Frank? What did you say?

**A MEMBER:** We need a little fireworks here today.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I hope it's . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**A MEMBER:** What were you doing there with taxpayers' money?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think I was looking for you or something.

At least I was smart enough on any trip that I made, that the Federal Government paid for it. There wasn't one cent paid for me out of here from Manitoba. That's when it was a bilingual country and they encouraged the participation from the bilingual provinces.

Mr. Speaker, they've succeeded; they got me thrown out completely. They don't want to listen to my message so I guess we'll be back to the old days and we'll fight it out, my friend and I, for the next month or so and I look forward to that also.

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Gosh, it's good to be back after eight and one-half months. I wonder if we could maybe tape that little episode we just had here. I realize, after the Minister of Health has spoken, it's going to be a difficult act to follow. He can create all kinds of excitement when he speaks and I noticed he was trying to give advice to this side and especially to our leader and I'd like to reciprocate in the same way and give some advice to his leader, the Premier, as we go along.

Firstly though, I'd like to pay the traditional congratulations or compliments to the Mover and Seconder. I think they had a difficult job, in terms of moving the Throne Speech, which I considered was a very bland type of document and it seemed they were searching for things in which to support them; but possibly it could be the last contribution of that nature in this House, depending when the election gets called.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to congratulate the Member for The Pas for his appointment to the Cabinet. I've always enjoyed the Member for The Pas and I hope he doesn't get corrupted by his colleagues in Cabinet there.

I'd also like to welcome the Member for Fort Garry to the House. We've had quite a few changes actually since last we met, which was the end of June, and had some changes across the House as well. To the Member for Kildonan, I'd like to wish her good health and God bless her.

To the Member for Ste. Rose, I'd like to wish him a happy retirement. We also have members on our side

of the House that will not be seeking office again when the time comes, where we go for an election, the Member for Roblin-Russell, the Member for Virden. These have been gentlemen that have contributed for a long time in this House and I've always appreciated them. They've given me a lot of advice from the time I was a rookie in the House and I'll certainly miss them - I don't know whether I'll be back of course, that's presumptuous, Mr. Speaker - but I'll be working toward getting back here. It will be sorry for the House to not have them here anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to compliment the Premier-in-waiting, my leader, on his speech yesterday. I think he covered a lot of ground, in terms of illustrating the lack of performance of this government. That brings me to the theme of what I basically want to speak about today, Mr. Speaker. That is, a few years ago we had a TV program called the Six Million Dollar Man and this individual had artificial props and what-have-you and it was some comedy really. It reminded me of our Premier of today and I'd like to call him the Five Million Dollar Premier because of his advertising program.

Mr. Speaker, normally I'm a very positive individual. I don't like to talk negative all the time and in speaking to the Throne Speech I was toying around with exactly what approach to take. Then I heard, after the Federal-Provincial Premiers Conference in Saskatchewan, that our Premier had said that this government has done more for Manitoba than any government in Canada has done for their province.

That is basically where I started getting confused. I tried to figure out, what have they done for us in this province? What have they done? And to assess it, lest we forget, I started going through the benches of the Cabinet, and after three-and-a-half years, and we're looking forward to an election coming up shortly, I think it's time we did a bit of a report card, an assessment of what has happened with the government, with the individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to try and do a character assassination, but basically the things that each Minister's been involved in and issues that they have been concerned with and dealt with.

I'd like to start with the Attorney General. The Attorney-General, this individual, Mr. Speaker, embroiled this House in one of the most controversial episodes we've ever had, which was the French language issue. He introduced that thing and the way it was handled is what's created all the problems and the acrimony in this House ever since that time. It has created many problems in people's minds. It still is there. The issue is being dealt with in the courts and I can understand that, but this is the gentleman that introduced that controversy and is again embroiling on something that is doing a lot of confusion and controversy in the province, which is the abortion issue.

At the opening of the Session we had many people out here, thousands of them, expressing their concern and it is again the Attorney-General that has the handle on things. I'm a little concerned exactly how he will or will not handle the issue. I suspect that we'll probably be known as the abortion province of Canada by the time the issue is through.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with the Finance Minister. I recall so vividly that night when he brought in the Budget, when we anticipated that the province

had to raise money through taxes. We, as the opposition at that time, anticipated that there'd be an increase in the sales tax and the Finance Minister brought in the payroll tax; and the joys of glee in their eyes when he did that, the Government of the Day. They thought they'd pulled a great coup when the Finance Minister brought in the 1.5 percent payroll tax.

To their detriment now, Mr. Speaker, they have removed it from some of the smaller businesses. It is still a deterrent for people to come and invest in this province. In the interim, we've still increased the sales tax by 1 percent. We end up with the biggest deficit that this province has ever seen and we can't get a direct indication from the Minister exactly what the deficit is going to be. He's trying to fudge and slide around it again. Ultimately it will all come out. He might as well be frank and tell us what he's projecting, but that is not the case.

The Minister of Finance comes up with some pretty cute deals, like last year when he financed - did he finance the Legislative Building? Sold it or whatever the case may be to a holding company to raise some money. The slick tricks that get pulled just to try and get money somewhere along the line create a problem.

Then we come to the Minister of Energy of Mines. Mr. Speaker, this shuffle game has been going on from time to time. I want to basically look at the responsibilities of the Ministers prior to the last shuffle.

The Minister of Energy and Mines unfroze the hydro rate freeze. When they formed the government, he blew the Western Grid; he blew Alcan, potash - we don't hear about potash at all any more. I was thinking, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes I think we should pity him. Our Minister of Energy and Mines must be getting jet lag on a continuous basis from flying around trying to make some pie-in-the-sky deals and not being very successful.

Ironically, when our government was working with Alcan the flack that was being raised by the opposition at that time, the present government, and it didn't take two years and they were negotiating with Alcoa and that didn't materialize either. Yes, Mr. Speaker, our government, when we were in power, possibly didn't have these things pinned down to the point we should have so that they would have materialized, because by allowing these people to get their hands in it, they destroyed it and destroyed thousands and thousands of jobs. Now they're turning around and buying jobs, trying to buy jobs and there's going to be a lot of discussion on that coming forward.

We go down the list here or down the line - I'll skip the Premier for the time being, I'll save him for the last because we want to sort of summarize what has happened - then I get to the Minister of Health. We've just heard his approach, his plea for co-operation and the moment things don't quite go the way he wants them to, he sort of gets very excited and . . .

**A MEMBER:** He blows his stack.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** . . . he blows his stack, yes. He's created a lot of confusion in the lotteries part of it, especially in rural areas. Very many people are upset with the way it has been handled. Then he indicated, don't talk of 1981, we're talking now. Well, we have to

talk about 1981 because the promises of this government in 1981 are why they got elected, deceptive promises that they still are labouring under and I'll go into that in more detail later on. But you know what they were telling us? Help, not cutbacks, when we were government. I can recall sitting on the back bench over there, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the opposition at that time giving our Minister of Health what for. Our Leader mentioned it yesterday, three strips of bacon versus two, like this was the big issue, changing the bed sheets, these kinds of issues.

The now Minister of Energy and Mines was one of the ones, the member who is now Chairman of the Treasury, who used to lambaste our poor Minister of Health at that time, the terrible things we had done. Today the Minister of Health gets up and says that things have changed dramatically. It's a new ball game. We all have to work together. Well, there certainly was no pleading of working together at the time when we were government, but I think they read the signs. They want to work together now. We have somebody that's going to work together with them; our new critic of Health is going to be working with him all right. We're very pleased with that.

Then we come to the Government House Leader, the now Minister of Municipal Affairs. When he joined Cabinet, he put his hand on his own head and said, I am the smartest man in this House, self-appointed. With that attitude this Government House Leader started off, that he knew everything and nobody else knew anything, which is fine. I'll accept that to a degree but because of his attitude, that's where the acrimony in this House started. I thought that possibly, by this time, he would have a different approach but you know what's happened? We're starting off the same way as we did last year. Instead of him as House Leader reprimanding his own Ministers in terms of when they read their statements, the time element on it - no, no comment from this House Leader. It's starting, it's developing again. Well, we'll get into all kinds of fights and what have you and it's a reflection on the House Leader.

If he would apply some of his knowledge and deal with Municipal Affairs - and I'm glad the Member for Ste. Rose is here now, I wish him a good retirement and I don't want to draw him into the debate - but now for three and a half years this government has sat on the assessment problem and it is a major problem and they are not moving on it. We discussed initially, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they would not have the intestinal fortitude to move on the assessment aspect of it and they still will not and the problems are getting bigger. I could spend hours just indicating the kinds of inequities that are out there and we'll be mentioning them during the Estimates. But I'm just doing a bit of a report card, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on all the things that have happened or have not happened with this government in charge.

Then we get to the Member for Brandon East and I want to talk about the Member for Brandon East. Actually, I should feel embarrassed because I'm not sure what his responsibilities are right now because there's been a real shell game all the time. Which shell has he got now? But his responsibility, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was McKenzie Seeds and he created embarrassment for the Premier of the province and

his government. He's been shuffled all over the place. He is the one that allowed the corruption to happen there and it still hasn't been cleared up. I don't know what he'll be into next, but they're trying to keep him in a low profile. They can't really ditch him. We don't know whether the member will run again next time or not. If he does, of course, then he will be ditched.

Then I want to get to the Minister that sits at the far end, who is now the Minister of Natural Resources, who's been playing a very low profile. He tried a low profile and I don't think he was always in the good graces of his party, so they gave him some of the responsibilities that were not high profile, but then they finally figured because he was a little antsy and maybe he was going to join some other party so they made him deal with the seat belt and helmet legislation and that's his recognition to fame in this House.

**A MEMBER:** Wasn't that John boy?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** No, I believe it was the now Minister of Natural Resources. And he has many problems coming as well. He's got a very capable young candidate that's running around in his constituency campaigning and we're going to have Sam in the House here all summer. He's going to be very frustrated. I think he'd like to get back out there.

Then we have the minister who was the Minister of Northern Affairs, the Member for Flin Flon, an enjoyable chap. He's been all over the North with the responsibility that he had. He ran from one northern place to the next and tried to indicate how good things were. I had the occasion in the last four or five months to do a lot of travelling up North and there's a feeling of frustration, nothing has happened, which is the trademark of this government. A lot of talk and no action, no action. But they'll talk you to death about the promises and the things that they will do, but after three and a half years that's why I feel disappointed when we look at what has happened.

Then we get to the Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Highways. I think he's a very frustrated individual. He would have liked to build roads all over this province, but somebody out there was cutting his budget down all the time. I must say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the roads in the province have deteriorated to the point where it's going to cost an awful lot of money just to come back to the status that we had at one time. I know the Minister of Highways was frustrated. He would have liked to spend more money but with the limitations that were put on him - he built a road down to his own cabin, I understand, and got it paved. I might not have heard that correctly, it's an insinuation. But when a man is frustrated he does all kinds of desperate things and we leave it at that.

Then I want to speak about the Minister of the Environment. This is a government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that has promoted the idea that they listen and respond. And this Minister - he hasn't been there that long - I've always enjoyed debating with him, where I was sitting before and where he was sitting as Minister last year. Even if I whispered he could almost hear me, so I always enjoyed that. But you know listening is one thing - but he created a problem with the municipalities.

The restrictions on the use of chemicals for municipal people is an embarrassment. There's a lot of concern

out there. I think the municipalities wrote him; I think they made representation to him; the weed supervisors made representation and they still proceeded to bring in the restrictions that they have and they're really ludicrous. We can go into that stuff but it's crazy and that just goes to show that this is a government that can appear to hear or listen and still do things exactly the way they want to do them.

Then we have the Minister of Community Services. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm missing a lot of the shortcomings of some of these Ministers. I'm just covering the ones that have been obvious to me and I know there are many others that are not, but I know the confusion that has been created, and the Children's Aid Society, for years, has created a lot of concern, a lot of confusion. She indicated today to the Member for Portage "all in due time."

Then we come to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and Culture - was it, one time? - and the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund. I really enjoy this individual - and you know what? - I have to respect him because there is the leader-in-waiting for the NDP and he has been their shrewdest individual. He's managed to get every department to cut down in money and bring it into the Jobs Fund and he must have his signature on more plaques and cheques than the whole of the government put together. Unique. I think it's a great coup; he has done this; he's done it very capably. He's got everybody peeled off and the money channels through him, and he's got the lotteries now too. I don't always catch up as to exactly what's going on. I sometimes think that the Minister of Finance must be wondering who is signing the cheques because I think that gentleman there has manoeuvred it in such a way that he has almost total responsibility in a lot of these things.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, then we come to the Minister of Education and a whole bunch of stuff that I was going to mention here but I think we'll be dealing with that in a different tone and different manner later on sometime. I just want to say, in the Minister of Education's responsibility, the biggest problem has been tax increases. This is the government that said, no more property tax increases, and it's jumping and jumping and it just shows the total disarray and lack of organization that has taken place with the government.

Then we come to the past Minister of Natural Resources. For months, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was building my case as the critic of Natural Resources to have my debate with the Minister of Natural Resources and now we find him transferred. He now has the responsibility of Minister of Labour. It creates a little bit of confusion for me because the now Minister of Natural Resources is a much different character than the one we had. But the mayhem that the Member for St. James has created in that one Department of Natural Resources, you would think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you can't do too much wrong in there.

There isn't too much that he did right in that whole department and that goes all the way from dealing with wildlife, dealing with the water resources, with the hunting aspects of it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be going through that with a fine tooth comb when we get into the Estimates and I expect possibly that the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who is the Minister now,

is probably going to be referring many of these things and saying they're under review.

I'll give you an example of the mayhem that has been created by this one individual in that department - and we want to go into this a little further yet - and the Member for Springfield should listen - engineering fees have increased by 133 percent to the municipalities from \$75 an hour, which was the fee that was being charged for engineering services, to \$175 an hour. The municipalities are rocked and excited about it; they're mad. The Minister of Municipal Affairs - I don't know what role he had in it or whether it was just the Minister of Natural Resources - but these are the kind of things that are happening.

As we continue down the row, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have the Chairman of the Treasury. Without being facetious, the thought crossed my mind that it's like putting the fox in charge of the chickens. We've had a complete reversal with that individual from the time he sat in opposition. I recall him standing back there and he'd belt out a 40-minute speech on anything, being critical all the time. Since he's been on the government side, we hear very little from that individual. I don't know whether his responsibility weighs heavily on his mind or whether other activities do.

Then we come to the Minister of Agriculture. If the Member for Springfield will read Hansard, I covered him pretty well but he wasn't listening at the time. The Minister of Agriculture - what is his track record? He's the individual, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that brought in The Farm Lands Protection Act at a time when there was no need to bring it in because the prices that are happening on the farms right now; there's no need to have any control or protection on that aspect of it. Prices are dropping. But the cutest thing that happened in the last few months was when this Minister was trying to promote the idea that he was going to correct all the ills in terms of the financial responsibility of the farmers and invited everybody across the country to come - and they didn't come. It was an embarrassment. He'd lost his credibility with that move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and then to save face, he comes up with the announcement that happened yesterday. There's so much confusion in the agricultural communities and the financial communities right now with what has happened that nobody knows what to do.

We have 4,000 farmers, supposedly, that are now going to gain some benefit from the announcement yesterday, for one year. What, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is going to happen to the farmers that are in trouble right now and have to borrow more money? Can they borrow at 8 percent? How about the other farmers that borrow from private places like banks or credit unions? The farm community would say, you treated a cow with pinkeye. That's the sort of relationship the Minister has done with his announcement. He's treated pinkeye. Out of a total animal, he's just touched one little aspect of it.

John, don't look so apprehensive; I'll be kind to you. Then we have the Minister responsible for Housing. When I was up at Norway House and Cross Lake and the people showed us the kind of housing they live in - I don't want to make light of it or fun - but I would suggest, Mr. Minister, that you do something to change the type of housing that is provided up there. Surely, for a government that promotes the idea that they look

after the needs of the North, it's tragic. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in homes that were built under CMHC and where this Minister was responsible, after three months, some of the homes that you have built, you could not walk into in stocking feet - well, you could and then you could wring them out, they were that wet and the humidity was that high. The rationale of the type of buildings that they put up is tragic, at a cost of \$64,000 for a building that the people then buy under subsidized housing - a tragedy.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** On a matter of privilege, the Member for Emerson made reference to me as a member being responsible for CMHC. I think the House should know that CMHC is a federal jurisdiction and he should be addressing his remarks to the Honourable William McKnight.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I'll accept the correction there, but this Minister is still responsible for Housing and if there are inequities in the system, whether it's federal or provincial, he has the responsibility to get involved and clear it up and not try and pass the buck. That's a common thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This government, anything that comes up now, they'll pass it on and say well the Federal Government, the Federal Government. — (Interjection)—

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've sort of run through the list of the Ministers and gave them my version of things. We had the Minister of Health speaking before and he said well he had certain comments and he always spoke the truth. I spoke what my version was of the performance of this government based on a Premier that said that they have done more for Manitoba than any other government in Canada had done for their province.

That is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why they need a \$5 million prop-up propaganda advertising program to try and change the image of their Leader, of the Premier. Who is responsible for all these things that have happened in the last three-and-a-half years? It is a leader who cannot lead. This government got elected in 1981. We want to refer to that because we're getting closer to an election again and we want to see why they got elected. They got elected by deception, by promising things that they have not been able to fulfill. Now, they're trying to prop up their image and their Premier with spending millions of dollars.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you must have read some of the advertisements about Jobs Fund. Months after the money's all gone, they're still advertising it. It is an artificial game that's going on at tremendous cost. You know what, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they will reap the benefits. They will reap the benefits. Not of their advertising, but of deceit. They got elected on that basis and they have continued to operate on that basis and they're trying to do the same thing again. It is a government, within our caucus we were talking, that are bankrupt financially, that are bankrupt in terms of new ideas, that are desperate.

The Premier stands up and says think positive. My first impression when I got into the House after being gone for eight-and-a-half months was what a tired looking group they were. They had been able to do their own thing for eight-and-a-half months. When you

think about these things, it is really, I guess, not that surprising. When you take people that get elected off the street or from their constituencies, that maybe have never even run a business, and collectively you put them in charge doing the biggest business in the province, what else can you expect?

Let's look through the ranks and see how many of these people have had business experience, monetary experience? That is one of the reasons why we are in a dilemma.

They give us the idea of promoting job creation. They've done a reversal on many things. They've reversed their position in terms. Now they want to buy jobs. They're trying to push the Limestone issue. They like to detract from the things that have happened in the past. They want to bring the attention to something else. They like to talk about the \$72 million supposed cut-back. They'd like to talk about the job creation with Limestone. They don't want to talk about some of the other effects of it, but I think they were really geared, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to maybe go with an election if the mood looked right. Some of my colleagues still think that they will. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think that they're going to be calling an election now. I don't think they'll be calling one in the fall. I think they'll be waiting till spring of '86. I think they will. I think they have nothing to offer. If they go now, they're gone.

What I would like to ask them and the period that you have - whether it's a year, a year-and-a-half when you finally call the election - try not to create more problems in this province than we have right now economically. We're all Manitobans and we all have to pay for them. I'm anticipating if we're going to have not a very pleasant Budget, I'm anticipating we'll have a lot of blame being tacked on to our federal counterparts again. Then this government is going to run for awhile to see whether there's an issue that they can maybe try and call an election on.

One point that I'd like to touch on yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker - seven minutes - is our relationship with our neighbours in North Dakota over the Garrison issue. It's really upsetting when you consider the fact that two governments, two neighbouring countries have to have a relationship where through the media they throw insults at each other. I cannot understand why our Premier hasn't made a special effort to go down and visit with the Governor of North Dakota and talk and resolve some of these things. I've had the occasion to be out there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and these people are reasonable people. They can understand our point of view. Why isn't this being done? Mr. Deputy Speaker, it hinges on the fact, lack of leadership. It is all a matter of lack of leadership and that is why this government is going to get defeated. The people of Manitoba have served notice on you and you know it. I don't even hear the squeaky voice in the back there. I'm so used to it already there.

I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when this government finally calls the election and we form the government, as we will, we realize we'll have a mess to clean up - it's always that way - that they sort of look after the interests, within reason, until that time.

Thank you very much.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos:** The Member for Thompson.



**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I would just note for the record that I was greeted by a nickname that I've heard used in reference to myself before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that of "Landslide". I must say they must have been reading the same polls I've been reading recently for the Thompson constituency.

Mr. Speaker, this is my fourth opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech Debate. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll see if the Member for Arthur's prediction is correct. I can tell him one thing that if his party continues to ignore the North the way it has, both in government and opposition, I have no worries about being returned to this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this Throne Speech offers us a different opportunity today. In the past, I think, the Throne Speech Debate has fallen into two sorts of themes, on the government side, of stressing government programs both past and proposed, and on the opposition side, criticism of those programs, response specifically to the Throne Speech in that sense, but more specifically, a criticism of the government's programs.

This time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would suggest that the debate on the Throne Speech has to be different. We're entering the fourth year of this Legislature. The government has been in power for three years and it's laid out its proposals for the upcoming year. There will be an election within the next 18 months - perhaps sooner, perhaps later - only time will tell. Certainly an election is on the horizon.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is reflected in the Throne Speech itself. The government has attempted to list some of its past achievements and put forward what it sees as a vision for the province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think that this debate offers the opposition the same opportunity. They will be going to that same election. They're going to be going to the people of Manitoba and one of the things the people of Manitoba are going to ask them is what are you going to do?

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the first few speeches in this debate are any indication, it appears they're not going to be doing that. They're not going to be putting forward their vision for the Province of Manitoba. In the debate today, I will submit that the opposition has failed to put totally such a vision. I will show that there are good reasons why they haven't put forward that vision; in fact, I will even develop what I see as their vision for the Province of Manitoba, since they failed to do it themselves. And Mr. Speaker, I will contrast that clearly with the vision put forward by this party and this government.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the Leader of the Opposition's speech yesterday. I think it proves exactly what I've said. The opposition is continuing to concentrate on a negative approach, continuing to criticize, continuing to merely oppose what this government is doing. It is not putting forward its own proposals for the Province of Manitoba.

You know, I went through this speech. I've got an advance copy of it and I checked paragraph by paragraph and I classified those paragraphs according to whether they were criticism of the NDP, whether they were fairly neutral, or they had anything positive to say at all. Well, there were 135 paragraphs in the speech, of those 108 were strictly negative, five were perhaps

neutral and the remaining 22 had some positive words to say about something. But, you know, even when the Leader of the Opposition was being positive, it wasn't about his own party's vision for the Province of Manitoba. There were only nine paragraphs in the entire 135 that said what the Tories either stand for or what they would do if they were a government. The other paragraphs, which were positive in any sense, either directly quoted the Throne Speech or supported what the NDP was doing in that Throne Speech. So you can see, even when the Conservatives are being positive, in a generally negative context, they're being positive about what we're doing. They're not being positive about what they would do. And as I said, Mr. Speaker, I will be positive later. I will list some of the positive achievements of this government and contrast it with the approach of the opposition.

Well, perhaps I'm being somewhat quick to jump to conclusions. After all, there was the speech yesterday; there was a speech today. Perhaps, things will change; I suspect, however, that they won't. And for proof of this, I would submit that the same approach is contained in this document. The Report from the Legislature, it's put out by the P.C. I presume it's the caucus; it doesn't state whether it's the party or the caucus, and it's dated February, 1985. Well, apart from the usual negative sort of rhetoric, if you read through it, you really wouldn't gather too much about what the Conservatives would do if they were elected government.

The most appalling example of this is their comments on Hydro development. I would invite all members of this House to read this particular document, including members of the Conservative caucus. Because if you read it carefully, you will find that despite the fact that they devoted more than three-quarters of a page in this particular report of the Legislature to hydro development, they made no reference to Limestone, no reference to the NSP power sale, no reference to the start-up date for Limestone, no reference to the start-up date for domestic purposes. You know, this was put out in February.

In January of this year, the Premier of this province announced that tenders for the main civil contract for Limestone had been put out. He announced that in July, those tenders would be awarded, subject to the approval of the National Energy Board, for the NSP power sale and that construction on Limestone would begin in 1985. Why then do the Conservatives one month later, and fully a year after the tabling of the Letter of Intent in regard to the NSP power sale and months of advance notice of the likelihood of the resumption of Limestone construction, why then do they not have one reference at all to Limestone or to the NSP power sale? It's a good question. Well, maybe we should start by piecing together the Tory position, not the Tory position as stated here, because it isn't clearly stated at all, it's merely rhetoric.

Let's piece it together. First of all, they're opposed to the NSP power sale. I don't hear any objection from members of the opposition; I assume that is the case from the statements they've made. If I'm wrong, I would appreciate them correcting me. They also opposed the 1985 start-up date for Limestone. — (Interjection) — Certainly, responds the energy critic for the opposition. But it goes beyond that, Mr. Speaker, it appears that their objection is not only with the NSP power sale or

advancing the construction date of Limestone because of that power sale, but it seems that they have very real questions about whether they would construct Limestone for domestic purposes, whether they would construct Limestone for the needs of Manitoba in the 1990s.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has suggested - and this is documented in a newspaper article on February 2, 1985 - that Hydro could either reduce its reserve cushion and/or cut off some industrial users at peakload times in order to delay Limestone. Does that mean, Mr. Speaker, that they would not start up construction? Instead, they would shut down, say Inco, or another major industrial plant simply because of that fact. Because that's what it implies. Does it mean, Mr. Speaker, that they would risk not being able to supply all of Manitoba's Hydro consumers in order to reduce the reserve cushion? Well, that's what it implies as well.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside, the energy critic of the opposition went even one step further and he said basically that looking at firm power purchases for the province is a very legitimate question. Let's clarify exactly what he's saying. He's saying that we shouldn't be building Limestone for Manitoba demand, we should be buying it, whether it be from the United States or from other provinces. You know, that's not in this document, this document, the Report from the Legislature, and with good reason. I've talked to my constituents and they're clear on where they stand on Limestone and hydro development. I know one thing, regardless of whatever thoughts they have on the NSP power sale and start-up date of Limestone, they feel that we should be developing our Hydro potential. They do not agree whatsoever with the suggestion that we should be buying it. That's why it's not in the Report from the Legislature. — (Interjection) — But, Mr. Speaker, we'll get to that later. We'll get to what the real Tory vision for hydro development is.

Let's look at a number of other items. In this Report from the Legislature, there's also a section on equalization, not a very major article on it, but it's interesting to note that despite their protestations in recent months that they too were concerned about the loss of the \$72 million. It doesn't come out at all in this particular document. You know, they're criticizing us for being opposed to the \$72 million cut in their political document, but on the other hand, they're saying they actually support us. Well, it's clear to me, Mr. Speaker, why that isn't in this particular document. Now that there's a Conservative Government in Ottawa, they don't want to offend them.

You know, it's amazing for me to sit here and see the Member for Arthur, for example, yesterday get up and actually defend that report from the Minister of Finance's office in Ottawa, defend it. You know, I'd never heard one word in defence of what anything the Federal Government did before from that member. But now that there's a Conservative Government in Ottawa, it doesn't matter if they bring in a report which says that farmers are nine times better off than average Canadians. It doesn't matter; that's not their fault. He's going to defend that.

It's the same with equalization. The Conservatives in Manitoba are preparing the groundwork for the Conservatives in Ottawa to say "no." They're trying to

say in this report that if the Conservatives in Ottawa say "no" it's because of the NDP. Well, that is their own political agenda. I don't think it's in the best interests of the province.

Now, let's talk about something else that isn't in there - rent controls. Well, that was a major issue in the last election. We were in favour of reintroducing rent controls; the Conservatives were against it. It's not that they haven't taken a position in this House. The Leader of the Opposition, when he was the Member for Tuxedo, indicated two very interesting propositions in regard to rent controls. One is on Monday, 14 June 1982, he suggested that if there are going to be rent controls, that there be user fees attached to those rent controls. It's in Hansard for that date, Page 19. So in other words, if you want rent controls, you the tenant pay for it. I think that's absolutely ridiculous.

Since that time, he's further clarified his position. It's not that he's in favour of rent controls with user fees. Now he's against rent controls, period. Members of this House remember a speech that he made last year. One of the first speeches he made as leader in which he made it clear that he was opposed to rent controls. Why isn't that in this particular document? I think it's clear. The Conservatives know the people of Manitoba want rent controls. In fact, the broad majority of people support rent controls. Not just tenants, but people as a whole. That's why it's not in here. They're concerned about the negative political impact of that.

The same with what they would do about job creation. There are a few references to the Jobs Fund here, a few critical references. What would they do? Would they cancel it? If not, what form would it take? Are they saying, for example, the Legion in my area which is attempting to build a curling facility, that there is no longer going to be the municipal community assets program, which they are now looking at for potential funding to build that curling facility? If they're saying that then I would like to hear it. But it's not in this document. I think there's good reason why.

Another particular area of real concern to myself, Northern issues. Throughout this entire document, there's no section on the North. There's nothing in there. There is absolutely nothing on the North. It's a major part of this province. I know they've even sent their MLAs into the North, this past year, for the first time since the election three years ago. I know that three Conservative members were in Norway House. They met with seven people in that community. It's one thing which wasn't mentioned in the reports. They obviously haven't learned anything. They haven't learned that when it comes to an item such as this, this, for example, a report from the Legislature which was sent to the Thompson constituency, the people in the North are going to be looking through this to find out what they are doing, what they are suggesting they are going to do for the North. There's nothing in here. I think with good reason.

The reason why these items and others are not in this particular document, Mr. Speaker, is because that party has two agendas. One for a document such as this, one for public consumption, and the second, a private agenda.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they are following the advice of their federal colleague, John Crosbie, who, before the last federal election said that

he was not going to tell the people of Canada what he would do or what the government would do if they were elected because if he did they wouldn't be elected. I heard one member over there say, well good man, that John Crosbie. I think they're saying more that he's a good man. I think they're saying that his philosophy is their philosophy, that his approach to politics is their approach to politics. You say one thing before an election. You set out a public agenda, but then you have a hidden agenda.

I'm going to get to what that hidden agenda is afterwards. Let's consider what would they do. Let's talk about Limestone? What would they do with Limestone? They're so opposed to Limestone, the NSP power sale. What are they going to do? I would suggest that they make that position clear because they could shut it down. I know it's of primary importance to the North, but that's not their concern. I know that there's a great deal of economic spinoff and jobs that will follow from that Limestone development, but that's not their concern. I would suggest if they had the opportunity, would they not build Limestone, but instead to buy power from other provinces. I think that would be shameful, quite frankly. But that, I think, is their agenda.

Let's talk about equalization. If they were a government and they were faced with a challenge to this province of the magnitude of the cuts in equalization which we're faced with, they wouldn't be lobbying very hard in Ottawa. They'd be afraid to embarrass their federal colleagues. That's their version of co-operation. If there's a Federal Government in Ottawa and it happens to be Tory then, well we step very lightly.

Rent controls. A very simple answer what they would do if they were elected. There would be no such thing. Rent controls, I think, would last maybe two or three months at the most.

The Jobs Fund. Well, I'm not sure if they would totally eliminate all the job creation programs. They've been somewhat hypocritical on that. They voted for the Jobs Fund when it's come up for vote, they've criticized it every other opportunity. I would suggest at the very least that the Jobs Fund would be gutted.

In terms of health, education, social services, I would suggest there would be a new round of cutbacks of the type that we saw when the Lyon Government was in. I would point, for example, to what is happening in Ottawa where they've already brought in a whole series of cutbacks. I have in my office four pages, listing department by department and program by program some of the cutbacks they've brought in. That's not even having brought in a Budget. I would suggest that the provincial Tories would do exactly the same.

I'm not saying that the events I have outlined that could happen are not a legitimate vision for this province. I think there are some people in this country who would accept such a vision. Obviously, the Social Credit Government of British Columbia would basically say that would be their kind of vision for a province. I would say, in looking at this caucus across the way, that most of them would probably agree with much of what I'd outlined. I would say it probably even reflects the views of the Leader of the Opposition. I know there are some who would say well he's only a captive of his caucus, that he would like to be more progressive,

that he would like to break free from his caucus which is basically right wing in orientation. I would say that it does fit in with his vision for the province, vision of the kind of area that he represents, Mr. Speaker, the kind of statements that he has made in the past years that I have been in this Legislature.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, if they don't want Limestone in Tuxedo, they do in Thompson. If they don't want the jobs and training opportunities of Limestone in Tuxedo, they do in Thompson. If they want to sit back while we lose \$72 million on equalization in Tuxedo, well they're not going to do it in Thompson. Maybe they don't need rent controls in areas such as that in the province. They do in constituencies such as Thompson. Maybe they're more concerned about the deficit than they are about health and social programs, about educational services. In Thompson, people are more concerned about those services than they are the deficit.

I say, Mr. Speaker, today there are two things that are clear about the Tory vision. 1. That is that vision is not what is stated publicly; that there is a hidden agenda; and 2. That if that agenda was to be made public that many people in many constituencies across this province would oppose that vision. I would suggest to members opposite that they rethink that hidden agenda, they rethink some of those approaches.

I will point to one example, Limestone. Limestone is becoming increasingly a political issue. There's no doubt about it. There's a clear difference between New Democratic philosophy when it comes to Limestone and the Conservative philosophy and approach. If you talk to people, for example, in my constituency, you will find that the support for starting Limestone, for developing our hydro potential comes not from the New Democrat circle, but from all people.

I've had many Conservatives tell me that they are a little concerned about what has been happening. They remember the days of the Roblin administration when a Conservative Government was the government was leading provincial development throughout the country, that they were pushing our hydro development potential. That's what's happening in my constituency. Not just New Democrats but Conservatives too are concerned about it. I would say to those members opposite that while it will be a political issue, there's no doubt about it, that they should reconsider at least part of their opposition to Limestone. If they are saying now that they are opposed to it, they're opposed to the NSP power sale, at least have them say and guarantee to the people of Manitoba - particularly the North - if they are going to be elected that they are not going to shut it down, because there are a lot of people in Thompson who are very very concerned about that. There are people who are graduating from high school, and the parents who are very concerned about the need for job opportunities in the North, because we've had a hard time in recent years with our mining industry being hit by low prices for minerals. We've had a very difficult time with the recession. We need that boost that Limestone can give.

So I would really plead with members opposite to make sure that when they do consider their position on Limestone, that they consider the North, they consider Thompson, they consider the fact that it's not just New Democrats who are saying, "Please develop

Limestone." certainly in my area. It's Conservatives, it's Liberals, it's people across any political spectrum. Please let them consider that because I will say, win, lose or draw on the next election, the most important thing in my area right now, as far as most people are concerned, is that Limestone go ahead. And to myself, as much as the political agenda is important, I think that is equally if not more important, so I think if we can depoliticize at least that aspect of it, it would be for the benefit of all involved.

But let's turn now to the government's view, its vision of the future. Let's look at it. We've said in this Throne Speech that employment is still a major priority. Now we could roll out statistics, we could use the same sort of parade of statistics that the Conservatives are using in this sort of material, but we don't have to. The fact is, if you look at the reports from the last month in terms of the labour force survey, year over year, the last year, in the last twelve months we've had the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. We are tied with Saskatchewan in that category. So as much as you and your reports in the Legislature can try and manipulate statistics from particular months or particular negative statistics, that's a fact.

Now if you're saying that you feel you could do better, that's fine, but let's hear how you would do it. — (Interjection) — I don't think that you are. I think we're the ones who are putting forward - the New Democratic Party is putting forward proposals for the future.

Limestone. You know we've stated our position very clearly with the people of Manitoba on that. We feel it's financially feasible. We also feel though that it's economically essential for job creation, first of all in terms of construction jobs and second of all, in terms of indirect jobs, because Limestone will create nearly twice as many indirect jobs for every direct job that is created on the construction site. We've said that.

In terms of other issues, the Jobs Fund. We've said that we feel the Jobs Fund is important. You know we've taken a lot of political criticism over it but we're not backing down. We think that that kind of job creation, short-term as it may be in some cases, more committed to long-term job creation as it may be in others, is necessary. That's part of what we see for the Province of Manitoba as being the solution to our economic problems.

Equalization. We said clearly that we're going to defend Manitoba's rights. We defended them just as vigorously when there was a Liberal Government in with regards to equalization and members opposite will know about that. And they will also know that we will do the same with a Conservative administration and I would just throw a bit of advice at them. If you look at the record of Conservative Governments, which have been in for any period of time in this country, you will find that they have had an ability, not just to be partisan in their dealing with governments in Ottawa, but to stand up for the interests of their particular province regardless of who is in. You know I think that will be the real test in the next few years.

Pierre Trudeau started off with six Liberal Governments when he was first elected Prime Minister. He ended up with zero. It's the same challenge for Brian Mulroney and I think those that will fall by the wayside will be those such as the Manitoba Tories, who can't distinguish between their own Conservative Party affiliations and the best interests of their province.

Continuing, Mr. Speaker, with what we are proposing, let's talk about health care programs, education, social programs. We're continuing, Mr. Speaker, to avoid the kind of cutbacks that you're finding in many other provinces and develop new programs. We're not following the lead of right-wing governments throughout this country.

Rent controls. We stated publicly within the last few months that we are clearly committed to maintaining rent controls in Manitoba, no doubt about it. We said it publicly, privately, wherever we had the opportunity. The members of the Conservative Party certainly do not.

And of most concern to myself, we do have a vision of the North, a vision of its future. Limestone development, that's the key, that's the key. Northern involvement in Limestone development is even more important, and to back that up this government has committed itself to training programs to ensure that that does happen.

Let's talk about health care. In the Estimates last year the Minister of Health announced there's going to be an Air Ambulance Service established which will cover the North and a number of additional rural areas. The Member for Swan River will certainly be aware of the fact that his constituency is now going to be covered by that program. It's not an inexpensive program. It took a major commitment to develop that program but the fact that we could do it, given the difficult financial times, I think is proof positive of the fact that this government is concerned about people in those areas.

In terms of highways. We hear a lot of talk from members opposite about highways but there's one thing that is clear. When it comes to the maintenance of highways in the North where often that maintenance and construction is essential, not just for comfort but for safety, this government has backed that up. It has given priority commitment to highways in the North.

It's also been responsive to local concerns. I could give one example in my own constituency. In 1981, when the previous government shifted to the ESP formula for educational funding, a number of cottage owners in my area found that their school taxes or their education levy - pardon me - shot up by as much as 700 percent. Now I worked with those cottage owners, I worked with the various ministers responsible and they now are being treated equally with other cottage owners across the country. That has been rolled back.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** You've got to have "fat cats" up there.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Paint Lake cottage owners will be pleased to know that the Member for Pembina refers to them as "fat cats".

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding:** Order please. Order please. I'm having some difficulty hearing the honourable member.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Now I see why the previous Member for Thompson got nowhere in trying to get that tax

rolled back, Mr. Speaker. They feel that cottage owners in the North are "fat cats". They've just stated so, publicly, several of them. Well I can tell you, far from the fact that one of those cottage owners is the previous Member for Thompson - I suppose they might know something more about him than others - I don't feel that the average person in Thompson who has a cottage should have to pay 700 percent more on their education levy because of the insensitivity of people such as those opposite.

And as I said in terms of responsiveness to local concerns, this government has acted in terms of education. There are a number of new programs in Thompson at the present time. There has been expansion of the high school and I can say that there are good prospects of future expansion of education, in fact a number of major initiatives in that area in the next period of time. But you know that's the Tory vision, Mr. Speaker, that's the NDP vision. What about the people of Manitoba? What about the people of Manitoba? What are their views today? What is their outlook? I would suggest to you that their outlook is basically optimistic. They're optimistic about the future of this province. You know it's showed up in national polls, provincial polls, it shows up to anybody you talk to. People realize that there's a lot of problems out there but there's more optimism now than there has been in a long time. Is it just an artificial optimism? Well, it's not. Capital investment has been increasing and people are investing in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, they're putting their money where their mouth is.

In my own constituency Inco, over the last few years, has been investing in excess of \$90 million. That shows commitment to this province and it's not anything to do with politics in some cases and some cases it is. But the bottom line is that people are optimistic and I contrast this optimism to the kind of view of this province that the Tories are putting forward, whether it be in this report from the Legislature or the Leader of the Opposition's speech yesterday. Their basic message is negative. Negative about Manitoba, its economic prospects, negative about virtually anything that this government does, but I can tell them that is not the view of people in this province and that is why within the next period of time, it's going to be very important for them to develop a vision which fits in with that because if they don't, I think they're going to find that their arrogance about being the government-elect in this province. It's going to disappear very rapidly because political parties have to be in step with the people, not just in terms of specific issues or political tactics, but in terms of their general view of the future, their general outlook in this province.

I've already seen this in the North. In the last federal election - I'd like to mention this for the Leader of the Opposition - the Conservative vote dropped; the NDP vote went up, and why? It's because they could see, after a number of years of NDP Government in the province, they could see the difference. In one sense it didn't make sense, did it? Governments are supposed to lose support after elections. People are supposed to become upset about this or that or the other issue, but the Conservative vote dropped and the NDP vote went up. This was despite a massive swing to the Tories federally, despite the fact that the Tories held that seat as little as six years ago. It's because, as I said before,

it's not just New Democrats who are saying this; it's people who are either moderate in their political persuasions or, in some cases, perhaps even Conservative philosophically.

In my area they've turned to the NDP because they know that it's paid attention to the concerns of the North and I say that sort of process is going to happen in many other areas throughout this province if the Conservatives continue their negative approach and they continue to not propose alternatives for this province.

I can tell you, I'm going to point that fact out, the fact that they don't have an agenda - or at least a public agenda for this province - every chance I can get. The gloves are off. We're basic in the pre-election mode I think, both parties, and I could tell you that I'm going to keep telling my constituents and the people of this province that they better ask the Tories about their hidden agenda because I don't want them to get hit with the same kind of hidden agenda we're beginning to see federally and that we saw in 1977 when the Tories got in then.

I'll say one more thing on a personal note. I'm personally ready for an election at any time. Since the last election I've knocked on every door in Thompson and, in fact, in a number of cases been in areas twice and even three times. By working with a government that cares about the North I feel that, as an MLA, I've been able to achieve things on behalf of my constituents.

In terms of school renovations, job creation, . . . funding, and yes Paint Lake taxes. They may laugh, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you that the Paint Lake cottage owners, who are just average people in Thompson, greatly appreciated the fact that there was a government that did listen to their concerns.

It's not all finished yet, and in that sense I don't think there will be an imminent election. I know in terms of the North there's a number of new initiatives that are on the way, particularly in the area of education. I know, in terms of Limestone, there's a lot of work still to be done to make sure there's going to be Northern involvement. There's going to be adequate training for that development, so in that sense I don't see any need for an imminent election, in one sense; but on the straight political sense I'm willing to fight this government's record in the North, in my constituency, and stack it up against what they're saying, even publicly, when they don't say a word about the North, or privately, when we all know in the North that more Conservative government would mean more cutbacks and more problems for Northerners.

So I guess my bottom line is, I'm optimistic too. I'm as optimistic about this province, I think, as most Manitobans are. I'm even optimistic politically. When I got up I was referred to as landslide because I won by 72 votes in the last election. I know, Mr. Speaker, you have some sympathy with those who are caught in tight elections. I know, from your own experience, what happened in one election and it doesn't always translate into exactly what happens in the next election. Really, when you get down to that bottom line that's not what it's really all about, about 72 votes in Thompson or marginal seats there or political speeches here or there, the bottom line as to who's going to do the best job for their particular constituency or area and the province.

Apart from all the political things that go back and forth, I say one thing to the members of the opposition. They are not giving any proposals to us; they're not giving any real agenda. It's that hidden agenda that scares me and I think it's beginning to scare a lot of other people in this province. Perhaps I shouldn't be saying this because, politically, it would be the best for the NDP because people know about Conservative hidden agendas. They've seen it before, but in terms of the best interests of the province, I think it's wise that their views on hydro development, on economic development generally, on rent controls, on health and social programs, do come out because I'm really concerned that if they ever do get the chance to get back in government it's going to be stopping Limestone; it's going to be getting rid of rent controls, cutting job creation programs and cutting back on health and education. I don't want to see that and I can tell you and I'm sure I speak for all my colleagues. In the next election we are going to fight you tooth and nail on each and every one of those items on your hidden agenda.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a refreshing opportunity to follow the Throne Speech Debate from such a laudible member as the Member for Thompson talking about hidden agendas, when today his Minister of Community Services didn't admit to the hidden agenda that her government has of closing the Psychiatric School of Nursing in Portage la Prairie. You talk about hidden agendas, Mr. Speaker, talk about the Minister of Finance who today admitted, but he couldn't quite bring himself to tell the whole truth, that the credit rating of this province is going down. Where's the hidden agenda and who has them? They're on that side of the House because of an incompetent, leaderless and mismanaged government. That's the problem, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Member for Thompson could fix the school taxes to the cottage owners in Thompson at the same time that farmers in my constituency and my colleagues' constituencies are going broke because of school taxes raised by this government, changing to education financing formulas so that his cottage owners get bailed out while farmers in my constituency go broke. That's equity and fairness, and I want the Member for Thompson to come down to Pembina Constituency and to southern Manitoba and give his line and song and dance about how roads and repairs and maintenances on roads is needed in Northern Manitoba for safety, when we're driving on repaired pot holes in Southern Manitoba because there hasn't been a dollar spent on the Highway Budget south of No. 1 Highway in three years. Where's the money gone? If it hasn't gone to the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker, it's gone to the Member for Thompson's Constituency to shore up landslide's opportunity to win the next election. I hope he keeps his confidence, Mr. Speaker, because that's one seat that he's going to have trouble maintaining a 72 vote majority in, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on a kinder note, congratulations on you once again presiding over this House and to the

new Assistant Clerk, I want to offer my congratulations to her in her new role and I know she'll do a good job.

I come into this Session optimistic, probably more optimistic than I've come into the last several Sessions of this House. I come in expecting that we would see the NDP blueprint for the future, what they would be doing for the Province of Manitoba because, after all, this government is near the end of their term and this is a pre-election Throne Speech, by all estimations, and I believed that they would lay out their blueprint for the future.

At the church service - and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that was the best church service of all of them I've attended and I think I've only missed one and I may not have even missed that one - that was an inspiring church service, Mr. Speaker, and Reverend Canon William McGregor left a message that I think is important for all of us to consider and to share with all Manitobans.

Reverend Canon William McGregor said, "Where there is no vision, people perish." Mr. Speaker, not wanting to make interpretations that the Reverend may not have wished made, I think his message was solidly to the Premier of this province and to this leaderless ship of state that he is governing, that he has lost his vision.

Given that sort of optimism of the church service, I thought that we would see the Throne Speech develop the NDP vision for the future of Manitoba and, after listening to the Throne Speech on Thursday of last week, we were given a hallucination, a nightmare. There is no vision in the Throne Speech; there is no vision in this government; there is no vision in this New Democratic Party.

The Throne Speech was truly a nothing document this time around. There was nothing new in it. It was a dietary Throne Speech. There certainly was, to quote one of the ads, "No beef in it." There was nothing in that Throne Speech that gives Manitobans optimism. Once again, this government has failed to even give passing recognition to the private sector as the engine for growth and job creation in the Province of Manitoba. Not one single reference, Mr. Speaker. There is no vision in this beleaguered government. There's no vision that recognizes and includes and welcomes the private sector of the job creation of this province. There is no vision in this New Democratic Party of policy to develop my province as an entity, as a complete community. There's no vision for Manitobans as a group of citizens working together. There's no vision of Manitobans as Manitobans.

There is no vision in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, to provide a stable and secure and prosperous future for our working families, for our seniors, for those less fortunate in our Manitoba society that rely on us in government to provide some semblance of comfort in their lives. There is no vision for our youth in Manitoba, many of whom are graduating to go on the unemployment rolls. Mr. Speaker, there was certainly no vision for yet unborn Manitobans in this Throne Speech. There is no vision given to us by the New Democratic Party founded on integrity, honesty, and intellectual principles.

There is not even a vision, Sir, based on a philosophical commitment. To us, on this side of the

House, this seems indeed strange, Mr. Speaker, because we have always said, as members of the Progressive Conservative Party, that the New Democrats are a group of people tied together by philosophy and ideology. We have always said that they were the academics and the dreamers. We've always said that the NDP are the pipe-and-sandal corps. We said that the NDP are those who muse but never soil their hands. We've always said that they are those who spend but they don't invest. Mr. Speaker, we've always believed that the NDP are a gang of travelling socialists. Have NDP card, will travel. They're willing to travel to any place in Canada where there is an NDP Government that can allow them to get their snouts in the public trough.

But for a government that is nearing the end of its term, where has the vision gone for this group? Where is their vision of the future? Where are these social activists that were elected in 1981 that got accolades as being the social activists that were going to so much for this province? They were elected containing an incredible wealth of talent, one reporter for the Free Press even said. What has that wealth of talent given us? Mr. Speaker, where are the doers that the Premier always talks about? The doers, the people that get things done. Why do the NDP have no longer any vision?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll offer my analogy as to why they have lost their vision. This is a party and a government with a bunker mentality. They are hunkered down. They do not know where to turn, what to do. They have lost their philosophical underpinnings. The harsh world of government and the reality of fiscal constraints has got them hunkered down in a bunker mentality. They have no vision, with the exception of one vision and one vision only. That vision is one of personal self-preservation. That is the vision of this government; to retain power and to win the election at any cost and at all costs. That's the only vision.

Now, why, Mr. Speaker, is it so terribly important to this group of ideologues who are approaching the end of their term, why is it so important that they win the next election? Is it because they are going to improve the lot of the working Manitoban? We know that's not happened. There are more people unemployed today than there were in 1981. Are they going to give us another four years of the miserable failures in government that they have delivered to us already? Let's just remind honourable friends opposite of some of their miserable failures.

Starting out with the Minister of Energy and Mines, he lost three viable projects in the private sector for the Province of Manitoba. He lost them; he bungled them; he fumbled them. He went back with the same offer on the Western Power Grid and he lost them. He lost all of them. Private investment, Mr. Speaker, has not yet achieved the level it was at in 1981 in constant dollars, let alone in inflation adjusted dollars. The deficits, Mr. Speaker, have skyrocketed in this province to something that is alarming, alarming enough that the Minister of Finance has to run down to New York on a secret mission to plead with the lending agencies not to lower our credit rating. Our taxes are all up, Mr. Speaker. Is that the vision of the future that this group is going to tell Manitobans they can do for them in the next four years? Well, the only reason they want to win the next election is for themselves, their personal self-preservation, and for the chosen few that they drag along with them.

Why do I say this, Mr. Speaker? Well, the proof comes up almost daily on this. I ask you the question, Mr. Speaker. Where else could Terry Sargeant, complete with his hirelings in tow, be employed anywhere in Canada outside of Manitoba? Nowhere. Nowhere, Mr. Speaker. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, where could unemployed and unemployable deputy ministers and senior staff from the Blakeney administration in Saskatchewan find a job anywhere in Canada outside of Manitoba? Nowhere. Nowhere, Mr. Speaker. There is no other socialist government in Canada. This province that is dear to all of us is the last bastion of the left wing in Canada. It is the last hope for those travelling socialists that I have referred to earlier on. The Province of Manitoba is the last place the travelling socialist from across Canada can come and get his snout firmly entrenched in the public trough, Mr. Speaker. This is the NDP's last battleground.

Now, my honourable friend from Flin Flon asks what Mulroney is doing. He's making some mistakes like appointing Lewis to the United Nations. That's No. 1 mistake. You can't put a socialist in charge of our affairs at the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, while I'm on the subject of Lewis and the United Nations, the United Nations voted \$96 million for a grandiose convention centre in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The United States and 14 other countries voted against that. Where was Canada? We were abstaining from voting while our appointment, Lewis, the man who claims to represent the poor, the deprived, the weak, and the innocent in society, refused to vote. He argued that the United States position was wrong. The United States position that they were arguing was that \$96 million should be spent on food to prevent starvation, on agricultural policy to prevent future starvation. Where did Lewis, the humanist, vote? No, he didn't even have the guts to vote for a palace in a communist country and show his true colours. He abstained from voting and that's why I say my Prime Minister made a mistake in putting him in the United Nations, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hate to get distracted from the main theme of my speech, but . . .

**A MEMBER:** What about Cherniack?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now that's another one. Here we have Cherniack, a former member of this House, one of the agents of influence that I read about in the KGB book, is head of Manitoba's security or Canada's security. Now isn't that a wonderful appointment. That's another bad one, Mr. Speaker.

**A MEMBER:** Who is that, Coates?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon has mentioned the Honourable Minister Coates from federally who resigned over a slight indiscretion

called "Tiffany's", while his colleague who he sits beside is still in Cabinet. Has he admitted to his indiscretion? Has he proved his innocence? No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for River East and the Government House Leader asks, am I making an allegation? They're saying am I making an allegation? Of course I'm not. But if innocence is there it can be proven in a court of law and it hasn't been. No one would slander me in such a way, Mr. Speaker, and no one would slander any member on this side of the House in such a way, but silence is golden when it comes to their side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP view Manitoba as the last battleground in Canada. This election will be a very hard fought one. It will be supported, this New Democratic Party will be supported in their efforts to retain government by every single union across Canada, by every provincial New Democratic Party and by the Federal New Democratic Party. Those three combined, Mr. Speaker, will put literally hundreds and thousands of paid organizers in this province to try to retain power in this province, because it is the last Socialist bastion in Canada, the last place that the unemployables, the travelling Socialists can get a job in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, no vision from the New Democrats; no consistent philosophy guiding their actions. And what have their actions been in their three years of government? Well, Mr. Speaker, they have embarked on a deliberate campaign of dividing Manitobans into separate little groups, each to be dealt with separately, each to be promised separate things, each to be treated as a separate entity. They are playing the fringe groups. They are playing the fringe causes, Mr. Speaker, and they are forgetting about the mainstream of the Manitoba population - the working man and woman, the farm community, the industrial sector and all its workers - they have forgotten about those and they have sectioned off Manitobans into separate little groups. And why do they want these divisions? Well, they want these divisions so they can portray to them on a smaller group and on an individual basis that only the New Democrats can be their political saviours; that only the New Democrats can provide them with the funding they need; that only the New Democrats can champion their cause, whether it be equal rights, equal pay, whatever. They segregate people into little groups and promise them the world.

Now let's take a look at some of these groups. The first one, Mr. Speaker, is of course our Native people in the Province of Manitoba and the New Democratic Party considers them to be owned completely by the New Democratic Party, that they will not vote any other way. They consider, the NDP consider the Native vote in this province to be a block vote. And what have they done for the Native community? Well, they've promised them the world, the Native community voted for them, but what have they done for them in the interim? They have discarded them as used people; they did what they were supposed to do - the Native community voted this government in - and they discard them for three years and they will court them again in the next six months to try to bring their votes back on to achieve government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting proposition because part of the promise to the Native community has been the concept of Indian self-government and

we on this side of the House had asked the Premier on a number of occasions, what does Indian self-government mean? Now the Premier of course - we shouldn't expect him to answer questions like that - and he doesn't know. He has never told us and he has no concept of it. But I put this proposition to you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask collectively my NDP friends across the aisle, does Indian self-government mean that the Fort Alexander Indian Band can rightfully dismiss teachers who are working on their reserve? Is that what Indian self-government means? Does it mean control over their education system? I don't hear anyone disagreeing. Possibly that's part of Indian self-government, we don't know.

But on that issue, Mr. Speaker, where have their supporters in the government been? They have been hiding, Mr. Speaker, because when it comes to Indian self-government and the possibility of the Native bands deciding who teaches their children, this government is silent. And why is this government silent, Mr. Speaker? Because Murray Smith with the Manitoba Teachers' Society is in saying, don't touch it with a 10-foot pole, and these people comply because they feel sure enough that the Native vote is in their hip pocket; that they'd best cater to the wishes of Murray Smith and the MTS and discard the Native view. Where does self-government lead this government and the Native people in Manitoba? We don't know; the government doesn't know; the Premier doesn't know; but it will be one of the promises they make to attempt to garner that block of votes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the ethnic community has been one that has been catered very very diligently by our friends across the aisle. The Minister of Cultural Affairs is probably the most generous Minister in this government in terms of providing grants to ethnic groups, to special interest groups, the lobby groups, to all sorts of groups under the guise of Cultural Affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know why the Minister of Cultural Affairs is doing that because he knows they're going to lose the next election and he is building his support in the ethnic community to win the next leadership of the New Democratic Party to get rid of the hapless leader they now have and that's what he's doing. He's using the ethnic community and taxpayer dollars to garner that kind of support. And do you know what? He'll win. He'll win because the only competition is the Government House Leader and that's no competition. He's lost, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact he probably won't even be in this House but the Member for Cultural Affairs will not lose probably his seat.

But, Mr. Speaker, this dealing of the ethnic community in separate little groups and dividing them off, has it helped them become part of the mainstream of Manitoba, a desire they all have, that the membership all has of the ethnic community? They want to become part of Manitoba, the whole Manitoba, Manitoba as a community, but having them part of the whole Manitoba community does not serve the political purposes of the New Democrats. They have to keep them separate, they have to keep them different and apart, so that they can appeal to the various factions in the ethnic community as the NDP being their only salvation, their only hope, their only advocate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have given to us by the Minister of Cultural Affairs and financed by the



taxpayers of Manitoba is one of the greatest feudal systems you've ever seen, dependency of the ethnic communities by keeping them separate and apart and funded differently, and we've got the dependency that the NDP hopes will generate in those groups to deliver votes to the New Democratic Party. It ain't going to happen. But, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was an example of feudal democracy in Canada, it's the program that the Minister of Cultural Affairs is undertaking to advance his leadership aims and to advance hopefully another block of vote for the New Democrats, but it isn't going to work, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, consider the New Democrats' effort in shelving off and dividing another group of Manitobans; and that, of course, is our Franco-Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. These ideologues back two years ago decided that they could guarantee forever the vote of the francophone community for the New Democratic party if they did one thing, and that was pass a constitutional amendment guaranteeing language equality and bilingualism in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, that failed because it was a policy directive that was not based on sound principles and good legislation; it failed because it was a policy founded on political opportunism. All Manitobans recognized that, including the Franco-Manitoban community, who now, as a result of this government, find themselves divided when they didn't want to be divided from the mainstream of Manitoba; they find feelings still running high; they find animosities that didn't exist, and what is even more important, Mr. Speaker, and it's been said a thousand times but it bears repeating, the action of this gang of incompetents in the handling of the French language constitutional amendment set back the case of legitimate services in French in this province for 20, and possibly 40 years. They hindered, they didn't help, because their policy was based on political opportunism and not sound principle.

The labour union, Mr. Speaker, is another group that has been sidled off by this New Democratic Government - and I'm not sure whether the NDP have separated the labour unions or whether the labour unions have separated the NDP, but nevertheless it is a very close knit little clique they have there. I've been careful to say, Mr. Speaker, it's not the rank and file membership of the labour unions; it is the senior people, the elected people, it is the union bosses that are so close to these people. They are a declining group, organized labour in this province, as are the New Democrats. But as long as the unions have control of the NDP's party machinery, as long as they have control of the back rooms of the New Democratic party and, more importantly, and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, as long as they have control of the fund raising in this party, then they will always be married to the New Democrats. That is an Achilles' heel that they can ill afford because organized labour has put demands on this government for legislative amendments that are bad; that are bad for Manitoba as a province; that are bad for our industrial community and the development of that industrial community; that are bad for investment in this province and, most importantly, legislative amendments that are bad for creating jobs in the Province of Manitoba.

Who's jobs are we talking about? We're talking about jobs for the rank and file member of the labour unions

in most cases, and this government's labour legislation passed because, if they did not pass labour legislation the unions would not support them moneywise with organizers in the next election and in the back rooms of this party. If ever there was a government in the pockets of a special interest group it is this government, the New Democrats, in the hip pockets of organized labour union bosses, and that is the cold, hard, blunt facts of it.

Given that they don't want to do anything against the unions because they lose the votes, the organizers, and the money, let's consider the legislative package that we have been given by this government for the organized labour bosses in this province. We've got such things as first-contract legislation; we've got the provision that my leader referred to in his address yesterday of the clause where anyone who buys a failed business in this province must assume the former and existing union contract.

These New Democrats passed that. The labour unions were happy, the bosses were happy, they got part of what they wanted in the legislative package. But who benefited, Mr. Speaker? The working man benefited but unfortunately the working man who benefited is in Oklahoma. The working man in my colleague, the MLA for Morris' constituency, in Morris, in Letellier, who worked for Superior Bus, did not benefit. They lost their jobs because of that legislation and workers in Oklahoma thank this socialist government for their anti-business labour legislation because it has created 100 jobs to date and it will create another 400 within the next two years. Were the bus orders not there? They have 3,200 bus orders right now and the company is growing in orders.

This government is going to run into its second instance where that labour law is going to provide workers with jobs, but unfortunately it's not going to be workers in Manitoba, it's going to be workers in Saskatchewan when the CI plant leaves this province and locates in Saskatchewan.

**A MEMBER:** They drove them out.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** How many examples do you have to have of the effects of bad labour legislation before you'll admit it's wrong and change it for the benefit of the working person in this province?

Mr. Speaker, the ultimate in - well, can I use hypocrisy, is that parliamentary? The ultimate in stupidity was the announcement by the Minister of Culture and Trade and Technology - the next leader of the New Democratic Party after they lose the election. He stood up yesterday and he told us how proud he was that the Manitoba Jobs Fund was providing monies to companies, not who were moving to Manitoba to locate and create new jobs, but companies that were going to leave this province and locate elsewhere, and he provided the Jobs Fund money to get them to stay, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that to me is bizarre. Here we have a government who has instituted a payroll tax, increased sales tax, cost of living, deficit, brought in anti-business labour legislation, and now they're having to use taxpayer money to buy firms to stay in Manitoba, let alone locate here. If that isn't the ultimate demonstration

of the failure, the abject failure of their policy, I don't know what other example they need. These people will try and sell this record to the people of Manitoba.

That announcement yesterday by the Minister of Culture followed hard on the heels of the speech by the MLA for Wolseley where she decried the injection of money into businesses to get them to locate here. We weren't even talking about money for businesses to locate here, we were talking about money to stop businesses from leaving here. Surely she must feel a little silly after making that speech on Monday and following up with that announcement yesterday. To my colleagues, I don't expect an apology from the MLA for Wolseley. She knows not what she said or does.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting other group - and the MLA for Thompson made reference to this - that Northern Manitoba is the exclusive domain of the New Democrats, that they have done everything good for the citizens of Northern Manitoba and, of course, we did nothing. Well, that's fine. They have promised Northern Manitoba the world; they've promised them jobs in their ill-fated Limestone development. Mr. Speaker, the question I ask to the MLA for Thompson and to New Democrats over on that side of the House is, are you going to be so biased in your hiring requirements that you have to be from Northern Manitoba so that you deprive people in my constituency from the opportunity of working on Limestone? There's unemployment in Pembina constituency. Is that what this government's policy is going to be, that the \$3 billion Limestone development will be the exclusive right of Northern Manitoban constituencies, to the exclusion of southern Manitoba workers?

**A MEMBER:** Are you opposed to that?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the concept I asked him about, that if only Northern Manitobans get jobs on the Limestone construction site, and that my unemployed people in my constituency are deprived of it because of government policy, you bet I'm opposed to that. And any thinking Manitoban would be opposed to that, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection)

Mr. Speaker, I want to add one more thing to the Northern community coddling that this government has done. Recall, Sir, the debate in 1978 when we initiated block funding with the City of Winnipeg. The wail and cries and the fuss and the bother and we were wrong doing it. The city was going to go to hell in a hand basket by allowing this. What have they promised in the Throne Speech for Northern communities in the Province of Manitoba? The very form of block funding that they opposed when they were on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe you understand slightly why we use the word "hypocrisy" from time to time in describing the actions of this government, because, Sir, they are on both sides of the issue. They have not been consistent in their policy or their philosophical underpinnings to make decisions, they change with the wind. They are trying to be middle of the road people and you can't do that with a group of left wing ideologists that we have over there. They are in no-man's-land politically, Mr. Speaker, and it shows in the kind of policy direction they are taking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, their vision of this province is one of self-preservation; it is one of win the election at any cost and at all cost; it is one that says people be damned. The only people that count are New Democrats, card-carrying New Democrats, and they are going to attempt to use their chosen groups that they have separated off to achieve their aims of election win.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it will work because Manitobans more and more are recognizing that this government is not one that has governed competently; they recognize this government as leaderless; they recognize it as a faltering, stumbling, reactionary government with no goal but self-preservation; and self-preservation, Mr. Speaker, will not wash in the Province of Manitoba. Self-preservation, because they are unemployable if they are defeated, will not win the next election, Mr. Speaker. I say to members opposite that surely the citizens of Manitoba deserve more from their government, and surely the man and the woman on the streets and in the rural communities of Manitoba deserve more than selfish, self-preservation that they are getting from this current government.

Mr. Speaker, I end with this challenge to my colleagues in the government. Now, Sir, that you have screwed up your courage and called the Legislature back, I ask you, collectively, call up your courage and screw up the election.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

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

**MR. P. EYLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the late hour, I wonder if we could call it 5:30?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order?

**MR. H. ENNS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, if members opposite do not wish to carry on the debate, we certainly are prepared to.

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

**MR. P. EYLER:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to see that the opposition is keen to hear what I have to say today.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. P. EYLER:** Could I have some order, Mr. Speaker? My colleagues seem to be creating a little interference here.

I'd like to compliment you, Mr. Speaker, on once again occupying the seat which you hold in this Assembly, and I was pleased to see that you were telling your constituents recently that you will be running again as a New Democrat.

I'd also like to welcome the new Member for Fort Garry, that's G-A-R-R-Y. It's nice not to be the most junior person in the Legislature anymore and I'm sure

we're all looking forward to some interesting new fresh ideas from the Member for Fort Garry.

What I'd like to do today, Mr. Speaker, is restrict myself to one basic theme in the Throne Speech debate, one which did not get much coverage from the Leader of the Opposition, but one which I think is probably central to the message that we wish to convey to the people of Manitoba and, in particular, that theme is the progress and the promise for development and expansion and growth in the economy of Manitoba.

I don't think that it's any secret that Limestone with a \$3 billion investment is the biggest project in North America when it goes ahead. I'm rather disappointed in what the Leader of the Opposition had to say about that because I'm rather excited about the prospect, I think it's probably one of the best things that could hit this province. I notice that someone in the press gallery on Sunday was wondering what the Leader of the Opposition would have to say about this. It was a fellow from the . . . — (Interjection) — I wish it was the Trib . . . from the Winnipeg Sun. This fellow from the Winnipeg Sun, it said, I quote: "What about Limestone which, Filmon says, is being started two years too early? If he becomes Premier, will he stop it or not? Manitobans need to know answers from you too, Gary, and hope you'll start giving them soon."

The very next day the Leader of the Opposition had his opportunity to give that answer and I was really looking forward to hearing it from him.

**A MEMBER:** Did he give it?

**MR. P. EYLER:** Well this is what he said. This is what he said, "Our position is very clear and straightforward as it has been for more than a decade." But after that I really lost track of what was going on. He never did answer the question from the press gallery. These are questions which the people of Manitoba want answered - that's what it says right here in The Sun. So I would ask Mr. Filmon, again, is he going to stop it? Is that his election platform? Would he stop Limestone? — (Interjection) — Well maybe he didn't have time, perhaps he just didn't have time to give that answer in his speech you know, it wasn't that long. But if you read the Free Press today it says that it was 115 minutes - and that's a lot of minutes - it's not very long in terms of hours though, it's almost two hours - but I think even that's stretching it. I'll bet that that 115 minutes is a gross over-estimate of how long he spoke. That's five minutes short of two hours. Now our journals show that this House adjourned at 4:30 p.m. yesterday. Now, going backwards, you'll find out he had to have started speaking at 2:35 p.m. in order to be finished at 4:30 p.m., if he spoke for 115 minutes and with a 40-minute question period and 15-minute debate on MACC loans, how did it all get squeezed in, how did he squeeze that 115 minutes in? More than likely it's about an hour-and-one-half and I suspect that maybe the press is being a little generous to Mr. Filmon, or to the Leader of the Opposition, in saying that he spoke for 115 minutes. — (Interjection) — He didn't say much but he certainly stretched it out as much as he could.

But to get back to the Limestone project, which is really one of the basic programs which we want to put in place to help expand the economy of Manitoba, there

is a lot of profit to come out of there, and that profit, \$1.7 billion, can be put to some very useful purposes in the future.

One of the things we would like to do in this Session is to pass legislation to allow the province to participate in the profits that come from those sales, not just simply by having increasingly lower and lower hydro rates compared to the rest of Canada; we're already the lowest in Canada. What we want to do is put this money into more economic development programs which will expand other sectors of the economy, and that's a key concept here, because, in reality, our resources are sunset industries. They're on the decline. They're not going to be the key to the future. There are certainly economic rents that can be recaptured such as hydro, and we should be capturing them in order to reinvest them, but that's not where the growth is going to come from. Certainly building Limestone will expand our economy but it's not going to make it grow, not simply on its own.

It's not the panacea. The Leader of the Opposition says that we talk about it as the panacea. I don't know that we've ever talked about it as the panacea. It seems we make one step forward and the Federal Government takes us one step backward. We have 6,000 jobs in construction and the Federal Government takes 5,000 jobs away from us in cutbacks. Now that's not a panacea. We're hardly treading water with the Federal Government behind us like that.

I would like to see more input from the opposition in the way of positive approach to solving our problems. I'd like to see them take a more co-operative and positive approach to preventing cutbacks in Ottawa which hurt Manitoba.

You know, in River East Collegiate the big talk is about how the Federal Government has cut back job creation for summer jobs. That's really going to hurt. They know that. It's going to hurt a lot. That's 1,000 jobs there. That's not a drop in the bucket. It's a major cutback and the kids are concerned about that. Now maybe you had them last year but you don't this year. If the opposition doesn't take a more positive approach to job creation, to job preservation, they're going to lose that. They're going to lose the footholds they've had. They talk about the polls. Well, everyone's seen the polls, but the polls are only one point in time and there's trends involved. We know the trends and they know the trends and they know where they're going and they know where we're going, so they want an election right now before we get where we're going and they get where they're going. — (Interjection) — Well, I'm sorry, I fear that some of the colleagues on the backbench didn't understand that. Maybe it was too fast for them. Were the words too big? The words were too big perhaps.

I would like to deal with some of the programs which we can be developing from our resource economy because, as I said, our resources are the wave of the past and not the wave of the future. Copper is never going to be big in Manitoba. All the copper is being taken out of electronics and replaced by fibre optic cables and glass. There's just not a future in mining like there used to be . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. P. EYLER:** . . . but what we could be doing, Mr. Speaker, is taking the profits out of our resources and putting them into the industries of the future. The industries of the future are generally high technology; things like micro-electronics, fibre optics, computers, robotics.

There's any number of opportunities where we can be investing and one of the things that we have done is put money into an industrial technology centre, which is doing wonders for small businesses and high tech companies in Manitoba. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the industrial technology centre performed 3,600 contracts for research and development with small firms in Manitoba. That's 100 percent increase over the year before. That's the sort of thing we should be doing and that's the kind of programs I would like to see expanded with the profits we can get from our resources such as hydro development.

Another area which we could be dealing and we should be dealing with is robotics. I'm sure that everybody on the opposition benches was reading Trade

and Commerce last September when they said, "The day is drawing closer when the National Research Council's new institute for manufacturing technology swings open its doors in downtown Winnipeg, rising on the old St. Paul's College site at Kennedy and Ellice. The \$41.4 million facility will have hired about 60 of its 175 staff by year end in anticipation of a 1986 operational start. The institute will provide a world class research and development laboratory in micro-electronics and robotics. Scientists, engineers and technicians on staff will meet with industry to create a forum for high tech development and technology transfers to manufacturing applications." That was great. It was great. It's probably the best thing Axworthy ever did for this province. — (Interjection) —

Well, what did the Tories do? Stay tuned.

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

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening when the honourable member will have 30 minutes remaining.