



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

31 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No.6A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 9 DECEMBER, 1982.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 9 December, 1982

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 Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a Ministerial Statement and I have copies for members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the appointment of a Task Force that will review the regulation of the Motor Transport Industry in Manitoba.

Changes in the regulatory system of highway transport which are under way in a number of provinces will affect Manitoba truckers hauling freight into these provinces as well as truckers from these provinces doing business in Manitoba. In Alberta, for instance, for-hire trucking within the province is for all practical purposes deregulated; Quebec has overhauled its regulatory system and substantial changes are under way in Ontario.

The regulation of trucking in the United States has opened opportunities for Manitoba truckers but it has also caused some difficulties. While the major source of friction between Canada and the United States has been removed, a review of the procedures for granting international operating authorities seems timely. I might add that arrangements are being made for ongoing liaison between American and Canadian officials to ensure continued co-operation.

In recent months, representations have been made by the Manitoba Trucking Association asking that regulation be more strictly enforced. It appears, however, that legal instruments to circumvent the regulations have become so sophisticated that strict enforcement is well-nigh impossible. Much of the so-called "Pirate Trucking" seems to be covered by such arrangements, and it is easier to identify that problem than to cope with it under the present legislation.

Another issue to be dealt with in the review is the state of the so-called independent truckers or owner-operators. These are drivers who own their trucks but who drive exclusively for licenced carriers. Their position is particularly difficult because The Highway Traffic Act makes no provision for arrangements between licenced carriers and owner-operators. Yet in most cases the agreements between the companies and the owner-operators stipulate that the operator is an "independent contractor." As independent contractors, drivers are not protected by provincial or federal labour legislation. At the same time the regulations prevent them from contracting to move freight for third parties. A fair resolution to their problem is urgently needed.

Also, Mr. Speaker, several organizations have called

for complete or substantial deregulation of the motor transport industry. The Economic Council of Canada advocates substantial deregulation in its 1981 report, "Reforming Regulations," while recognizing that regulation has had beneficial effects, particularly in the rural areas of the prairie provinces. The Farm Implement Dealers Association has asked for exemptions and the Canadian Manufacturers Association wants deregulation.

Mr. Speaker, I am conscious of the fact that there are many conflicting interests in highway transportation and that it will not be easy to arrive at a comprehensive solution. I have instructed the Task Force to consult with all interested parties on an ongoing basis. Comments and suggestions from the general public will also be invited.

Members of the Task Force are Dr. John Rea, Director of the Transportation Division of the Department of Highways and Transportation; Mr. John Kinley, Chairman of the Motor Transport Board, Mr. Carl Prociuk, Registrar of Motor Vehicles, and Mr. Bill Janssen, Economic Consultant. Dr. Rea will be Chairman of the Task Force.

I have set the following terms of reference for the review:

To consult with the users of transportation services in Manitoba, shippers and receivers, in order to assess their perceptions of the adequacy and efficiency of the services provided and their suggestions for improvements.

To consult with the participants in the industry - PSV carriers, commercial truckers, independent truckers (owner-operators) - in order to assess their perceptions of problems and opportunities in the industry.

To examine the existing regulatory framework in relation to present conditions in the motor transport industry.

To determine changes in motor transport regulations introduced or contemplated in other jurisdictions and where possible will assess the potential impact of those changes to determine the role of government in regulating the industry and to make recommendations for regulatory changes.

In addition to the preceding terms of reference, the Task Force will be assessing the potential of increasing the co-ordination of highway and rail transportation. This, of course, is a very complex undertaking and it is anticipated that it will take considerable time to fully examine the issues. Meanwhile, the review of the more immediate regulatory issues will not be delayed.

I have instructed the Task Force to proceed expeditiously with its consultations and to provide me with its conclusions in order that I may further report to the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This announcement is indeed a very interesting one. It seems to demonstrate some concern for the problems

that the for-hire trucking industry is facing in the province and that industry indeed does have some serious problems today and part of it is due, of course, to the economic downturn that has been worsened in the last year; but truly the transportation industry is important to Manitoba, the trucking industry, because Winnipeg has served for a number of years as a central hub for the trucking industry and that industry has provided the opportunity for a lot of jobs and investment in the Province of Manitoba.

Last year at Budget time, it seemed as if this Government had forgotten about the importance of that trucking industry because it seemed to be singled out for three very onerous new measures in the Budget. The trucking industry was faced with an income surcharge on its professional drivers and management. It was assessed the payroll tax, which helped to make it noncompetitive with trucking industries of other jurisdictions and, certainly, the dramatic increase in the fuel tax imposed on the trucking industry by last year's Budget didn't help the competitive position of the Manitoba industry. It seemed as if in one fell swoop — (Interjection) — To correct the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, the fuel tax on diesel fuel was increased rather dramatically by their first Budget and that impacted directly on the trucking industry in Manitoba and removed some of that competitive position the trucking industry enjoyed for the last several years; and it seemed in one swoop last year at Budget time, this Government removed some of the economic advantage that the industry had gained through our efforts in the cross-Canada negotiations to bring in the Vehicle Reciprocity Agreement which lowered licencing and registration fees across Canada for our home-based industry.

I see that the Minister has chosen some rather precise terms of reference and will do some rather wide consultation amongst the industry, the participants in that industry and indeed consultation with the users of that industry as well. His choices of membership on the Task Force are 75 percent very commendable with some very knowledgeable people in that Task Force, John Rea, John Kinley, Carl Prociuk.

I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that in making this announcement that the Minister does not use it as an excuse to put off enforcement of legitimately arising complaints by our rural carriers on violations of other carriers in their PSV authorities. Those are occurring more and more now it seems, Mr. Speaker, as competition for limited numbers of loads becomes greater, and if this study will merely put off enforcement which can take place under the existing framework of the law and allows the Minister a way out to prevent the illegal trucking operations from taking business away from some of our home and rural trucking firms, that would be disappointing indeed; but I know the Minister will pursue that as he indicated yesterday in my questions to him.

We welcome the consultation process and will look forward certainly to the recommendations that the Minister may receive from this Task Force review of the industry, but we more importantly, Mr. Speaker, will look forward to what this Minister in this Government does with it for the industry which is so important to Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

RETURN TO AN ORDER - NO. 14

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file a Return to an Order of the House, No. 14, dated June 29, 1982, on the motion of Mr. Kovnats, the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. W. PARASIUK introduced Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Oil and Natural Gas Tax Act (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

HON. R. PENNER introduced Bill No. 17, An Act to amend The Judgments Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of members to the gallery where we have eight American journalists who are studying for a fellowship in professional journalism at Stanford University. They are touring Canada under the auspices of the Department of External Affairs, and with them is a representative from the Canadian Consulate in San Francisco, Mr. Allan Unger.

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

Also in the gallery, there are 50 students of Grade 9 standing from the St. George School under the direction of Mr. Clint Harvey. This school is in the Constituency of St. Vital.

There are also 16 students of Grade 5 standing from Balmoral Hall under the direction of Mrs. Vandeboncoeur. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

There are 30 students of Grade 9 standing from the John Henderson School under the direction of Mr. Warren Earl. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Festival du Voyageur - casino

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of Economic Development and Tourism, and would ask her whether or not she could inform the House that a major part of the presentation made by the Festival du Voyageur, when they were asking for the \$200,000 from the Manitoba Government, was the fact that they were having difficulty finding a permanent home for their casino, and that they were having difficulty getting the Convention Centre at times when they wanted, and that this was one of the main reasons they needed this facility?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we inherited a situation where the Festival du Voyageur were looking at their problems of having a permanent location and of having a financial base that would enable them to give some stability to their annual winter program. Mr. Speaker, by the time the proposal came to us, the Festival had already gone through a year where they were required not to use the Convention Centre because of priorities given to out-of-province conventions, and they had had one year's experience with holding their casinos in decentralized locations. Mr. Speaker, although they may have undertaken their building originally in order to provide a location for their casinos, by the time the proposal reached us they had had the experience of a decentralized holding of their casinos, found it to be so successful that they in fact changed their plans and decided in future years that they would continue with the practice of decentralized casinos.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we were left with the problem of evaluating the proposal for the building for the multiple uses that they then determined it should be directed to. They have three halls in the building, one is quite large but smaller than our major halls in the Convention Centre; they have a smaller clubroom hall; and they have another bright and airy room which they wanted to use for senior citizen meetings. So it was on the basis of this new facility and the proposals that they had for its use and its role in the tourism field that we evaluated, and on the basis of which we made our grant.

MR. R. BANMAN: A supplementary question to the same Minister, I wonder if she could inform the House when they were evaluating the proposal, did they take into consideration that if the Festival du Voyageur were not to get a casino licence this year that they would show something like a \$250,000 loss in this year's operation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the question of the casino and lottery is my responsibility. I want to make it quite clear that no one, not even the Festival du Voyageur, is assured of any future or annual casino licence. That has been made very clear, and when they approached the province for a grant, we've been informed that they had approached the former Government and they hadn't had a reply at this time. When it came to my attention, I discussed it with the Minister responsible for this program. We made it quite clear on a number of occasions, and as I said, and I'm still making the same offer, we can bring in the letters that were sent to them, they were told not to count on any casino licences. We told them that if they wanted to show, and they would have to show that this building was viable, that they could not take into consideration any revenue from any form of gambling or sales of lottery tickets. This, in writing, they confirmed this, they understood that, and that is the situation as far as the casino is concerned.

Now, as was explained by the Minister responsible,

this is a program under Tourism. I don't think there's any doubt that Festival du Voyageur and Folklorama are probably the two events that bring more tourists here in Manitoba and it was given on that term only.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Economic Development, who is in charge of Destination Manitoba, where these funds were appropriated from. I wonder if she could confirm in her study, her extensive study into this matter, that when the Festival du Voyageur appeared in front of the Finance Committee from the City of Winnipeg, that one of the main reasons for the establishment of this building, and one of the main reasons they wanted to have city funding, was so that they could establish a casino and have a facility where a casino could be held because they were having problems at certain times getting the Convention Centre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we were aware of that rumour but we had no substantive evidence of it. However, on the basis of the rumour that the building was being set up as a casino operation, long before we made any decision on the grant, had the directors of the Festival come in, and what we raised with them was our concern that that was in fact their intention.

Also we gave them the information that we were reviewing the whole operation of casinos in the province, as my colleague has said, and that they should know in advance that we hadn't got a clear policy or set of regulations on casinos, but that there could very well be a tightening in regard to the regulations relating to casino operation, and that we did not want them to assume in advance that they were going to be able to earn money in an area that in fact they might not well be able to do.

So we had quite a thorough discussion with them and we felt that our grant was based on the tourism component, that they were well-warned and informed about the likely developments on casinos. We said that on the one hand the regulations might become much stiffer, but on the other hand, they would be entitled, the same way any other Manitoba group would be, to make application for such a licence and that they had to absorb the uncertainty of that situation in terms of their decision about how to spend money and what amount to request. I think the net effect was that they had a clear understanding of our situation and we had assurance from them that the monies that we were granting for them would not be for the prime purpose of operating casinos.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Festival du Voyageur derives the majority of its income from casinos - i.e., the casinos held during the time when the Festival is on. I think last year they received something like \$250,000 from that casino, so it's an integral part of that operation - could the Minister inform the House, now that the Festival du Voyageur is in financial problems and is asking the

Government for another \$75,000, whether or not the Government will be advancing any more funds to that particular project?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I had a communication from the Festival after the questions in the House the other day; a communication saying that they did not support the opinion that appeared in the newspaper a few days earlier and that, in fact, they apologized for any misunderstanding or embarrassment that it might cause the province; that they had been dealt with fairly and openly by us: that they did not hold us accountable for a business decision that was made by them, and in fact they have not made representation to us for an additional amount of money.

Lotteries Licencing Board

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Lotteries. I would ask the Minister if he could confirm that the Board - that's the Lotteries Licencing Board - is the one indeed that makes the decisions and that he is not personally involved in the decision-making process when it comes to the handing out of casino licences.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: So far, yes, yes, yes.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, a question to the same Minister. Is the Minister satisfied and confident with the Board's decisions and the manner in which they have been running the Licencing Board to date?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, no. Under the former administration it was a "bloody mess," as I stated publicly, and we're trying to correct that.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House, after November 30th the casino licences and the different licences that have issued - he has just indicated that the Board has made those decisions - is he confident with that Board, and is he satisfied that the manner in which that Board has acted since he has been Minister, Mr. Speaker, has acted in a proper and judicious manner.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not satisfied - the complaint is not so much of the Board, but the lack of direction that was given the last four years. This is why we asked Judge Jewers to form a commission of one to give us an idea of where the funds are going. I stated publicly that I will not interfere with Judge Jewers until we get the recommendations in his report and then we will have policies that will be presented to the House.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could confirm that the Lotteries Board, which looks after Government sponsored lotteries, has not met roughly in about a year.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I've never interfered with the Board. I don't know when they meet. My contact has been with the employees of the Board, the general manager, and whatever concern or whatever direction that we want to give, went through that channel. I have met with the Chairman of the Board, who I found to be very co-operative, on one occasion.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I gather from those remarks that the Board has not met; otherwise, the Minister would have known. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether or not he instructed the Acting Chairman of the Manitoba Lotteries and Gaming Control Commission not to hold any more meetings until he instructed them to do so.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the member can gather what he wants. I didn't tell him that they had meetings or didn't have meetings, I'm not too sure about that. My directions are quite clear and I'll stand behind them. The situation is this: that we are waiting for a report and as far as I'm concerned we put not a freeze, we try not to "rock the boat," and they have been able to go on as they were doing from month to month. They were instructed not to issue any new licences on the casino. You probably won't believe it but I'll tell you anyway - the setup is that I have no idea who is licenced. I have refused to let them tell me a year in advance. I don't want to know.

The only change is that they used to get together sometime by pressure from outside sources, I'm told, and they would announce all the licencees for the year immediately. Now, because we were expecting - you said the Gaming Commission and Licencing Board - (Interjection) - that's right. Oh, the control, not their licencing, oh, that other one. All right. Well, then fine, that gives me a chance to answer that question. I was trying to sneak the other one through, but I did, I guess. Yes, any decision that's been left to the chairman of the board, again, I've worked with him. They've never been told at any time to have meetings, or not to have meetings, but there is very little to do because we are in a situation of waiting for the report of Jewers that originally had been promised from some time in July, the 1st, and then in August, and because Price Waterhouse, who has been retained by Judge Jewers, has had difficulty in getting some of the information from some of these groups and I've been promised that as soon it's ready, it'll be forwarded to us. It might be that I'll ask my colleague and Cabinet that we proclaim the Act before that to start getting down to business.

Agriculture Ministers re oil crushing industry

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

MR. J. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a committee of MLAs from this province headed by my colleague, the Member for Arthur, went to Regina and met with the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, and staff from the Department of Agriculture in Alberta, in an attempt to get the three western Ministers of Agricul-

ture to meet and attempt to resolve the serious problems which the oil-crushing industry is facing in this province, and especially the CSP Foods at Altona and Harrowby, I wonder can the Minister confirm that if and when a meeting is ever called - and I'm sure he's not going to call it - that he will attend that meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm to the honourable member that a meeting is taking place next week and I will be attending.

I should also mention to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that some of the difficulties that the crushing industry is facing - I'm sure the honourable member maybe doesn't realize it - are on two issues that really face the crushing industry and, that is, the freight rate question, which my honourable members have been on record as wanting to see the change and the crushing industry has in fact been caught up in this whole process and may be dealt a very serious blow.

As well, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with another Provincial Government who, because of part of the reasons that we are in the difficulty we're in with respect to energy prices, we're using energy dollars now to subsidize an industry, is killing the industry in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. A Conservative Government, a government who as well was supported by the previous Conservative administration in allowing and wanting energy prices to rise and getting a better deal for Alberta. So, Mr. Speaker, there is great concern as to the long-term development of that industry in Western Canada.

I have just sent a telex to the Minister of Transport urging the Federal Government to rescind the 40 percent-plus increase in transportation rates and we will be meeting with the three Prairie Provinces and urging the Province of Alberta to renege on their subsidies that they have put into their industry.

MR. J. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that this problem just didn't arise yesterday and, of course, we have the news today from the Free Press of the warnings and the problems that this industry has been facing for the last several months, can the Minister of Agriculture advise me, and especially the people that are in the oil-crushing industries, the farmers, why he and his Premier and his Government have been dragging their feet for the last seven months on this problem?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should well know when his Government agreed with the increasing in energy prices, we are now competing or attempting to compete with the Alberta Treasury in terms of the subsidies that were put into place. Even the Government of Saskatchewan, a Conservative Government, knew that they could not compete with the Treasury of Alberta. The honourable member indicates that there was a problem. Just a few months during the election period, they were crowing as to how well the rapeseed industry was doing in this country with the opening of Harrowby. They should have realized the implications

of the changes in the Crow rate that were coming about and the problems that would be dealt with that industry and they are faced with now. They don't realize that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture who I think we now have a better understanding why there are as many problems in Agriculture in Manitoba today as there are because of his total lack of understanding of the basic problems.

A question through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of his comments about the Federal Government making changes in energy pricing in this country that are affecting the rapeseed-crushing industry - the only thing he did was to sit down and write a letter to the Federal Government in Ottawa telling them to take off the subsidy that Alberta had put in place, not calling the Government of Alberta, the Government of Saskatchewan and the CSP and the rapeseed-crushing people together to jointly resolve the problem. He asked the people that caused the problem to solve it. So, why, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't the Minister of Agriculture have called that meeting and dealt with it directly in Western Canada, and if he is going to that meeting, would he lay his proposals before us? How much money is he prepared to put into subsidizing the transportation and helping the jobs and the farmers in this country?

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

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member obviously doesn't realize that it was the Manitoba Government, through its administration between the Department of Transport, the Department of Economic Development and the Department of Agriculture who were in contact with the other provinces to indicate and to discuss prior to the ministerial meeting that was even talked about that the honourable member makes so much about in terms of dealing with the problem that we have in place.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we have another example, on the one hand, the Leader of the Opposition indicating that we have a runaway deficit, that the deficit is too great in this Province of Manitoba; and we have the Member for Arthur saying, put up more money, spend more money and now compete with the Alberta Treasury because they are able to use the revenues from the oil that they supported in terms of the increase that they wanted the Alberta Government to have when they were talking about negotiating the agreement with Ottawa. It was the then Premier of this province who said he wanted to see Alberta get world prices in oil. We now have it, Mr. Speaker, we are paying the price.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture is again trying to mislead the public to try and suggest that we, Mr. Speaker, are advocating more expenditure. Mr. Speaker, what we are asking for is the policy of the Minister of Agriculture.

I, Mr. Speaker, have a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who I would think is responsible for food and food products in the Province of Manitoba. What has he done, Mr. Speaker, to encourage the use of the canola meal or the canola products that are used in the province and try to encourage a greater use of those commodities in Manitoba and in this country so that it in fact would help the crushing industry in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Honourable Member for Arthur doesn't know the structure of the industry in Western Canada, that the industry was developed strictly on the basis of export, that the industry is not structured in terms of the crushing industry in this country on the basis of domestic use. The bulk of the industry in terms of oil is for export, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, again I'm having difficulty getting an answer from the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and in view of the fact that some 30 percent of the canola meal and the canola oil, I should say, is used in margarines and table products in this country - 30 percent for the information of the Minister of Agriculture - could the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs tell us what he has done to encourage the use of that commodity in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: In answer to the question from the Member for Arthur, I was never aware that it was the function of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to promote the use of agricultural products in Manitoba. However, if you would like us to consider setting up retail food establishments to retail canola products, we could take that under consideration.

Lead-in-soil removal program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Member for Tuxedo requested some information on a report on the lead-in-soil removal program in the Weston area. At that time he indicated it was his information that report had been in my hands for approximately one month, to quote him, and I assured him I would determine if in fact the report was available and if it was I would forward it to him. I have the information after having consulted with my staff today, and the fact is that he had consulted my staff on November 17th, requested information on that report. They told him that report would most likely be ready in mid-December. The report has not been completed yet, but when it is forwarded to me I'll be more than pleased to provide the member with a copy of that report.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if that was a ministerial statement, but assuming it was I would have to say that —(Interjection)— well, the Minister answered the question presumably yesterday but if that was an addendum to the answer I'd have to say that the members of his staff indicated that the report material was available at that time and I've been waiting for it ever since. So perhaps the Minister could discuss that with his staff.

HON. J. COWAN: I'll be more than pleased to discuss the misunderstanding on the part of the Member for Tuxedo with my staff, but I can assure him that there has been no report published or printed as of yet. When it is published and printed, which I expect will happen over the course of the next few days, I will ensure that he receives a copy of it as soon as it is available, which is the policy of this government and was not the policy in respect to reports which were prepared under his administration.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, again assuming that was another ministerial statement, I'll respond to the Minister saying that we've been well aware of the policy of his government with respect to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

Does the Honourable Member for Tuxedo have a question?
The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Manitoba Investment Activities Report

MR. J. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I referred to a Manitoba Investment Activities Report that is kept up-to-date by the Department of Economic Development. The last one that I have is January to June, '81. This report gives all of the list of investments within the province during the first six months of '81 and I'm wondering if the department still continues to compile all of this information from different areas and keep it as a report to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the member opposite asked that question. The reports do come out and I'd be more than happy to make sure that he gets a regular copy. One of the interesting things that emerges from the reports is that in this recession, which we know is deepening and getting more and more severe in terms of its impact on people, that the decline in investment rate is significant for the Municipal Government, the Federal Government and the private sector. In fact, the only group that have been increasing their investment rate is the Provincial Government and, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that although the capacity of a Provincial Government to override the effects of the recession are limited, that we are in fact taking initiative in a way that none of the other actors in the field are doing. And if the member

opposite cares to give me suggestions as to how we can induce the other responsible groups in society to do their fair share in the difficult times that we're encountering I would be more than happy to hear his suggestions.

Square poplar log houses

MR. J. JOHNSTON: I thank the Minister, Mr. Speaker, it was a long dissertation to tell us that investment is down but I would like to have the lists that are kept regularly by the department.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing and it is in regard to Order-in-Council 1403 for \$10,000 to assist in the cost of construction of two experimental square poplar log houses in Manigotagan, Manitoba. Was that \$10,000 approved by the Board of MHRC?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that it was approved by the Board of Directors. I will take that as notice and check for sure.

MR. J. JOHNSTON: I wonder if the Minister would also take as notice or make a request to find out if the Board read the report on the two log cabin houses that were built in Wabowden under the Schreyer regime that cost \$76,000 apiece, were never able to be sold and were never able to be used because the type of construction was not suitable for the area. I wonder if the Minister would ask if the Board read those reports.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the log cabins and the project that was going on — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition makes a comment from his seat about the shared misery of the log cabin. I would recommend that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition go out to Manigotagan and view the poplar log house that has been built there and he would appreciate both its architectural design and its comfort.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the cost of the experimental homes that have been built in both Manigotagan and other parts of the province to date and particularly with respect to the square poplar log homes, the cost is anticipated to be under \$40,000.00. It has been recommended by the Senior Planning Consultant from CMHC that these buildings be approved for construction in the northern parts of the province. It is expected that these buildings will cost approximately half of the standard home that we're delivering into remote parts of the province and it is going to be a superior product.

General assessment freeze

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'd like to ask the Minister if he can tell us how much longer he anticipates the general assessment freeze will be in place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: It is pretty difficult to say at this time. There is a challenge in the Supreme Court, as the member is aware, and perhaps it may be off sooner than we think.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I'm not sure that I heard the Minister correctly, but I think he said it would be longer than you may think.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that in view of the challenge to the Supreme Court, appealing Bill 100, it may be lifted sooner than he thinks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Along with the Main Street Manitoba Program, is there a freeze on assessment in cases where the merchants are upgrading their properties or will they be subject to reassessment immediately they make the improvements?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, the freeze applies to the City of Winnipeg on individual property assessments and the City of Winnipeg does not qualify for the Main Street Program, so the answer is no to that question.

MR. D. BLAKE: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, for clarification. I am to understand then that those buildings will be reassessed at the completion of the Main Street Manitoba Program for those towns that qualify.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter for the municipal council when there are building permits that are issued, and if from time-to-time these building permits are sent over to the Assessment Branch, they will be dealt with in a regular manner such as they are dealt with at the present time.

MR. D. BLAKE: A final supplementary to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, in the case of the Village of Erickson, seeing as that is a model for his Main Street Manitoba Program, if he might make some recommendation that they not be reassessed for a period of three to five years following the improvements to the main street.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, The Assessment Act is clear and it is not the responsibility of the Minister to override the legislation and the statute of this Province.

White Horse Trailer Court - evictions

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Clean

Environment Commission. I have a number of residents in my constituency facing possible eviction at this time of year. There are some 40-50 school children involved. I'm referring to their place of residence in the White Horse Trailer Court that apparently is facing an eviction notice as of December 15th. I would appeal to the Honourable Minister to take under consideration the problems these families would face if that order were enforced and surely that, between him and the Minister responsible for Housing, some resolution to the problem can be found.

I'm not taking issue whether or not the Clean Environment Order is correct or not, as it is being imposed against the owners of the trailer court, but I do appeal to the Minister on grounds of compassion to have some concern that these residents can enjoy a peaceful Christmas in their homes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: I thank the Member for Lakeside for his continuing interest in this matter and I think the record should show that he has brought it to my attention previously, on behalf of the constituents, and advised me of their concerns. I think we have acted in a compassionate way and will continue to do so in response to his inquiries on behalf of those individuals.

For the record, so that it be clear, Mr. Speaker, the residents of the White Horse Plains Trailer Court received a letter from the Rentalsman on November 16th which has created some concern. That letter advised them that the trailer court was under a Clean Environment Commission Order, that order had expired, that the necessary corrective work had not taken place and that they might in fact have to vacate those premises at any time. That of course will put, as the member has so rightly acknowledged, undue stress on those individuals and we want to see that the Clean Environment Commission orders are followed, so we will continue to do that which we must do, as an Environmental Management Division, to monitor and to prosecute where necessary, but given the circumstances of this case and the involvement of the Rentalsman, we want to have a meeting with the residents of that trailer park in order to discuss this with them so that we can pursue, in a consensus-making way, alternative actions which may ensure that the integrity of the Manitoba environment is not violated unnecessarily so, but that they in fact will be able to have at least considerable notice if in fact it is necessary for that operation to be discontinued. I would suggest that would not take place before Christmas, so I hope they do enjoy their holiday season and we will do everything that we can do as a Government to act in a compassionate way, given the timing of the year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the residents at the White Horse Trailer Court will view the response by the Minister with some hope but perhaps, or maybe, would like to be able to keep them in their homes at Christmas time, it's still not reassuring to the families involved. Surely the Minister can; I know he has the authority to simply indicate that the Govern-

ment will be going into this meeting on December 15th, which is very soon, I might add, with the willingness to allow these residents to have the safety and the comfort of their homes at least during the Christmas period, and I would say, in Manitoba, to spring-time when the proper arrangements can be made, when the order of the Clean Environment Commission can be carried out, when the matter can be properly dealt with.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I do take into consideration the member's pleas on behalf of his constituents, and I can assure him that we are entering into this meeting in the near future in order to resolve a difficult problem. Part of that problem is their housing, and that of course is of grave concern to every individual, and when it is threatened such as it appears to have been in this case, then we want to make certain that we can provide to them assurances that they are not going to be acted upon in an arbitrary fashion by an uncaring Government. This is not an uncaring Government, so that is not going to happen.

I want to, without attempting to prejudice the discussions that are going to take course during that meeting, indicate to the member opposite that we will be approaching that meeting to find an alternative which in fact ensures that they can enjoy their houses and their homes as long as is possible, and at the same time ensure that they can do so with safety, as he has suggested is necessary, and that safety applies also to the safety of the environment, and that environment must be protected as well. So we will be compassionate, loving and kind, but firm. We will ensure that we don't act in an arbitrary fashion, and if they have every opportunity to work with us to develop an alternative which will in fact meet this difficult situation in a way which is satisfactory to everyone.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired, might I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where I'm informed that we have 20 students from the Creative Communications Course at Red River Community College. The college is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster. On behalf of all the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Riel and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Brandon West has 25 minutes remaining.

The Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to diverge slightly from my original plan of speech. At the beginning of my speech I indicated that it was very exciting that my speech was following directly after the speech of the Member for Morris. I indicated that I thought there would be quite a contrast between what he was

proposing and what I'm proposing, and that is in fact the truth.

However, I've been giving a lot of thought to what the Member for Morris said, and he expressed the feelings of his constituents and his own feelings extremely well. He indicated that what his people wanted, what his constituents wanted, was the freedom to work hard; the freedom to worship and carry on as they've been carrying on for a long time; the freedom to have their land and to pass their land on to their children and their children's children, and that he would have to take a very very small "c" conservative approach to how these virtues, if I may call them that, be continued.

I can't find fault, Mr. Speaker, with what the Member for Morris wants for his people. I can't find fault with that at all but, in contrast, I'm also reminded of what the Member for Rupertsland wanted for his people. When you strip it down, the Member for Rupertsland's people don't have very much, and their aspirations are basically the same aspirations as those people from Morris. So I'm not criticizing the Member for Morris, because he is doing what he's supposed to do. I wish that I could do what I would like to do, and that is to see that everybody in Manitoba has the things that the Member for Morris wants.

I'd like to now return to where I was yesterday at the closing of the Session. When the recovery of our economy does come, and let's pray that it comes soon, I think that it'll have to come as a result of a new deal, a new form of marshall plan, a modernized view of the marshall plan, a new deal, the Government will have to intervene massively. The only way that it can happen is with Government intervening. It's like a war. When wartime comes, Government intervenes and everybody gets behind the Government, everyone accepts all sorts of things they wouldn't accept in peacetime. Well, the danger is as great now as if there was a war. I can see that we are going to have to have intervention of a type that, even though we might not like it, it is going to be absolutely essential.

While we are waiting for this to happen, because we in Manitoba are too small to do it by ourselves, we can do things to facilitate the stimulation of the economy and I indicated yesterday, we are doing this in some small measure in the Speech from the Throne. I'm indicating "some small measure" and I should indicate it's not going to be by eliminating useful jobs, but we must be doing some positive things and we can't do what the Conservatives did in 1978, 1979, and that was to push the economy downhill to give us a headstart towards the recession. What we must do is doing things to give us a headstart to go on up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wind up my remarks by commenting on my changed position in this Chamber. I am enjoying my role as an Independent Member. I am still a Social Democrat, but I am not sitting with the Caucus of the New Democratic Party and I feel very, very free to give them the benefit of my advice and the benefit of my criticism and to vote against them at any time that I don't approve of what they are doing. On the other hand, I intend to do the very same thing to my friends on the right.

I am in a unique position, Mr. Speaker. It's very, very seldom in life that we get very much freedom, and I'm

probably as free as any man can be. I think I can summarize my position up on sort of a lighter note as this - when my bank manager sneezes, I no longer catch pneumonia; when the Premier burps, I no longer get indigestion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Monsieur l'Orateur, c'est avec fierté que je me lève aujourd'hui dans cette Chambre pour adresser la parole en temps que Député de Saint-Boniface, Ministre de la Santé, des Loisirs et Conditions Physiques et Sports.

Je suis très fier de représenter la circonscription de Saint-Boniface, circonscription qui a vu le jour en 1870 lors de l'entrée du Manitoba dans la Confédération Canadienne. Je suis fier d'appartenir à cette formation politique qui vise avant tout la justice à tous les niveaux. Mais Monsieur l'Orateur, surtout je suis fier de posséder une conscience sociale. En tant que Ministre de la Santé, Monsieur l'Orateur, je dois vous dire comme il me fait plaisir de vous voir en bonne forme, en pleine forme. J'aimerais féliciter mes quatre nouveaux collègues au Conseil des Ministres ainsi que le proposeur et le secondeur du Discours du Trône. Vous le constatez sans doute, cette journée est pour moi toute particulière, elle représente un grand pas de l'avant, un pas dans la direction de la justice. Certainement, vous pouvez vous imaginer comme ce n'est pas toujours amusant de parler à des piliers de granite. Aujourd'hui, jour mémorable, je vous adresse message, parole et vous me comprenez. J'ai attendu vingt-trois années, vingt-trois longues années, pour cette occasion et j'en profite. L'Honorable James Prendergast, l'Honorable Joseph Bernier et tant d'autres n'ont pas eu l'occasion et la chance que je possède aujourd'hui. Que leurs contemporains n'ont pas été de mesure d'entendre et surtout de comprendre certains discours remarquables m'attriste.

Depuis 1890, quatre-vingt-douze longues années, plusieurs discours furent prononcés en français, mais peu importe la haute qualité, l'importance et la valeur des paroles prononcées, toutes se voyaient perdues dans les échos de cette Chambre. Incomprises presque inutiles. Ce succès, aujourd'hui, est d'autant plus apprécié, monsieur l'Orateur, après avoir lutté depuis 1959. Je dois vous avouer que les défaites furent amères, les victoires pénibles et longues à venir.

Au début, avant la révolution tranquille au Québec, il ne fallait jamais séparer les questions de langue et de foi. La lutte pour ces deux causes se faisait toujours ensemble. Plus tard, vers les mi-soixante, ces deux causes furent bien distinguées.

J'aimerais vous référer au mois de mars 1963 lorsque je proposais un projet de loi qui aurait permis l'enseignement du Français dès la première année. Je dis bien du Français et non pas en français. À cette époque, nous pouvions enseigner le Français comme sujet à partir de la quatrième année seulement, pas question d'enseignement en français, encore moins de classe française, et surtout pas d'école française. Comme de raison, mon projet de loi fut amendé pour complètement changer l'intention originale.

Plus tard, quelques années plus tard, en avril 1963, un autre projet de loi, le projet de loi 64, dont l'inten-

tion était de faire du Français une langue d'enseignement au Manitoba, encore la même chose, une autre défaite, ce projet fut encore tellement modifié que son intention fut perdue dans le verbiage technique. Mais le climat politique changeait, en effet le Parti Liberal lors de son congrès annuel en novembre 1966 avait inclus dans sa politique l'utilisation du Français comme langue d'enseignement.

Et à présent, j'aimerais vous lire quelques lignes de la première page de La Tribune datée du 19 novembre 1966.

"Overwhelming Support, Liberals Approved Teaching in French. Fifty-year Issue Revived. The principle that French should become a language of instruction in the province's schools has been approved by the Liberal Party of Manitoba. At the party's annual convention in the Royal Alexandra Hotel delegates gave overwhelming support in a voice vote to a resolution from St. Boniface MLA Larry Desjardins that French should become a language of instruction when demand and facilities existed."

Monsieur l'Orateur, aussi un éditorial d'à peu près la même date, cette fois du Free Press, je cite:

"The vote at the Liberal Convention must have been extremely gratifying. Manitoba Liberals can take pride in having broken an outmoded tradition and in the knowledge that they have acted in the best interest of all Manitobans. The next step is now up to the Government. When it takes that step as it should without delay, it would be able to do so with full confidence that it will have the support of the Liberal Party."

Plus tard après des discussions en caucus, voici ce que La Liberté du 1er décembre 1966 disait:

"La cause libérale approuve le Français comme langue d'enseignement. Tous les amis de la cause française de l'unité nationale au Manitoba et dans tout le Canada apprennent avec joie l'acceptation sans hésitation par le caucus libéral, tenu tout récemment, du Français comme langue d'enseignement dans les écoles du Manitoba. Le député de Saint-Boniface, Monsieur Laurent Desjardins, avait déjà fait adopté à l'unanimité cette même résolution comme premier pas au dernier congrès libéral. Cette décision du caucus libéral met officiellement au programme du Parti Libéral l'enseignement du Français au Manitoba. Les barrières politiques sont par de ce fait abaissées, le temps d'agir est arrivé. Félicitations à tous les artisans de la véritable unité nationale."

Monsieur l'Orateur, à présent l'ouverture de la session 1967. Le gouvernement Roblin, certain de l'appui des Libéraux, présente le projet de loi 59, projet rendant ainsi le Français langue d'enseignement légale au Manitoba. L'auteur du projet de loi, le Ministre de l'Éducation d'alors, était le Docteur George Johnson. Oui le même Docteur Johnson qui est maintenant mon aviseur médical au département de santé. Encore une fois, je félicite le Docteur Johnson ainsi que tous les membres du Parti Conservateur.

Trois années plus tard, soit en 1970, avec le projet de loi 113 du gouvernement Schreyer, il était maintenant légal, à concurrence de 75% des heures de classe, d'enseigner le Français au Manitoba. Encore une fois, ce projet fut approuvé à l'unanimité par la Chambre. Cela il y a déjà douze ans, un autre pas géant, car maintenant les écoles françaises peuvent

revenir. Et, monsieur l'Orateur, les franco-manitobains répondent à l'appel. Aujourd'hui, là où il y a une population de langue française suffisante, il y a une école française. Le Français est langue d'enseignement pour des milliers de jeunes Manitobains, soit qu'ils sont à l'école dite française ou bien on les retrouve dans les écoles d'immersion. Plus de Manitobains, peu importe leur source nationale, sont en mesure de s'exprimer dans les deux langues officielles du Canada.

Monsieur l'Orateur, en effet, beaucoup de progrès ces derniers quinze ans. Mais ou allons-nous maintenant que le Français dans l'enseignement est légal. Malheureusement, notre loi scolaire ne reconnaît ni l'école française, ni l'école d'immersion. Aucune garantie ou protection légale; n'était-il pas grand temps que le Manitoba ait une loi scolaire qui est au moins aussi progressive que celle des autres provinces. Il est certainement à espérer que ce sera le prochain pas.

Le gouvernement actuel annonçait récemment une politique globale pour ce qui est des services gouvernementaux en langue française ici au Manitoba. Cette politique dépasse les cadres du colere juridique. Une politique qui tout simplement tente de rendre accessible aux francophones des services dans leur langue maternelle là où les besoins se manifestent. Quoi de plus juste pour un gouvernement de tenter de répondre aux besoins et aspirations légitimes de la population entière. Le secteur de la société si longtemps dépourvu de plusieurs de ces droits les plus fondamentaux, pour cela mes compatriotes seront encore plus manitobain que jamais et nous en serons tous les gagnants. Pour cette politique, je félicite mon Premier Ministre et tous mes collègues et je leur en remercie en mon nom et au nom de tous mes compatriotes franco-manitobains.

Imaginez ce que le Manitoba et le Canada auraient été et auraient évité si de telles mesures auraient eu lieu plus tôt ou encore mieux n'auraient jamais été nécessaires.

En 1870, Louis Riel et la majorité des citoyens de la Rivière Rouge avaient un simple rêve. Ce rêve était de recevoir un traitement juste et équitable de la part des autorités canadiennes. Pas facile. Plusieurs méprisaient les valeurs des habitants de la Rivière Rouge. De par leurs préjugés, ils ne pouvaient pas accepter que des gens de sang mixte pouvaient devenir des citoyens à part égale. Malheureusement, comme le faisait remarquer l'autre fois si bien l'autre soir le Député de Rupertsland ces préjugés existent toujours. Conscient du dynamisme explosif qui existait à la Rivière Rouge, les pères de la Confédération décidèrent de faire de cette nouvelle province une province modèle. Une qui représenterait le vrai esprit de l'entente confédérative qui avait été signé trois ans auparavant. Ils étaient conscients des deux solitudes qui se trouvaient au Québec et en Ontario. Étrangers de par leur origine nationale, leur langue et leur religion, ces deux entités avaient décidé que la coopération, par l'entremise du pacte confédératif, était la seule planche de salut valable à cette époque. Le Manitoba, une petite société devient donc province. Ces citoyens, métis, amérindiens, catholiques, protestants, de langue française ou de langue anglaise, mais tous Canadiens reçoivent les mêmes droits que tous les citoyens britanniques. L'Acte du Manitoba

proclame à Westminster en 1871 en est le témoin. Le Manitoba sera ni à l'image du Québec, ni à l'image de l'Ontario, mais bel et bien à l'image du Canada tel que perçu par les pères de la Confédération. Pendant vingt ans, monsieur l'Orateur, le Manitoba a vécu de ses plus beaux jours. La tolérance et la collaboration primaient surtout. Cependant, les anciennes passions se réveillèrent avec vengeance en 1890. La dualité de cette Chambre et dans les cours de justice de la province fut remplacée par une forme de monolithisme, la tolérance par des débats passionnés. Ce son de cloches déclencha les pires haines et préjugés qui s'étaient endormis depuis pendant quelques années.

En 1916, la hache tomba une fois de plus. C'est l'éducation qui est atteinte cette fois. De l'enseignement en français, certes il y en aura, mais à la cachette, dans les écoles dites privées ou séparées, et ce, à des couts économiques et psychologiques exorbitants. Mais monsieur l'Orateur, monsieur le Président, je ne veux m'arrêter plus longtemps sur le côté noir de notre histoire. Je voudrais plutôt vous présenter Saint-Boniface, circonscription établie en 1870.

Saint-Boniface est comme un chêne, petit arbre planté il y a au-delà de cent soixante-quinze années. Il a enfoncé ses racines profondes qui le nourrissent depuis. Devenu arbre moyen, il a su soutenir les tempêtes, les sécheresses et oui quelques feux de prairies. Mais il endure et persévère. Les assauts ne font que le rendre plus fort. Toujours il s'est tiré de ces épreuves une nouvelle force et une volonté de vivre. Le siège que j'occupe présentement a connu plusieurs députés renommés et de différente formation politique. Des députés dont le sens de la justice et la dévotion envers leurs principes n'ont jamais été en question. Saint-Boniface s'est vu représenté par les Marc Aimable Girard, Alphonse Alfred Larivière et Roger Marion, l'Honorable Juge James Prendergast, Jean-Baptiste Langevin, S.A.D. Bertrand et l'Honorable Juge Bernier, Horace Chevrier, G.P. Dumas, H.F. Laurence, A. L. Clark, E.A. Hansford chef du Parti CCF et enfin Jo. Van Bellingham et Roger Teillet.

Monsieur le Président, en 1959, j'adressais cette Chambre en français, mais peu nombreux étaient ceux qui me comprenaient. Pour une fois, je me répète, je cite quelques phrases tirées de mon discours lors du Débat au Discours du Trône en 1959, le premier discours que j'ai prononcé en cette Chambre. Je cite:

"Plusieurs milliers de mots, plusieurs centaines de discours ont proclamé les louanges de Saint-Boniface, et ont aussi fait connaître les besoins de ces citoyens; des poètes, des historiens, des éducateurs, des membres du clergé, des citoyens, des visiteurs distingués pour parler de Saint-Boniface. Je me sens donc indigné de parler trop longtemps sur ce sujet, mais toutefois comme humble représentant de ces fiers citoyens, ce sera mon privilège de travailler à faire connaître Saint-Boniface et ses enfants. Ce sera mon devoir de voir à ce que les gens qui ont eu confiance en moi soient bien représentés et s'il le faut, défendus même. Saint-Boniface a raison d'être orgueilleux de son histoire, mais ce que j'aime le plus, ce dont je suis le plus fier, c'est que le côté de Saint-Boniface est celui qui est le plus manitobain, le plus canadien peut-être de la province. Ici on trouve des groupes de différentes origines. La plupart de ces

groupes ont conservé leur langue maternelle. À Saint-Boniface on parle français, anglais, belge, polonais, ukrainien. Ces groupes sont fiers de leurs propres croyances, culture et coutumes. Ils ont tous leur propre organisation, leur propre chef et unis ensemble ils travaillent tous au bien-être de Saint-Boniface. Dans cette Chambre je porte les couleurs de Saint-Boniface avec fierté. J'ai toujours cru que les gens passent avant la politique et toutes les formations politiques. Si nous avons des partis politiques aujourd'hui, c'est pour que ceux-ci servent les gens et non pas l'inverse."

Mes vingt-trois années dans cette Chambre n'ont pas toujours été faciles. J'ai du subir plusieurs revers, je n'ai pas toujours été compris et on m'a souvent critiqué. Et trop souvent, je me trouvais si seul. J'ai du prendre des décisions pénibles, certainement pas toujours populaires, mais aujourd'hui j'oublie toutes ces difficultés. J'ai rêvé en 59, en 63, en 67 et en 70 et je rêve toujours, mais grand miracle, mon rêve est en train de se réaliser et j'en suis très fier. Merci monsieur.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to take part in the Throne Speech Debate and I would like to add my best wishes to you for continued good health and to wish you and all the members of this Assembly, "Season's Greetings."

My congratulations to the new Deputy Speaker and to the Chairman of Committees, and I'd like to also offer my congratulation to the Mover and Seconder of the Speech from the Throne.

We are faced today with a government whose First Minister signed a document - and you've all seen it many times - "A Clear Choice for Manitobans." It says that we can turn around the harsh economic circumstances of the past four years.

Now in the third paragraph on the first page of the Throne Speech and I quote, "The economic recession under way when my government assumed office one year ago, has deepened and persisted causing widespread hardship throughout Canada and in Manitoba. Unemployment has arisen to post-Depression record levels. Homeowners, small businesses and farmers are struggling for their economic survival in the current difficult situation." As one of my colleagues keeps saying, what a difference a day makes.

Mr. Speaker, our province has 52,000 people unemployed in this province today - I want to repeat - 52,000, 8,000 more than last month, double the number a year ago when this government took office. Every day the statistics in the newspapers bombard us with facts and figures about the unemployed.

In Tuesday's Free Press there's an article and it's headed "City welfare rolls grow, funds short." Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read a couple of paragraphs out of that: "With welfare rolls threatening to swell beyond his highest predictions by the end of the year, Winnipeg welfare director Ron Hooper has asked the city for yet another increase in the 1982 welfare budget." Then he further goes on to say, "At the end of November, 5,371 individuals or families were getting municipal welfare in Winnipeg, an increase of 131 percent over the 2,322 welfare cases 12 short months ago."

Hooper said in an interview yesterday."

Mr. Speaker, this is the state that our people, our people in Manitoba find themselves. They believed the Premier when he said that we can turn around the harsh economic times of the past four years. But, Mr. Speaker, I think the next paragraph that I'm going to read out of this same article probably speaks as much for Manitobans as anything. "A substantial number of people are exhausting their UIC benefits but are not applying for welfare assistance," Hooper said. "They may be living from savings, a spouse's earnings, a temporary or permanent job, or may have moved in with relatives," he added."

Mr. Speaker, how many people are facing this kind of situation? What kind of hardships are these people facing, who will almost anything to stay off the welfare rolls and believe me, there won't be many of them finding either part-time or permanent jobs. How many of these people, how many of the people who finally were forced to apply for welfare to keep a roof over the heads of their families, to make sure their children were fed, how many of these children waited until they had exhausted every resource before applying for welfare? The kind of stress that is put on families in these kinds of situations must be enormous.

What does this government talk about? I'll go back to the Throne Speech, Page 1 again, and I quote, "These are times which will test the will of individuals, communities and nations. Manitobans are meeting this test and in the process, proving that their tremendous ability to cooperate and support each other in times of adversity, is as strong today as it was during the Great Depression in pioneer days." Rhetoric, Mr. Speaker. This Throne Speech has finally taught me the real meaning of the word 'skill' in the effective use of speech and that's what this speech is. The Throne Speech is filled with it: the nerve. Then they go on to say, and back to Page 1, "This province is demonstrating a community spirit and will, to make the best of a difficult situation." Difficult situation. I can hardly believe those words. I have a difficult situation when my car doesn't start or have a difficult situation when I've made two appointments at the same time but believe me, if I was having problems feeding my children or clothing my children, 'desperate' is what I would call my situation, and desperation is what the unemployed in this province must be feeling. When my children were young, Mr. Speaker, I used to read to them about "The Grinch Who Stole Christmas." Well, Mr. Speaker, it's the NDP who is stealing Christmas this year.

I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, and talk about the jobs. In the Winnipeg Free Press on Tuesday, again, there was a \$24-million scheme for jobs announced. "Between 1,500; it says, 'and 1,800 unemployed Manitobans a month are exhausting their unemployment insurance benefits and the figure will likely hit 2,000 a month this winter,' says Mary Beth Dolin, Manitoba Labour Minister." Two thousand a month; that is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. What are these people going to do? Nothing this government can do can change the fact that we are going to have 2,000 more unemployed every month or coming off UIC onto the welfare rolls.

Mr. Speaker, then we find that the Minister goes on to say, and I'll read a little further, "Manitoba really

now is in a catch-up position with other provinces,' Dolin said." That's a strange way to put our unemployment situation; we're catching up. Great stuff for this government, Mr. Speaker. We would have had the jobs in this province if the Minister of Mines and Resources hadn't fumbled the Power Grid. They can talk about Alcan; possibly that wouldn't have happened. They can talk about potash; possibly that wouldn't have happened. But let me tell you the Power Grid would have happened and, as a Manitoban, I resent the fact that they fumbled this great opportunity for our province and for our people to have jobs which are permanent and meaningful and are long-living jobs, not just short term.

Winnipeg has the second worst jobless rate in Western Canada. That's disgraceful. I've lived in this city all my life and have never seen anything like this. I want to tell you the people of Winnipeg and Manitoba are being short-changed by this government and all the short-term jobs in the world are not going to change that.

Then, Mr. Speaker, this one I think takes the cake. I have a newspaper clipping here and it says, "Officials visit job creation sites," and it's a picture of the Premier, the Minister of Northern Affairs that's here and the Member for Thompson visiting. It's bad enough that they have people digging mud for short-term but then they have to go up and say, "Look what great guys we are." Now I want to just quote one little thing out of here. It says, "The Premier promptly asked for a shovel and began to make a modest contribution to the mammoth task. Cowan spoke words of encouragement" - as we know - "as he leaned on the long-handled spade." Now, Mr. Speaker, in this picture there's a total of, I think, six or seven people, and who's smiling? - three. There's the Minister of Northern Affairs; he's smiling. There's the Premier; he's smiling and then we have the Member for Thompson; he's almost laughing. This is just great stuff. Well, I want to tell you that the miners from Thompson are certainly more polite than I might have been because I think if he had asked me for a shovel, I might have told him where to put it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, I feel a sense of disgust that this government — (Interjection) — 'outrage' probably is true, but 'disgust' I think describes it better, that these people would go up and take advantage of a situation like this. No wonder the miners were saying, "Get out of the way, I came here to do a job. I want to keep at it without politicians bothering me." Sure, they're sick and tired of being exploited by this government who are doing things, but at the same time they have to go up, and this is what they call compassion. Compassion, my foot. It's sheer politics, nothing more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go on and speak a bit about the deficit. What is happening to our province? Close to \$500 million in deficit. We have never lived like this. Surely the people across this Chamber don't live like that. If we did we'd be under long ago. I can't believe that they are sincere when they would put not only our children and our children's children in this kind of debt, but in one short year I believe, they've overspent or are spending an increase of \$155 million. Where are they going to go from here? They've got a couple of years left yet. That's about all they're going

to have because how long does one go on like that? How can you put that sort of deficit on the backs of Manitobans? Mr. Speaker, I ask you. Then what does the Premier say when he's asked a question about it? I want to tell you who the Premier hides behind. He hides behind the handicapped. When he's asked a question he says, "The Province of Manitoba does not intend to kick the crutches out from beneath the handicapped in this province." He says that in reference to the 1.5 tax. Then he goes on and says it again when referring to the deficit. "As I indicated the other day, we certainly don't intend to undertake those kinds of programs that will kick the crutches out from underneath those that are in need." How pious, how dare he hold up the people of Manitoba who are handicapped in this manner? They don't want to be treated any differently, Mr. Speaker. They want to be treated the same as anyone else. Let's not hide behind the handicapped in this province for mismanagement because that's exactly what they're doing.

I have heard so much about compassion and discussion. Everyone is compassionate, Mr. Speaker. I don't doubt for one minute that they're compassionate, but I tell you I have heard enough about compassion. What I want to see is some direct action that will help them in the long term.

When this side of the House was in power during the last four years, this government put up a program for the low-incidence, high-cost funding - the autistic was one. Now, this isn't a high-profile type of handicap, and the Minister of Education in her compassion, didn't add one single solitary cent to this group. Now they need one-to-one, Mr. Speaker, not to be shoved into Portage, not to be put in institutions any further. The ones that are there, it's bad enough, but not anything further. Yet, this government talks about compassion. This is a very needy group.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for this Premier waving the handicapped out, pulling them out like a star, 'and look what we did; look how great we are.' Let's have a little bit more anonymous giving, if that's what it is, but it shouldn't be; this should be their right.

When we're talking about the handicapped and talking about funds and saving money, the local CAMR group in Flin Flon which the Minister of Corrections and Community Services was funding - these were funds that were put up originally under the former government - they found a home in Flin Flon that would suit their needs. That home cost \$79,500, but someone came along just before they signed the deed and said, no, that's too high; we can't spend that kind of money. Great. I understand that; they would understand that; but now, what have we got? The government is going to build a home to the tune of \$125,000.00. Now, that is an extra \$45,500, and these are approximate figures, Mr. Speaker. I haven't got the exact numbers, but that's what it is.

The Member for Minnedosa said it correctly. They're using this as one of their job creations. So instead of having an existing facility right now that could help these people, they're going to put it off and say in the spring, look how many jobs we created. What kind of help is this? How many of these would we find if we could carefully look through their Estimates? I would say hundreds. So there are savings to be made. Mr. Speaker, I think it's known as robbing Peter to pay

Paul, and I think it's despicable. I find that this government talks, talks, talks constantly in consultation and this is great, people want to talk, but eventually they want some action.

There are some examples of ways that they could cut back, and they're just minor examples. I wasn't looking for big things; these are just things that came to mind. But how about comparing the extra people that are in the Premier's office now to when we were in power? I mean that's probably just a small thing, but how many are there? Two new departments just announced. There we go again, and I think that probably there were some more last year. Extra Ministers, how many extra Ministers? Hey, 500 more in the Civil Service.

Now we have in the Quarterly Report, which we finally received, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: "To keep the deficit situation manageable, we are taking additional steps to contain expenditure growth, both for the balance of the current year and into the new fiscal year. Desirable but nonessential spending approved for 1982-83, which does not offer significant economic or social benefit, will be postponed or canceled." Great stuff.

"To supplement corrective action already taken, the government has recently" - and I'd like you to note the word 'recently' - "adopted the following expenditure control measures: out-of-province travel will be limited to essential conferences and meetings, and the numbers traveling will be kept to an absolute minimum; no further additions to the government's vehicle fleet will be permitted." I would imagine with that one that it's because all their high-powered help that's in place already have their vehicles. "The Treasury Board must approve any new road construction projects, land acquisitions. Finally, we intend to limit new hiring." Mr. Speaker, this is called closing the barn after the horse is stolen - absolute tripe.

The First Minister - I think he said it yesterday in answer to a question - says our situation is not unique when he was referring to the economy. What does make it unique is that this government said they could turn it around. Our situation is not unique, but this government told the people of Manitoba that they could turn it around, that they would help them. The only people sure of their jobs - and that isn't for too long - are probably the members in this Chamber. I really do feel that it's about time they stopped giving us the cliches that they talk about our Leader talking about and get down to absolute business.

There was another article in the Winnipeg Sun, and I don't intend to read it all. They're talking about the Premier, Mr. Speaker, when he spoke about our deficit and he said, "Manitobans must now realize the extreme financial position of their Provincial Government. The projection of a \$252 million deficit," - \$252 million - my gosh. Now we've got \$500 million and still going, and that's in one year, Mr. Speaker. At the end of the article it says, "What a difference a year makes." I couldn't agree more.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just mention my own taxes, and I have them here. For four years of our government they went up \$125.09 - four years, \$125.04 - pardon me, I made an error there. In one year, Mr. Speaker, under this government, my taxes went up \$212.10. Now, Mr. Speaker, in four years 13 percent; in

one year 19.6 percent. I don't particularly like percentages, but I can't believe this is the sort of government that were going to reduce taxes, help the homeowner; they sure have helped the homeowner. I hate to think what's going to happen next year.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just spend some time on the payroll tax, the tax on employment in this government. How does this government react to the unemployment that has risen to post-Depression levels? It puts a 1.5 percent tax on employment. How could a government that is supposedly the friend of labour come up with a tax on employment? Whether this government likes it or not, this tax is being paid by the employees in most cases. It is unreasonable and foolish to assume that a company that is struggling to stay alive. These are the companies, they employ the people, they're the ones that help the people so they've got to stay alive. There's too many bankruptcies right now.

How can these people be expected to absorb this unfair tax? The result of this tax is many businesses are either putting a freeze on salaries, reducing salaries, or laying off employees. Is this what this government meant when they put on a 1.5 percent tax that they were just so thrilled to have come up with. Aren't we clever? They sure were clever.

In a brief to the Premier and members of Cabinet by the Manitoba Chambers - and my leader has already referred to this, but I think it can be said again - they commented on the timing of the tax. "The 1.5 payroll tax could not have been introduced at a worse time for business in general," said the Chamber. "For labour-intensive businesses the imposition of this tax at this point in time is a devastating blow. Overall economic activity, as reflected in gross national produce figures, both federally and provincially, are static or diminishing, leaving many businesses in a fight for survival. The majority of businesses, particularly those tied to the agriculture economy in Manitoba, have nowhere to turn to earn extra income that will be required to pay this tax."

The Chamber goes on to say that the payroll tax will only add to the difficulties in creating employment for students and others lacking direct employable skills. "The timing of the payroll levy is adverse on one more point. At a time when all jurisdictions are fiercely competing for labour-intensive industries, the payroll levy in Manitoba amounts to a significant deterrent for businesses to locate here."

I would think that this last point, Mr. Speaker, made by the Chamber, might give this government second thoughts about the 1.5 employment tax, especially as it relates to the Winnipeg Core Area Agreement. As I understand it, the key objective, or was the key objective, of the Winnipeg Core Area was to create employment activities, employment opportunities in the core area, and to see that the residents of the core had first crack at these jobs. Monies are available to be spent to provide incentives to labour-intensive industries to encourage them to locate in the industrial park in the Logan area. Now that was at the time, Mr. Speaker, when the industrial park was to be close to 20 acres. Since all the hoo-hah in the newspapers, with the Minister of Urban Affairs interfering everywhere, we're not sure exactly what we have there.

These businesses are supposedly highly labour-

intensive. Now, why would a highly labour-intensive business locate in Winnipeg when they know they'll be faced with a payroll tax, with a tax on employment? Incentives in most cases are one-time grants; but a 1.5 tax could not only go on forever, but would be subject to increase, as it has been in the Province of Quebec. With only two provinces in the whole of Canada having this discriminatory hidden tax, why would any business choose Manitoba? Surely this is a legitimate question that this government should be facing.

Now to get back to the core area, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the proposal - I'm not sure if the City has accepted it yet - is for the Government of Manitoba to take over the part of the housing, and spend up to the tune of \$5 million on one small neighbourhood. Now, Mr. Speaker, whether this is right or whether it is wrong, I don't know, but I do know that when it comes to an industrial park they do indicate that about 20 acres is about as low as you can get if you want to get industries that are going to be viable, that are going to be labour-intensive. They need that much space, and if they're going to cut this down arbitrarily because the Minister doesn't like what they're doing, why doesn't he stay out of Winnipeg on this issue? Why doesn't he let them go on with the plan?

I heard the Member for Rupertsland say that the Native people in Winnipeg are really looking forward to the things that are going to happen in the core. This was supposed to help them, Mr. Speaker, because they were going to spend, I think it was close to \$5 million as incentives, to help these people get employment, and it was the Natives in Winnipeg who probably could have been helped as much as anyone. Certainly this government, I know, seems to be committed to helping the Native people, but here they are at cross-purposes because we have a Minister who wants to go in and put in some houses, which is great stuff, but there are other houses that they can have. Possibly it's the jobs that they need, and in fact, not possibly, we know it's the jobs that they need.

I've been a Manitoban all my life. I can't believe what I'm seeing when I see this Minister interfere the way he is in the local government. When he talks about consultation - and I couldn't agree with the Member for St. Norbert more - councillors get more call in one day than a provincial member would get in a year practically. I know that may be a slight exaggeration but it's very slight. Just one watermain break gets about 50 calls. These people are consulting constantly; they couldn't be closer to their constituents. I find this intrusion into the City of Winnipeg again out of line.

I'd like to speak a moment, Mr. Speaker, about Shoal Lake because - I may not be able to find Shoal Lake to speak about it. Mr. Speaker, it came as a great surprise to me to get in the mail a letter from the mayor and a pamphlet talking about Winnipeg's water supply. Why should the city, at a time when money is in such short supply, have to both waste their time and money sending me a pamphlet so that they can show support, so they can get some help from the Minister of Urban Affairs so that we can keep our water in Winnipeg clean. I don't understand this kind of thinking; this is another case of waste. But I want to tell you, it brought a bit of action, because I think I heard on the news this morning that Munro got in touch immediately with the mayor, saying hold everything,

maybe we'll do something, 30,000 answers does count.

I want to say that it's fine to say, spend the money. It's fine to say . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Eyler: Order please.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It's fine to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the Minister is getting a little bit nervous on this one, and well he should be, because when it comes to Winnipeg's water supply we've had the greatest water that you can talk about, and here he is saying buy the land, let's see what's happening, support the city.

What is happening to our province when they are wanting to interfere with everything? There are enough problems in this province that are under provincial jurisdiction without this Minister interfering in the water supply. I would suggest it's time they got out of this sort of thing and got down to where it counts jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was reading an article on the - let's see - it's in the Executive, December, 1982, and as I was reading along, it said "waking up to political reality." It says, "At last Canadians are waking up to the political reality that their institutions have been undermined by a small group of political activists intent on changing both the direction and nature of their country. The interventions are but a means to the end, which is to fasten government's grip upon all aspects of the Canadian economy, paying lip service to individual enterprise. The activists practise the game of two steps forward and one step back."

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I read this I thought they were talking about the NDP. Well, it turned out that actually they were talking about the Liberals in Ottawa, but it could have been this government. This is the sort of thing that they are doing.

They want to enter into private business now. They want to get into the life insurance and pension business, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say that the life insurance - why would a province, why would a government want to get involved in an industry that is employing so many Manitobans? Why would they want to take these jobs instead of developing others? They seem to see something there and they want to grab it. I don't understand this kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, and I know that they would like to get their hands on the pension business. I don't doubt that for one minute. They see that.

Now we have them going into ManOil. Well, here we are again, and I must confess I don't know a lot about the oil industry. I do know that from talking to the Member for Arthur that there is a lot of business going on, that there is a lot of mining, a lot of development.

Now we have our Government saying that they're anxious because PetroCan is going to come in. Well, I have an article here from the Winnipeg Free Press by Dian Cohen, and it says: PetroCan profits just don't exist. I won't read all the article, but I will read just one little part of it. It says, The Financial Times - if Petro-Canada operated as a normal corporation its annual interest cost would be somewhere between \$250-300 million and the company would be losing its shirt rather than reporting a profit of \$64 million. Petro-Canada's profits are pure fiction, an economic lie, and with the amount of money that's been poured into this

one government enterprise; and here we have a province who is talking about helping. They're talking about helping the underprivileged, the handicapped, the women; they're going to help everybody, and yet they're going to waste their money doing something that private enterprise does so much better. When will they learn, Mr. Speaker?

Then back to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, Page 3: "The venture capital initiative will address the shortage of equity capital frequently experienced by small and medium-size Manitoba firms. It will stimulate equity investment in innovative firms and strengthen such ventures." Well, Mr. Speaker, this makes me very nervous. What's the matter with just plain ordinary firms? Why innovative? Why something that's so weird that nobody will ever get a handle on and you won't get any jobs and won't last? They went into innovative things the last time they were in power and look what happened to them - everyone went down the tube.

Now, I would suggest that this is not the kind of support that Manitoba businesses need. They want help in your day-to-day business; not innovative - (Interjection) - No payroll tax is correct. They just want some help in day-to-day business and just while they're hurting. They don't want help forever; they only want it for a while, none of this forever business. Once they get on their own two feet, by gosh, they'll be happy to pay taxes, they'll be happy to help out. Give them a break when they need it.

Mr. Speaker, I know I've got such a short time, but one thing I think has to be said, and that is we have to say something about the wage settlements in the public sector. There is a growing resentment out in this province about the public-sector money, the settlements that they are having - the average guy isn't getting it. You can tell by the unemployed, this is what's happening to them; they're losing their jobs. We need something a little bit more sensible than what's been happening now and I'm afraid that the government in the next year or two is going to hear about this more and more and more. They can talk all they want, Mr. Speaker, but this is probably one of the things that is going to hurt this government in the long run the most, because it is hurting every other Manitoban.

Mr. Speaker, I request and I beg of this government that they start looking at Manitobans in the public sector - the way things are - not the way they think it is.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Eyler: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I begin by congratulating you on your appointment to your position. I know from the skills that you've demonstrated in the past, you'll certainly fill this function particularly well. Through you, I would like to pass on my regards to the Speaker. I congratulate him on his improved health and I wish him continued good health into the future. I want to congratulate my new colleagues in Cabinet, the Deputy Chairman of Committees, the Mover and Seconder of the Throne Speech.

I also want to commend the Member for Rupertsland for his very thoughtful and thought-provoking comments. The Member for Rupertsland brings us the

benefit of his insight and his background, a background that makes us a better caucus, a background that makes us a better government, a background I'm proud to have on this government team along with the backgrounds of all my colleagues.

Despite the rather strange statements made by the Leader of the Conservative Party regarding the background of the people on this side of the House being of a nature that we weren't fit to govern. Mr. Speaker, those statements debase politics almost as much as those statements debase the Leader of the Conservative Party, and I'll return to this topic later because statements like that have no place in the political spectrum of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the people on the other side think that making statements that verge on bigotry shows leadership. They can be proud of that, Mr. Speaker; I'm ashamed that they're proud of that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Member for Minnedosa have a point of order?

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the member who is speaking is inferring that our Leader was using a bigoted remark when he referred to background of members on that side of the House, and I would like to have the record show that he was inferring business training and ability to manage and run the Province of Manitoba. That's exactly what he was referring to and it's pretty obvious by the damn mess you've got us into already.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll certainly comment on that point of order, which wasn't a point of order, and I hope it doesn't detract from my speaking time, in that when the Leader of the Conservative Party made those statements he made no reference to that whatsoever and I said that they were rather strange statements - they were rather strange statements. They should have been qualified; they weren't qualified. He has made statements somewhat like that in the past and I'll be coming to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now, the interesting thing about the people on the other side is they somehow think that a New Democratic Party Government is an illegitimate government. They always try and paint that picture as if somehow they are members of some type of family compact, that they are members of some type of elite group that somehow is preordained to rule, and that isn't the case, Mr. Speaker. We have indeed a different situation here; we have a changing set of circumstances in this province and, Mr. Speaker, all people are getting a voice in this government. Take a look at our backbench, take a look at our caucus, take a look at our Cabinet, and you'll see that the various groups that make up the cultural mosaic of this province are getting a chance to participate in the decision-making process of government.

The interesting thing is that when we called the Economic Summit and we brought forward business and labour to meet with government, the Conservative Party somehow felt that this process wouldn't work, that there would be all this antagonism because they were the only legitimate group to ever deal with groups like that, that a New Democratic Party couldn't.

In fact, their biggest concern was that they weren't there. And the interesting thing is that they've run this down; they've run down the cooperative spirit of the Summit; they've run down the cooperative spirit of the Summit. They said it was a facade; it was imagery; there wasn't anything to it; you people are trying to hype it out of perspective.

We're not trying to hype anything out of perspective, but I'd like to quote Mr. Lloyd McGinnis, the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, who was writing in *Mid-Canada Commerce*, November 1982, and he said, "As the program progressed," and he's referring to the Economic Summit, "the value of consultation took on new meaning and the potential areas for cooperation expanded. By casting-off our traditional adversarial roles of business, labour and government, we found we had much more in common than originally thought. For instance, we readily agreed on the seriousness of the depressed state of our economy and the limited manoeuvrability of Manitoba about the national circumstances on the short term.

"There was also considerable agreement as to the causes of our economic downturn. As expected, the solutions to our problems have brought to the surface the greatest divergence of views, but even here there was much common ground. An area in which we all agreed was the opportunities we have in Manitoba to combat the short-term conditions and to prosper in the long term."

Mr. Speaker, there was an approach of bringing the people together, of getting an understanding of the problems that exist, of respecting each other, respecting the consultative process that has just been denigrated by the previous speaker. There is an understanding out there; there is an understanding of the seriousness of the situation, internationally and national, and the fact that it's important for people to pull together despite all of the negativism of the Conservative Party. The people of Manitoba are willing to pull together. The only 'odd man out' is the Conservative Party.

We hear a lot of complaints from the Conservatives who say that we shouldn't be going out there and speaking with the people and yet, when the Leader of the Opposition spoke, he was saying that I was too afraid to go up to ManFor or to go up to Thompson and deal with the miners. Well, let me tell you, I've gone up there; I've gone directly up to ManFor. I've gone to Thompson, I've gone to Lynn Lake, I've gone to Leaf Rapids. I have not hidden under a rock like the Tories did for four years.

When I went up to ManFor just after becoming Minister responsible for Manfor and finding out that the Conservative Government had ordered a buildup of 14 million board feet of inventory because they were coming into an election, when the normal inventory was one million board feet. Fourteen million board feet of inventory was built up in ManFor leading up to an election, even though the Board recommended some action being taken, and these people coming into an election, these business experts hid under a rock for that period of time.

I went up and I met with the management and the workers and I said, we have a problem here, and they said, "We know, we can see it all around us. We're glad

you've come up here. The other people were afraid to come up here; they wouldn't come up here and deal with the situation." That's the same thing with the miners and this is why people get so upset, that maybe, despite the seriousness of the economic situation, despite the fact that we don't have great international markets for minerals and that there are layoffs, there has been a process of consultation with the mining companies, there has been a process of consultation with the workers and we have been working to do something in terms of keeping that labour force there. We've been doing community projects, we've been working with the miners and with the companies and we've been working together. We initiated that and that's in marked contrast to what the Conservatives did in 1977; they didn't have an international recession then. There was a shift, a rationalization by Inco of their Thompson activities versus their Guatemala and Indonesian activities, and these people sat on their hands and said we can't do anything about that.

The people recognized that you were a do-nothing Government up there, that indeed you were afraid to go up and see the people. We have gone forward, we have not been afraid and that's the big contrast between the New Democratic Party Government, despite the difficult times - and we are living in difficult times - and the record of the Conservative Government, when we weren't living in an international recession or a national recession, but rather when we were living in a situation whereby the world around us wasn't doing that badly, but we weren't doing well at all, and they hid there during that period.

The only thing that they would do from time to time was to come out - they would come out of the bunker here, they had developed a state of siege mentality - they would come out and if a group came forward they wouldn't go meet with them; they had to march in the Legislature. They would go out and spiel venom at that group, and that is the approach of a bully. There is a lot of rough talk, a lot of swaggering, a lot of name calling, a lot of breast beating, but when you come right down to it they are cowards, they are quitters. No one exemplifies that name calling more than the Leader of the Conservative Party, the biggest swaggerer, the biggest puff fish in this Legislature and, Mr. Speaker, the biggest coward and the biggest quitter. He lost as Premier and now he's picking up his marbles and he's going to run. Why is he going to run? Because within his own party, Vaughan Baird wants to bring forward a motion that any normal democratic party would have on its books, that there should be a leadership review. We have it on our books on a yearly basis. We are proud we have it because we are a democratic party. It is a secret vote, but at the first breath of this being introduced in the Conservative Party, what happened to the swagger? He ran. Even Joe Clark has stayed around and faced some very very difficult times and he's prepared to go into the next convention. —(Interjection)— No, I don't have to support him; but will you support him? Fine. That's the interesting thing; that's for you to choose, but even through that process there isn't a democratic process. They can't do it. They don't even do it on a democratic basis and we have these little lectures about democracy, democratic conditions, when we have a com-

pletely undemocratic party in action, when they won't have a leadership review, when they won't have motions on resolutions, but this is not out of character. Remember what happened in 1966 when there was a Leadership Convention then in the Conservative Party? —(Interjection)— Whenever that year was, it was '65, '66 —(Interjection)— '67, fine. I'm corrected by the Honourable Member for Lakeside who did stick around, who lost that election, who lost the subsequent one but is still here. He's not a quitter. I make the prediction; we have a dark horse there.

What happened to the present Leader of the Conservative Party? He packed up his marbles at that time. He put his tail between his legs and he runs at the first real sign of opposition, even within his own party. Now the only saving thing for him is to act like Trudeau. If you notice, he wants to be a reincarnation of Pierre Trudeau. The two most disliked politicians in, I think, recent Manitoba history are trying to pull the same shuffle. He's announcing a resignation; he's sticking around and every day he's bellowing the call for a new election. 'Sterling in Fantasy Land' -3D. I'd rather have him stay. In fact, I challenge him to screw up his courage and stay here. He is such an inviting target. —(Interjection)— Well, that's the interesting question. If he doesn't screw up his courage to stay - and I prefer his staying, he's the best on the front bench - I'm interested to see who will replace him for the Tories. Will we get an even more regressive Conservative, an even more regressive than the one we have in place now on the far right. And I've referred to an interesting article in the November 29th edition of the Globe & Mail, and it's the results of a survey. "The Conservative Party has sent questionnaires to the 650 delegates who attended the party's policy convention in Toronto last May. About 60 percent replied. The portrait of the typical Conservative convention delegate that emerges from the results shows a man 46 to 55 years old" - Bud, you're in there - "who lives in Ontario" - well, we'll allow that. "He wants the Government to cut spending on day care, unemployment insurance, family allowance, and, yes, job creation projects." Cut it all out. And I'm still quoting from the article, "He doesn't want any increased government spending on hospital care, medicare, post-secondary education or the poor."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. NORDMAN: There's a little problem I'm having with hearing, even with the speaker here, you're not speaking into the microphone. You're speaking to the backbenchers —(Interjection)— yeah, the mike's in front.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: He's Conservative, a typical Conservative and this is their own questionnaire, this is their own questionnaire. They don't want to spend any more on health care, on medicare. We have an aging population; we are going to have to deal with those problems with respect to expenditures on health care. When we say we won't let deficits cause us to kick the crutches out from the handicapped or the ill,

people complain.

Look at this resolution - that's exactly what they want us to do - in their own survey. In their own survey, this is what they want to do. It's an interesting thing and where do they want to spend? They want the government to spend more on defense, especially on NATO and NORAD. End of quote from that article. What they want is the Reaganomics approach, and there is this feeling amongst the Conservatives that they should move to the right. So I look at the group, and there's a number out there --(Interjection)— Peter Pocklington, - that's right. I look at that group and I wonder which ones are going to emulate that approach and take Amway and Peter Pocklington - that approach, take their politics even more to the right. Who wants to do that? It will be interesting because we'll watch that and we will determine which direction they want to go and then what we also want to know is whether any of them there have the courage to move in a more progressive direction.

We've known what's happened to anyone who's spoken out with a progressive voice in the Conservative Party over the course of the last four years. They've been blackballed; they've been kicked out. Speak to some of your own Conservatives about that. Now, the interesting thing will be to find out which one of those people will break out from the mould and try and strike out that ground. It'll be an interesting thing because they will have to show some courage in doing that because the present Leader of the Conservative Party will still be there, hoping desperately for an election so he could be a reincarnation of Pierre Trudeau. So we will watch which direction they will go. So far I haven't seen it; so far I've seen this continued drift to the right on the part of the Conservative Party, and the Conservative Governments elsewhere have been moving to the right as well.

There has to be that approach which is one of compassion, competence, caring and the only alternative when it comes to that approach of course, is the New Democratic Party Government. That's why they are so frustrated, that despite the difficult times, the people of Manitoba are keeping faith with their government; they are working together with their government and I don't want to underestimate the very difficult times we are in. That was the mistake of the previous government.

We indeed realize, as do most people in Manitoba, the depth of the international recession; the fact that they have record deficits in the U.S.; the fact that we're into a very serious situation in Canada, which is reflected in every province, every province across this country. B.C. has put a freeze on their hydro development; Alberta lost \$50 million in mega projects with the same government there. Do you hear all the braying about someone losing mega projects, \$50 million worth of mega projects. They were deferred or canceled. No, I'm not blaming them because that's the economic situation and circumstances that we live in.

The interesting thing is that the Alberta economy has gone so bad that they've had to go out to external borrowings to borrow \$1 billion, the first time in 10 years. Saskatchewan, their potash mines are down; Ontario, massive deficits, record unemployment. 52 percent in Sudbury; Quebec, they may have to postpone the James Bay Project, they've said that they

will. They're not sure of how long, it could be up to 25 years. So that shows the severity of the economic situation that we find ourselves in and no one is trying to hide that; no one is trying to deflect attention away from that because unless you recognize the severity of the problem you're not in a position to try and come to grips with it and do those things that you can deal with the short-term problem, while at the same time giving yourself the wherewithal to deal with the long-term opportunities that will come about when the economy does make an upturn, especially at the international level.

The interesting thing is that those possibilities - and there are a number of them - still exist. I don't want to raise a set of false expectations with respect to the Alcan development or an aluminum development or a potash development, but there are still discussions taking place. But I wouldn't want to put out ads the way these people did. The interesting thing - and hear the scoffs because that's to be expected - on October 3rd, 1982, Joy McDiarmid was appointed as the Public Affairs Liaison Officer for Alcan. It's part of Alcan's commitment to maintain a liaison office in Winnipeg during the postponement period following the 15th of June, 1982 announcement to delay the final decision on the construction of a 2,000 ton aluminum smelter in Manitoba - that's happening.

With respect to the fertilizer, the Annual Report of the IMC says that the company is going to put on hold its 1.3 million ton expansion of its present K-1 Mine at Esterhazy, Saskatchewan, that's on hold. They had received approval when the previous administration was still in. The negotiations for a new potash mine in Western Canada are not expected to resume until there is a marked improvement in markets, the report says. That's what they are saying, not what the Conservatives are saying; I'm not saying anything, I'm saying that this is what they are saying. Again, I don't want to put out a whole ad campaign on that. I don't want to raise false expectations, but I do say that we in Manitoba have confidence regarding all long-term prospects. We do have confidence, and we won't be as negative. We'll be realistic, we won't be negative like the previous administration.

Then we come to the Western Inter-tie - an interesting statement that was in the Free Press by Don Braid as the Edmonton Journal's political columnist, says: "Shaben says with total candor, the engineering work on the Slave River Project will occupy the province's depressed consulting industry. Alberta has been littered with underemployed engineers since the collapse of the energy mega projects." That's not my quote; that's what they are talking about.

Mr. McLaren, the Minister responsible for the Potash Corporation in Saskatchewan, says that, although the province decided to shelve the project for a couple of years, it is still interested. He says, the reasons for the delay was a lower demand for power in Saskatchewan. —(Interjection)— Lorne McLaren, the Minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

The Minister pointed to declines in the potash industry and farm machinery manufacturing as areas where less power is needed because of slumps in the economy. So, I'm not saying those things. These are the people saying them. These are what those people are saying and their whole concern arises as to whe-

ther in fact the government somehow went wildly off in a new direction when, in fact, the truth of the matter is - and this was documented last spring - Manitoba Hydro management advised us of four weaknesses with respect to that interim piece of paper that required up to two years further negotiation to finalize and that is what we took forward to for discussion with the other two provinces.

We negotiated that; that's part of a negotiating process. We didn't re-invent the wheel, we said that we were committed to the notion of a Western Inter-tie, that we would pursue it in good faith on the basis of the principle of a fair sharing of risk and a fair sharing of benefit. We didn't re-invent it. We didn't go back and raise up some of the early discussions put forward by even some of the Conservatives that maybe the Inter-tie should be somehow attached to their increases in the price of oil because Manitobans are certainly going to pay a lot more for oil. There is a massive escalation there. We didn't do any of those things, but those things were raised originally. They weren't at all negotiated in the discussions that took place between the Conservative Government in Manitoba and the other two governments to the west of us.

We didn't go and re-invent all that, but we did, indeed, raise the points raised to us by Hydro management which is what I think they should do, and it's incumbent upon us as government to respect those points and to take them forward, and that is what we did.

I believe that our long-term development is solid. We do have a good renewable energy source. When the economy picks up internationally energy-related projects will improve. We are doing what we can at the same time to make greater use of our renewable energy in Manitoba. We are working to replace diesel generators with hydro. We are working on the electrification of urban transit, and I'm pleased to be working with the City of Winnipeg in this respect. My colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs and myself will be working with the City; we'll be pursuing that, and I don't mind acknowledging that the previous government initiated that. —(Interjection)— No, I'm not at all. That's right.

We are pursuing the electrification of railway. We want to pursue the electrolysis of water to produce hydrogen. We have a good long-term resource strength and we should have confidence in the long-term future of Manitoba, and we on this side do, despite the fact that group keeps moaning and groaning that we don't have a future any more we believe in our future.

Now, I want to turn in the few moments I have left to the whole statements regarding whether we are fit to govern or not, and I've heard statements like that before. They're despicable statements. They've been made often in campaigns, in the heat of campaigns. They are a vicious carry-over from a sad chapter in our past and should be buried. Possibly I'm too sensitive about this, but when I look at circumstances where someone would say, the people who in large measure are unfit to govern, unfit to govern by background, by philosophy and so on, but have listed the other things, listed philosophy and you know all red-baiting he goes through, the other point was background.

Well, look at the backgrounds of us. We can open

our backgrounds up, we don't have things to hide. There is an ethnic bias that can be raised though, and I refer back to the 1974 campaign where people were concerned about that type of statement being made before and I quote: "One of the best examples of how the Conservatives are fanning prejudice in this campaign is a recent four-page pamphlet distributed in Winnipeg South by candidate Sterling Lyon. It is a highly selective sometimes patently distorted picture. In this election I'm not running against the Liberals, I'm running against the Trudeau Liberals, there really is a difference; that's why so many real Liberals are voting Progressive Conservative this time." And there's an ad that he put out, chock-full of things in the middle of the ad are three names: Jean Marchand, Keith Spicer, Marc Lalonde, two francophone Ministers and the Commissioner of Languages, nationally. Out of the blue, no explanation, just put in there. That to me was despicable politics, raising the whole notion of background the way that was done, whether intentionally or unintentionally, someone who's been around as long as he tells us he's been around and someone who's been a Premier of this province should know better than that. I say that approach is completely and totally unacceptable in this Legislature - and the people on this side of the House will not allow anything like that to be pushed in an intentional way or an unintentional way. That is completely unacceptable.

I switch now to the petroleum package that is in the Throne Speech. I will be introducing three bills this session that together form a petroleum package with which this government will make clear its intentions with regard to royalties and taxation, the ground rules that will guide the industry, the conditions governing access to land and the rights of landowners and the public sharing of this vital, natural resource.

The new Bills are: An Act to amend The Oil and Natural Gas Tax Act, The Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation Act and The Surface Rights Act. We have deliberately chosen to introduce all three pieces of legislation at the same time in a conscious effort to inform the public and the industry exactly where this government stands on this critically important energy sector of our economy.

The oil industry has experienced several years of uncertainty in other jurisdictions and I feel that while Manitoba might be a junior producing province, we can still set an example by removing as much uncertainty as possible. We recognize that the industry is entitled to know where they stand in terms of taxation and public sector intentions. I believe this package accomplishes that and when the Legislation is enacted, the Manitoba citizen and landowner, our municipalities and the industry will be able to look forward to continued expansion in a positive atmosphere of fairness and intelligent encouragement.

Against the background of economic recession, the current boom in Manitoba's oil industry is a welcome contrast. Take a moment to bring members up to date. For the first time in 14 years production has increased. To date this year 177 new wells have been drilled, three times the activity of 1981; 150 new producing wells, a 20 percent increase to 900. We expect to have some 200 wells drilled in 1982 by the end of year, a level of activity not seen since the initial boom of the mid-50's and all known intentions for 1983 indicate a

continuation at the same level. This is going on despite the fact the people opposite keep saying that this government can't work in a mixed economy with the private sector. The interesting thing is we have been able to work with them. They have come in, in a very competent manner. What we're saying is we're getting a twofold approach there. They say if the oil's there they should be there.

The interesting thing is that it was basically priced. It's basically priced. I'm not taking credit for it. I'm saying that it's basically a set of circumstances, the most important of which was a discovery that in part people will say possibly it was a bit of an accident, the fact that people moved in around that, the fact that the prices went up. We had the situation to the west of us where provinces were changing their royalties so we've established some longer term stability over a period of time and we believe that when we move with respect to the oil and gas royalties, when we move with respect to a Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation, that we will move to enhance the long-term stability of the oil industry in Manitoba and that's what we are looking for. We're not looking for any quick response and we recognize that we're having a mini boom, but in Resources you often have mini booms and major busts. What we're looking for is long-term stable development because it's when you have long-term stable development that you can get proper linkages with service industries, that you can get proper opportunities coming forward for the people who live in that area, for employment opportunities.

We believe that long-term stability is important and we believe that a Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation will add to the development of that long-term stability. It will stimulate existing development and assist private juniors who often don't have the opportunity through joint ventures because a lot of the majors, a lot of the big companies don't, in fact, pay much attention to Manitoba because they're looking for the massive oil find and they believe that although there's oil in Manitoba, their overhead is too high. They really aren't that interested, so it's the small ones who come forward and they need to deal with other people on farm outs and joint ventures and that's a common practice and indeed we already are receiving applications from people who want to talk to us. That means we have to be careful. We have to be prudent. We want to make sure we separate the wheat from the chaff with respect to these proposals and we want to make sure that we do have a good development, in terms of different geographical areas, in terms of different depths of drilling.

We also believe that it's important for us to have the expertise, develop it in the southwest, develop that commercial expertise and maintain a window on what is taking place on the Hudson's Bay and the stakes there are massive. The Ontario Government for example has put up something in the order of at least \$350 million. That's a conservative effort, Mr. Speaker. We're being attacked for wanting to make sure that we have some effort of a similar nature in Manitoba and we're not unusual. Alberta's done it, Saskatchewan's done it, Quebec has done it.

The Conservatives would want to keep us in the 19th century. They are still speaking out, day in, day out against PetroCan. Let the record be clear. We on

this side of the House believe in PetroCan; we believe that it's important for the future of Manitoba and the people on the other side, they don't believe in it. They would disband it immediately and they would sell off all the private, profitable things to the private sector while at the same time keeping any losing aspects with the public sector and they are saying, yes, because that is their approach. Our approach is different and we will be moving with respect to Surface Rights legislation and I will have my Legislative Assistant, the Member for the Pas, speak on that. He will be filling people in on further material on that and I'm pleased that he is working with me on this. He has been a farmer for a long time. He understands many of the problems and I'm very pleased to have him working with me on this.

The interesting thing is I'm hearing some comments as to who initiated this and I will admit that it was the previous government - the Ross Nugent Report, it was a good base to build on - but they spent four years dealing with this and we are bringing in legislation within one year. We act. I went out there; we visited with the people; we're acting, Mr. Speaker. We believe that these initiatives will add to the long-term development and stability of the oil industry in Manitoba. We believe that's an important thrust. It shows, Mr. Speaker, our general approach. We have faith in our province, we have faith in its resources, we have faith in its people and we have faith, that by working together we will survive these difficult times and we will meet our great future in the future.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My first words in participating in this Throne Speech Debate, Sir, are, of course, words of renewed welcome to you in your position of high office in this Chamber and in your role as advocate for all of us who are members here. Also I express pleasure, along with all others in this House who have done so and who no doubt share in the feeling, at your remarkable progress and recovery of your health, Sir, and we devoutly hope that continues to a point of 100 percent completion.

I'd like to take a moment to congratulate the Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for River East, on his elevation to his new office; to congratulate the Mover and the Second of the Speech from the Throne, the Honourable Members for Riel and Thompson respectively and to congratulate the three new Ministers, the Honourable Members for Dauphin, Flin Flon, and Gimli and to wish them well in their ministerial assignments. I stop short, Sir, of wishing them longevity in their roles.

I would like to extend special congratulations, Mr. Speaker, to two of my honourable friends who have been in this Chamber for some considerable time, the Honourable Member for Elmwood and the Honourable Member for Concordia. I wish to congratulate them for having the good sense to distance themselves from the centre of the nuclear bomb blast, Mr. Speaker, and put themselves in a position where they will escape the damage and the fallout, and potentially be in a position to pick up the pieces after the front

bench and supporting members of this government are destroyed. I think that shows considerable presence of mind on the part of the Member for Elmwood and the Member for Concordia, but they're veterans of this Chamber and veterans of the political process and it was to be expected of them I think, Sir.

I also want to recognize the altered status, if I may use that term, of the Honourable Member for Brandon West who, since we last met, has become an Independent rather than a member of the New Democratic Caucus and therefore indicates, Sir, that he has seen at least half the light and there may be expanded illumination shine upon his conscience before long.

I would join others who have paid respect and recognition to the contribution in this Throne Speech Debate and the contribution thus far in this Legislature, the Thirty-second Legislature, Mr. Speaker, made by the Honourable Member for Ruperstland. He speaks eloquently for his constituency, and I use that term in the broadest sense, not necessarily the narrow political sense, and I am sure that my colleagues agree with me that the deliberations of the House in terms of the welfare of Manitobans in general, are enriched by having the kind of contributions that he has demonstrated he can make.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry the Minister of Mines and Energy has left the House because I wanted to compliment him on his eloquent contribution to the Throne Speech Debate and his brilliant defense of the indefensible; his brilliant concentration on the Throne Speech and what was in it, and what the programs (?) of this government are, and how magnificently he defined them, articulated them and laid them out so that all of us in this Chamber, in the public gallery, in the press gallery in the Province of Manitoba can understand it. Now we all know clearly what this government is doing, where it is headed, and what we can look forward to, Sir, and it adds up to the sum total of nothing, as articulated so clearly and so cleverly by the Minister of Mines and Energy. What he said, Sir, spoke volumes for the Throne Speech, that pathetic, rapid, rhetorical effort that was brought into this House by the First Minister and his colleagues and which Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor was forced to deliver to the people of Manitoba last Friday.

Sir, if anyone ever saw verbal 'Redi-Whip,' and yesterday's Redi-Whip at that, it was this year's Throne Speech. It was artificial topping that had gone sour before it was even delivered, and it was demonstrated that even members opposite felt that way about it by the performance of the Minister of Mines and Energy a few moments ago when he studiously avoided that message and studiously avoided any reference to the contents of that unfortunate effort.

I also want to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to say that I deplore the tactics employed by the Minister of Mines and Energy - perhaps I should say re-employed by the Minister of Mines and Energy - in the area of venal personal assault and character assassination. We saw considerable evidence of that between 1977 and 1981 when he sat on this side of the House in Opposition and expended all his time and all his energy to distorting the position of the government of that day to manipulating peoples' minds, to orchestrating public demonstrations, to contriving fictions and fabrications and to trying to spread them as widely as

he could across this province. Well, he did his job very well, he did his job very well. He succeeded in getting himself and his colleagues elected. But we would have thought, Sir, that his elevation to the Treasury Benches, that his swearing in as a Minister of the Crown, that his Oath of Office, imposing and invoking the sense of duty and responsibility that it does upon one entering upon that kind of career, would have mellowed him and perhaps persuaded him to take a more responsible approach to public affairs and persons involved in public affairs in this province. Unfortunately that appears not to have been the case. He's spent half of his time attacking my Leader, and half of his time attempting to discredit the positions that Progressive Conservatives take generally with respect to the interests of society and engaged at some considerable length in that exercise, Mr. Speaker, in dragging in veiled references so typical of his manner, veiled references to the ethnic question.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there are some of us in this Chamber who would say that in Manitoba there is no ethnic question and why somebody like the Minister of Mines and Energy continually tries to inject it into conversation and debate, to plant seeds of doubt and cynicism and discrimination in people's minds and to tag members on this side of the House or anywhere else with those venal thoughts that exist in his own mind, he's obviously very very preoccupied with the whole question of ethnicity, is beyond me, Sir, after he's been sworn into office as a Minister of the Crown. I think that was a very deplorable manoeuvre and I wish the First Minister had been here to hear it.

There are some of us in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, who recall some pretty unsavoury remarks having been directed at a large and very important ethnic community in this province by members of the previous NDP Administration in this province under the then Premier, the Honourable Ed Schreyer. We remember some pretty unsavoury things that were said about shyster lawyers and gold dust-twins and the like, which were very thinly veiled references to a distaste held by many members of that government for certain members of certain ethnic communities in this province. So when the Minister of Mines and Energy stands up here and tries to twist a remark of my Leader having to do with background which was related specifically to competence, into some kind of mean and venal ethnic or racial slur, I, Mr. Speaker, for one say that he should be censured and that kind of action is to be deplored. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to spend any more time on that point because I think it's an unsavoury point.

I want to devote my attention at this point in time, Sir, to dealing basically in the time at my disposal with two basic deficiencies, as I see them, with the NDP Government of the Day. For the past eight months, Sir, we've been challenging and questioning the competence of this government to administer the public affairs of the people of Manitoba and the justifications for that challenge to their so-called competence are all around us. They keep piling up one on the other and that has been one of our basic approaches eloquently articulated by my Leader and by others of my colleagues who have spoken in this debate already, and it will be taken up again by colleagues still to speak and will certainly be pursued by us until we

achieve what is necessary for the people of Manitoba, either some development of competence on that side of the House or a replacement of that government by others who would be able to deal more competently, innovatively and imaginatively with the problems besetting the province today.

But that's one of the deficiencies that I want to spend a few moments on and not necessarily the most important one, Sir, so just let me say fairly briefly that those justifications for our challenge to that so-called competence, which I say are widely evident, are seen in particular in the dismal condition of our economy, a condition which is not, despite what the Minister of Finance and the First Minister and their colleagues would have us believe and despite the lamentable hand-wringing that comes from every corner of the government benches everytime the subject is raised, a condition that is not solely or even primarily based on external economic factors or the result of policies made in Washington by the US Administration or made elsewhere. They are partially the result of those external realities and nobody is attempting to deny, that and in fact we tried to say that in 1980 and 1981 but of course our position was very shrewdly and cleverly distorted by the Opposition of the day, now the government.

We're willing to concede to the temporary stewards of these offices in administration of the affairs of Manitoba that there are external factors over which a province of one million people has very little control, over external factors of international economic, fiscal, social and political pressures over which a province of one million people in the heart of North America has little control. We concede that, which is something they never did for us, Sir. However, let's not expect fair treatment of Progressive Conservatives by the members of that party opposite.

The fact is, Sir, that they are only partially responsible for the difficulties that exist in Manitoba today and for the dismal condition of our economy. They are partially and significantly the result of that Provincial Government's failure, unwillingness or plain inability to rise above its self-imposed ideological constraints, to rise above its inability to deal with emergencies and to introduce action of a nonpartisan nature that would meet emergencies head on and also its inability to take the tough action necessary to help get this province and this country through the current recession as quickly as possible.

I want to say, Sir, that when I refer to those self imposed ideological restraints, I'm not engaging in mere rhetoric. They find themselves unable to do things that disturb the basic constituency to which they appeal and on which they rely for their vote and therefore they are not in a position politically, they're not able politically, to do the job that needs to be done to save this province and this country. That is one of the biggest problems that we face in that government over there. They do not do other than the bidding of the leadership of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and the leadership of the labour movement generally, not the rank and file, and the influence of those persons who subscribe to their abuse and sustain them in office. They have not got the courage to say to that particular constituency, "Look, we are the government of all Manitobans. We are the linchpin, Keystone

Province of Canada who should be participating for all Canadians in national economic recovery. There are certain things we have to do and if we have to rise your temporary displeasure, maybe even risk your vote, we're going to have to do it." And I say, Sir, that the previous government of this province did that. Unfortunately, we wound up in Opposition but we had the courage to do it because we knew that that was right. We said we won't play political games; we will do what needs to be done for the people of Manitoba and for this province. Over there you've got a government so constrained by that kind of lock-step commitment, inherent commitment to its masters in terms of philosophical approach to society, to its masters and to its funders and to its bag men and bank rollers and money raisers and to its influence pedlars and to its policy shapers, none of whom are in this building that they cannot move to take the tough action necessary and make the decisions that have to be made to help Manitoba through this recession, and through Manitoba, to help Canada through this recession.

Mr. Speaker, the justifications, as I say, for the challenge that we lay at the feet of the government's so-called incompetence, or so-called competence, actual incompetence, are seen in the suffering and the anxiety brought about in Manitoba today by the fact that there are now 52,000 Manitobans out of work. Many of them are heads of households and those people represent an increase of almost 23,000 - in fact, I believe that's virtually a precisely accurate figure - 23,000 more jobless in the province today than was the case just one year ago when the government changed hands. The justifications of which I speak are seen in the new payroll tax which was supposed to generate much-needed provincial revenues in a fair and relatively painless way, Mr. Speaker. The government falsely proclaimed that that new tax would generate new revenues for the province in a fair and reasonably painless way. It was going to be spread out across the spectrum of society in such a way that it affected everybody equally and nobody was unduly harmed or affected. Well, Sir, that was what it was said it was going to do by this government when it was introduced by that Minister of Finance last May, and in fact, Sir, it has failed by both criteria. It has not generated the necessary new revenues that the province requires and it has compounded the economic and social suffering of the people of Manitoba because it has penalized business, it has cost jobs, it has eliminated enterprise and it has semi-paralyzed economic activity in many sectors of the small business community so that it has made suffering of an economic and social nature in Manitoba worse. So it fails on both counts, Sir.

These justifications that exist for our challenge to their competence are seen in the so-called Interest Rate Relief Program, Mr. Speaker, a program of relief that has failed to relieve Manitobans in any significant number in any of the areas to which it was addressed. It has failed to relieve significant numbers of Manitobans and surely that was what it was intended for. In fact, it was proclaimed as certain to guarantee that kind of performance by the Minister of Agriculture when it was announced last February. It has failed to relieve Manitobans in any significant number from the high interest burdens they are carrying in the areas of

their homes, in the areas of their farms or in the areas of their businesses. The Minister of Agriculture raises - perhaps it wasn't the Minister of Agriculture, I didn't see him, it might have been his seatmate who appeared to question my reference to the Minister of Agriculture - it was the Minister of Agriculture who was in charge of drawing up that Interest Rate Relief Program and who introduced it last February, and we said at the time it won't work, it's not properly thought out, it's spread too thin, you're not applying the money in any meaningful way where it can help any meaningful numbers and the figures are in today that demonstrate that you've reached about 15 percent of the target population that you said you would reach, and about 7.5 percent of what the proposed Progressive Conservative Interest Rate Relief Program for homeowners would have reached for the same amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, this incompetence is seen in the tangled jungle of their housing programs. This incompetence is seen in their loss - of whom the grand architect was the Minister of Mines and Energy - the loss of those three great job generating projects, the aluminum smelter, the potash mine and particularly the Western Power Grid. Some 12,000 to 15,000 permanent career opportunities, vocational opportunities for young men and women, such as, the sons and daughters and grandsons and daughters of those members opposite, blown out the window, Mr. Speaker. That is a testimony to their incompetence.

Their incompetence is seen, Sir, in their inability to recognize, identify and act on new opportunities and replacements for those projects, and I intend to take up with the Minister of Mines and Energy, who has simply moved further back in the Chamber, or whether that's a portend of things to come, I do not know; an initiative which I think he has blown that could have involved the Province of Manitoba with two enterprises, Dynamic Mining Exploration Limited and Combustion Engineering Limited, in development of chromite reserves in the Bird River area of Manitoba, in the Lac du Bonnet area of Manitoba; the possible development of a chromium smelter and a possible enterprisers that would have provided 1,000 jobs in Manitoba. Now, those two enterprisers are still going ahead with their feasibility study but no thanks to the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker, and I've got a file of correspondence here one inch thick that will demonstrate that. No thanks to the Minister of Mines and Energy. For \$12,500, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy could have got Manitoba in on that feasibility study and on the ground floor of that project but we're not in on it now.

I will table it — (Interjection) — It's all in the Minister's offices.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the honourable member's words.
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the challenges to the incompetence of this government can be seen in the crushing increases in bankruptcies in this province in the past year, personal bankruptcies, business failures and farm bankruptcies. The challenge to their competence can be seen in the significant increase in most school divisions across this province in real pro-

perty taxes and school taxes; most school divisions in this province. Mr. Speaker, and don't let them cite the one or two in their particular areas that may have escaped, because most property owners and taxpayers in their divisions are faced with increased real property and school taxes as a result of their meddling and fumbling with the financing program that's in place in the school system at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the incompetence can be seen in the dangerous proclivity of this government to engage in almost open-ended borrowing, particularly it's risky and repeated forays into off-shore financial jurisdictions, into the off-shore money markets. At a time, Sir, when the relative strength of the Canadian dollar compared to many other international currencies is uncertain to say the least, if not perilous, uncertain to say the least, but they're merrily going on borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars in those international markets without regard for that uncertainty, for that volatility.

Mr. Speaker, the incompetence can be seen in this government's inability as reflected in the Throne Speech to produce any imaginative or innovative initiatives or programs or policies for battling the recession in this province, for helping to ease the economic and social suffering imposed by the conditions of the day and the conditions which they blame as being uncontrollable.

Mr. Speaker, the incompetence can be seen in this government's unwillingness to support the National Economic Recovery Program. I think that is one of the strongest indictments that can be laid at the door of this First Minister and his colleagues. They are not willing to join with the other provinces of Canada and with the average Canadian, man and woman, concerned about the conditions in our country today who are all making an extra effort, going the extra mile, taking the extra cut, taking the extra limitation in order to help their community, their province and their country out of this difficult fiscal and financial situation; but not this government, they won't even support the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. They won't even support individual villages, towns and municipalities in this province who want to get spending and costs and excesses under control. They won't do it. Why, Sir? Because as I said before, they are inextricably wedded, committed forever to the doctrine of their masters, and their masters say to them, you do this, you jump and we vote for you, and therefore they jump and assure themselves of that vote. If that jump means ignoring the 6 and 5 appeal and going to 13, 14, 15 percent, well, that's how high they jump, Mr. Speaker, because they know that they will get that political support and they're afraid, they haven't got the guts, the intestinal fortitude, to put the interests of Manitobans on the line first.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important justification for our challenge to their competence - our challenge of their competence - the most important justification was brought into this House on Tuesday of this week, I believe, in the quarterly statement presented by the so-called Minister of Finance. The devastating half-billion-dollar deficit for 1982-83, now being projected by the government, that will saddle Manitobans for generations to come with debt, not of their own making, debt not of their wishing, not of their desire;

that's what we're faced with today through that quarterly financial statement, and the incompetence of this government, Mr. Speaker - a doubling of the provincial deficit in one year, a half-billion-dollar deficit. A fiscal and financial and taxation burden around the necks of generations of Manitobans to come who had no responsibility for it, and who didn't rack up the debt. But they don't care.

Mr. Speaker, that is indictment No. 1, the incompetence of this government. And my Leader and others of my colleagues have spoken eloquently on the extent of that incompetence.

But an equally serious indictment, Sir, and one that I want to spend the remaining minutes of my time on, is to be found in the area of honesty, the area of this government's credibility.

Mr. Speaker, in the mid-1960s, during the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson and the traumatic mid-way years of the Vietnam War, there was coined in the United States a phrase that came to be almost a household cliché in political terms in the western world, the phrase that referred to 'the credibility gap.' Before that, very few of us having any exposure to politics, had much knowledge of any credibility gap or concern for credibility because we believed politicians, we believed public officials, we believed our governments were telling us the truth, and it came as something of a shock, I think, to North Americans in the mid-1960s to find out that in many instances the administration of the day could not be totally believed in terms of the things that it was saying, in terms of the news that it was giving the people of America, and so the phrase, the "credibility gap," emerged.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to warn the First Minister and his colleagues that they face very serious devastating risk and damage, of course to the Province of Manitoba, but to themselves if they persist in widening this credibility gap that now exists between that government and the people of Manitoba.

This government, Sir, has got itself into a very serious psychological state of mind. It is like a gambler who gets hooked on gambling; a drinker who gets hooked on drink; a criminal who gets hooked on the thrill of crime. This Government, when it was in Opposition four years ago, started the practice of twisting the truth, of telling half-truths, of distorting things, of fabricating, and they got hooked on it, Sir, and they can't get out of it now. It's now second nature with them. They do not level with the people of Manitoba. They do not answer honestly to the people on this side of the House. They suffer a psychological handicap, Mr. Speaker, they are incapable of telling the truth. They can tell the half-truth, and they tell it very well.

I think that's a serious problem for the people of Manitoba, that we have an emotionally crippled Government, a psychologically crippled Government, that has been twisting the facts for so long, and here was a classic example of them, Sir, for four years over here, distorted, manipulated, twisted the conditions of the day in business, in social affairs, in the economy, in the mine layoffs in the North, in health care. Day after day they twisted and distorted, and they got themselves into a mindset that now does not permit them to act any other way. In government, they are in the same mindset; they are twisting and distorting. They fail to address questions properly, they fail to

answer them properly, they cover up, they tell half-truths, and that is a devastating condition for this province to be in. They got so used to it that it has become characteristic of them.

Let me give you some examples, Mr. Speaker. We've got a Minister of Energy and Mines. Mr. Speaker, for example, a Minister of Energy and Mines who has carefully and consistently demonstrated that he's able to cover up, relatively effectively, his miscues in the area of the Western Power Grid and the other major job-generating projects that were at the starting point in this province when the NDP Government took office. We had another example of it this afternoon, when he twisted remarks made by my Leader in his participation in this Throne Speech Debate.

Mr. Speaker, we've got a Minister of the Environment who had a report from the Clean Environment Commission which he sat on, against the desires and the needs of the people of Manitoba, until it suited his purposes to release it and make it public.

We've got a First Minister, Mr. Speaker, who, out in Vancouver the other day, talked about the desirability of having an NDP Government because it was the only type of government that could deal with unemployment, the only kind of government that could deal with unemployment. We've got a First Minister who, in Vancouver the other day, said that his government has in one year increased capital construction in the health care field by 100 percent, and that is a lie, Mr. Speaker. The First Minister is quoted as saying in Vancouver that his government in one year has increased capital health facility construction by 100 percent, and he knows that is not true. If anything, it may be up by about \$29 million and that's a far cry from 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we have got a First Minister who has said two or three times in the last two or three days that he heads a government that "unlike the members opposite will not kick the crutches out from under the handicapped." Mr. Speaker, what kind of devious innuendo is that? He knows that there was no such action by the previous government. The previous government defended and did all it could for the League for the Physically Handicapped, and for the people receiving social assistance, and for the people on community service programs, and the health care generally.

We've got a First Minister who goes about talking in his celebrated pamphlet, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans," promising a restoration of the health care system. What restoration, Mr. Speaker? Nothing needed to be restored. The health care system was in excellent shape; it was receiving 33 percent of the tax dollar in the Province of Manitoba; it was as good a health care system as could be built and maintained anywhere by one million people and was the envy of most Canadians. But those people, Sir, they believe that by making an election promise that they will restore the health care system, that somehow they'll persuade some people that there's something wrong with the health care system. That is dishonest campaigning, Mr. Speaker, and the First Minister is party and privy to that.

We've got a Minister of Community Services and Corrections who launches an inquiry into a correctional facility, denies it in the House and goes outside

and tells the media that yes, it's already under way, Mr. Speaker.

We have got a Minister of Education —(Interjection)— I trust this isn't being counted against my time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Does the honourable Minister have a point of order?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I just heard the honourable member make a statement which is false. He is misleading this House and I want him to withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry to the same point.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, Hansard will show that I said we've got a Minister of Community Services and Corrections who launches an inquiry into a correctional facility in this province, denies it in the House, then goes outside and tells the media that yes, it's already under way. Now, Mr. Speaker, I stand by that and the record is in Hansard and in the media.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister to the same point of order.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, that statement is totally false. The Member for Fort Garry is making a misleading, deceitful statement that is not worthy of a member of this House. That matter was dealt with and the matter is clearly on the record. He is continuing to perpetrate an untruth, Mr. Speaker, and he cannot get away with continually putting words in other people's mouths on this side; continually twisting the truth; continually making allegations that are totally untrue, totally unfounded. He cannot get away with this and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that that member withdraw.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I think the honourable members for their contributions. They will be aware, I'm sure, that a difference of opinion as to the facts between two members does not constitute a point of order.

Order please. Order please. Order please. The matter was brought up as a matter of privilege in this House within the last two days. That should have concluded the matter.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry should not refer any further to the matter, in concluding his speech. He has four minutes remaining.

MR. L. SHERMAN: In any event, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— In any event, Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Does the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources have a point of order?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes I have, Mr. Speaker. There has been a statement made in this House attributing words to another member —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm entitled to make my point of order without heckling or interruptions there. I am addressing the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has been a rule in this House that where a member says that another member has said certain facts and alleged that he has misled this House, that when those facts have been clarified and the matter has been cleared, then this House is bound to accept the word of the member and no further continued reference to that should take place. That is the rule in this House and that matter was clear.

Now the honourable member raises the same question again, the same innuendo —(Interjection)— that is out of order, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— I am not, I am not.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister for his support regarding the point that the matter has been concluded. I will ask the Member for Fort Garry to proceed with his remarks with no further reference to the matter which has been concluded.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we've got a Minister of Education who passes off a fiscal initiative in the area of school divisions as a new program of support and assistance, when in fact it's merely a continuation of a program introduced by our government and to which my colleague, the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, had already spoken.

We've got a Minister of Finance who stood in this House and sold The Post-Secondary Health and Education Tax Levy Act to us last May, last June, and said that it was designed to supply revenues for health and post-secondary education and to fill up the shortfall that would result from changes in the EPF legislation and then who, this summer, Mr. Speaker, went out before certain groups at the railroads, having to do with health benefits paid to railroad workers and said, and was quoted in the Winnipeg Free Press as saying that not one penny of the health and post-secondary education tax can be traced to medical surgical services, it goes into the consolidated fund. —(Interjection)— Well, he didn't say that when he was selling the bill of goods to the people of Manitoba last May, Mr. Speaker. He said this is for health and post-secondary education. But put him in a bind where a union leader is putting the pressure on him to preserve some certain benefits and then he says, "How high should I jump?" as they all do, and they say, "This high," and he jumps that high. He immediately says, oh well, that money is not going to health and post-secondary education, it's going into consolidated revenues, therefore you, Mr. CNR and you, Mr. CPR

still have to pay those health benefits because otherwise it would be double taxation. That's the kind of subterfuge double-talk we're getting from that Government, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore I conclude, Sir, by suggesting that although that indictment of incompetence is very very serious - incompetence is not acceptable or excusable, but it is at least forgivable, and in this case we have a more serious indictment of untruthfulness from that government and untruthfulness is unacceptable, inexcusable and unforgivable, Mr. Speaker.

Let them deal with that credibility gap, let them address their two big challenges, the credibility gap; that they have created and the question of some competence, Mr. Speaker. If they can do that, Manitoba can be saved if they can't, Manitoba cannot be saved, and certainly they can't be saved. The First Minister had better address himself to those problems.

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

The honourable member's time has expired. I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening when the floor will be open on this matter.