



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.4B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 7 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
DEJARDINS, 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	Virден	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, 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
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 7 December, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. On the motion of the Honourable Member for Riel, the Amendment by the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland has 21 minutes remaining.

MR. E. HARPER: Mr. Speaker, in my previous remarks I alluded to how fundamental it was to understand the relationship of the Native people between governments and this is essential in order to appreciate the plight of Native people. I also commented on statistics and conditions in which Native people survive. Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue on this debate and provide an alternative.

We want access to viable economic base on reserves, in rural communities, in towns and in cities. This requires channeling of funds from resource and economic development programs. This also requires money for job creation and also for training of communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne guarantees special employment funds transferred to northern community projects, matching for job creation via the NEED Program, the New Employment Expansion and Development Program, funds for job training and retraining.

Mr. Speaker, the Economic Summit Conference held in Portage la Prairie brought Native people together along with other sectors of the population. The Conference had meaningful discussion on cooperating in difficult economic times.

The Northern Development Agreement was just signed recently in the amount of \$186.2 million. This agreement will provide the framework for an overall social and economic strategy for the North. An example of the program is the Northern Nurses Training Program based in Thompson.

As mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, Native people have an historical and also an economic interest in realizing the potential of the wild rice industry and a greater initiative is needed in this area.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we want a fair settlement of our land entitlements and I commend this Government in establishing the Treaty Land Entitlement Commission. This Commission is working to bring its report to the Government. These entitlements are outstanding and unfinished treaty business. The issue of Metis land claims has yet to be addressed by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I go into an area where it's very difficult at times to discuss. This area is in the area of racial discrimination. We want to curb or put an end to racial discrimination, if it is at all possible. It takes many forms, but in general it is one of the most subtle and most pervasive barriers for Native people seeking to interact with other Canadians. It happens every day. It is so deeply woven into the fabric of this Canadian society that it goes unnoticed or accepted simply as the way it is or the way it ought to be.

The Manitoba Human Rights Commission is rigorous in pursuing accusations of racism. Yet, racism is far from solidly entrenched than may be dealt with on an issue by issue basis. Let me remind you of a few blatant examples. This spring, an Appeal Court judge said that the only evidence he got from the Indians came from drunken Indians. Mr. Speaker, this summer another Appeal Court judge referred to Indian religion as pagan and made other derogatory comments about culture and traditions. One of these judges apologized for his remarks, neither was disciplined or censored.

Mr. Speaker, by contrast, when a B.C. Supreme Court judge spoke out against the federal-provincial back-off from entrenching Aboriginal and Treaty Rights, the Judicial Council of Canada harshly condemned him for taking political action and only stopped short of recommending his removal from office.

Mr. Speaker, when the judiciary expresses such sentiments toward Native people it is difficult to trust that we all receive an impartial hearing. Our interactions with police are similarly fraught with distrust and uncertainty. You are privileged to teach your children that a policeman will always help; as someone to seek out in terms of trouble. How would you feel if you could not in honesty offer your child that support? You could not tell your child that the system is basically friendly.

The Government intends to prepare legislation to deal with citizens' complaints against police. It will be important for my people to be considered when this legislation is drafted.

Few people understand Native people and there are reasons why this exists. The image of Native people projected on the screen by movie makers has not been helpful. Hollywood gives us the noble savage and others, including some of the judiciary, want us all to be ignoble savages. While there are a few of both stereotypes around, most of us do not fit that mold.

Second, the media intends to present our goals and aspirations superficially and sensationally. Did you notice how penetrating the analysis by the media of the Quebecois just when they were about to vote on the issue of sovereignty and, by contrast, the information that we received was totally different. I think the analogy would hold for concerns of Native people.

Third, we also have suffered a series of unsympathetic court interpretations. Judges unfamiliar with Native goals and aspirations have set precedent after precedent, unfavourable to Native people.

Finally, the general public, to a degree, chooses not to see; in part because it's too painful to look at the inequity, and partly it refuses to see because it is too large; the inequity is everywhere. To give you examples, in housing, and schools, etc. How does one even begin to reform when reform will lead you inexorably to acknowledge our claims?

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying a few words about the upcoming Constitutional Conference. I am not optimistic that the present Federal Government will advance and uphold the solemn pacts signed between the Native people and the country. Just look

back at what has happened. When the constitution discussions were beginning to take place we were led to believe that these treaties would be entrenched. We went through the constitutional committee hearings and had the debate in the House of Commons and when it came time to deal with the issue with Trudeau, the Prime Minister of this country, and with the other premiers of this province, one of the first items that he compromised was on Native people and also on the woman issue. Even after that Trudeau also mentioned that we had a 48-hour time limit as to, what do the Native people really want? After that 48-hour time limit expired he said, "I will reintroduce the clause which had the recognition and also affirmation of treaty and aboriginal rights into the constitution if other provinces agree."

Although the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction under The BNA Act, nobody really challenged them, and also the Federal Government has trust responsibilities and statute obligations under The Indian Act to protect the interests of the Native people. At no time did the Federal Government lift a finger to help the Native people.

The aboriginal people, the Indian, the Metis, the Inuit, have a tremendous pressure ahead of them. We seek understanding and co-operation from Governments and other individual Canadians to undertake this difficult task as to what relationship the aboriginal people will have with the rest of the country.

I am hopeful and also enlightened that this Government is taking initiative, and also establishing a framework, and also it provides an example to the rest of the provinces and also Canada.

Mr. Speaker, much can be said about this upcoming important historical Constitutional Conference.

In conclusion all we ask is a rightful place for Native people, so we can grow together, learn together, contribute together, and together make this country a proud democratic place for us to live.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to express my appreciation to once again enter into the Throne Speech Debate. I wish you continued good health after your recovery, and I hope that the trying times in here from time to time will not affect your health in the future.

I'd also like to, at this time, take the opportunity to express my thanks for the opportunity to come and participate in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference that took place in the Northwest Territories this summer, thanks to your office. I think it was a very rewarding trip and very enjoyable, and it would be beneficial if all members could possibly see how some of the people live in this country of ours.

I'd like to also take this opportunity to congratulate some of the changes in Government, the new Ministers, the new appointments to the various positions that have taken place. We will have time to possibly weigh the consequences or the benefits of those kinds of moves later on some time.

I'd like to, at the same time, compliment the Government on starting this Session at this time of year. I think it's beneficial to some degree and I want to encourage them. I think the situation as has been

illustrated by a few speakers already, economically and such, I would encourage that we can possibly meet again in the middle of January at the latest possibly, to continue the work of the House. I don't know what the Government has in mind when they'll be calling us back, but I would urge the Premier that we not wait too long. I think there's many things that have to happen. I think the activity in the last three days has illustrated that. The report of the Finance Minister today I think has raised a lot of concerns by people, not just on our side of the House, but within the province as well.

I want to compliment - and I do this sincerely - the Mover and Seconder of the Throne Speech Debate. I think you know they were well-prepared speeches and why I feel genuinely that they should be complimented, because after having received the Speech from the Throne and look at the whole thing, I could see the difficulty they must have had in trying to really support it and work out meaningful things that are with it.

Mr. Speaker, with a Throne Speech like we have had here, I've had some difficulty in trying to arrange my thinking for the reply to it. This Government has been in power now for a little over a year - it was in November of last year they got elected - and I've been going through some of the material that went out at that time and we've continually used this one document here, the NDP manifesto, but I don't want to zero in on all those things. There are certain things that I'm concerned about.

I would like to express my thoughts basically as a layman representing a rural area. Then when I look through the Throne Speech, I find very little mention of anything to do with the rural area. Specifically, there's mention made in one place, "Homeowners, small businesses and farmers are struggling for their economic survival in the current difficult situation." Then we have further on, on Page 4 it says, "Agriculture is the key to the Manitoba economy and my Ministers have been working with the farm community to develop policies and programs that support healthy farm production." Still, when you look through the whole Throne Speech, you find nothing there of any substance that will help the farm community and that is basically the context of what my remarks are going to be - the lack of feeling for the rural area.

When I look at some of the material that was sent out in 1980-81, today Manitobans are paying more and getting less for it. This was 1980. Our smiling Premier doesn't smile as much these days any more, but his face is there, very excited and prone to go. The do-nothing, blind Government has increased the provincial debt to more than \$4,000 for every man, woman and child. The NDP is committed to helping people, not to cutbacks. I want taxpayers to get their money's worth again.

When we think back to this afternoon when the Minister of Finance came up and predicted a half-a-billion dollar deficit blandly, some of the people in the government side thought it was relatively funny. I think, tongue in cheek they thought it was funny. I know they're hurting, but as our Leader has very capably stated time and time again, mismanagement, mismanagement. Anyway, I could get into that area, but I think that's been covered to some degree.

I'd like to cover the area of the agricultural aspect of it. In drawing up my remarks, I felt I didn't want to be totally negative all the time. You know people always say we are always bashing the present things and what have you, so I took a fair amount of time and I wanted to assess what are the good things? We've had the Member for Riel and the Member for Thompson that was sort of exploiting all the beautiful things that have happened, and I was trying to assess it on the same basis. What has it done for let's say the constituency of Emerson, or southern Manitoba, the production country? What basically have they done for it? So I'm looking around and I'm trying to —(Interjection)— Yes, we'll get to that. So I sort of made a few notes and took the Ministers that basically affect, let's say, the rural areas most. I'd like to start with the Minister of Agriculture and the various things that have happened since this Government took over.

Number one, I'd like to just touch on Crown lands. This is a thing that never was an issue during election. It was in 1977, but it was not an issue in the 1981 election. But the first thing that the Minister did, our Minister of Agriculture, he stopped the sale of Crown lands, he said reviewing it. Well, basically we knew that they were going to go along the same trends as they did prior to 1977, but what happened is, a lot of pressure from your own people made him change his position. —(Interjection)— The Member for Springfield asked, how do I know about it; that their people were creating pressure to change it back and open it up again, because people from his constituency kept phoning me, and I have letters and correspondence to prove it. With that kind of pressure this is when the Minister of Agriculture backed off. He buckled under, and we now have partial sales. We'll get the details on exactly how many applications have been received and how many have been dealt with, but that's just one little thing.

The Member for Thompson invited suggestions. Let's work together, give us suggestions, positive suggestions. For a whole year we almost begged on our knees the Minister of Agriculture to implement a beef program, and he finally did. He brought forward a program. It was a washout, strictly rejected by the beef producers. He withdraws it. He says more consultation is needed, and I attended many of the meetings where consultation was taking place. What a farce, what a farce.

Now, we've had —(Interjection)— our Premier and his colleagues, one thing they always say we're contacting the public. We want to get in touch with people. Well, they met with all various beef groups, who were all opposing the initial proposal of the beef program, but the Farmers Union, they were supporting it, and that is a consultation that actually took place. What do we have now? Now we have a beef program in place, yes, and farmers are joining. But one thing the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association is meeting right today at the International Inn, and they finally were able to get copies of the regulations that are involved. That can of worms is going to blow up in your faces again. I thought possibly after the licking that you took in 1977 based on your socialistic philosophies, that you would have learned some. You did to some degree by the Crown lands, you back off, you back off with pressure. With this beef program you've

got them tied in again as tight as can be, and you will be reaping the benefits of it again. Again you will, yes. I find it's interesting this consultation business.

When the Minister of Agriculture got up in this House, and he says we've been consulting. I checked with my Cattle Producers Association. I checked with my Cow Calf Producer Association. They had no input into these things. You know what? We backed the beef operators into such a corner that they couldn't see out. Many of them are entering this program, why? With terrible reservations they are entering this program because it's another trap.

This new philosophy basically is what bothers me. You always got to tie everything in. You've got to nail guys down. You got to control everything. Government control is what you thrive on, instead of thinking that we're having proposals coming forward or a bill that has been read for the first time regarding the Farmlands Protection Act. Big concern, big production. We'll have a great debate on that one I can guarantee you. But why do we have to have that bill? Why do we even have to discuss that in this House? When we look at some of the promises here, and I'm just trying to get my material together here. Oh yes, I'll take my time.

We have a proposal in suggestions. It says here the priority of a program for first-time farmers will continue to be assessed once other agricultural initiatives are in full operation. Well, there have been no initiatives yet. But when we talk of the Parliaments Protection Act, if you people would make credit available to the young farmers, it would solve a big portion of the problem. When you consider the average age of our farmers is between 55 and 56 years of age, who is going to take over the farms? Your State Control Program? No way, no way.

So you come in with these kind of things and I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that before this group is going to be through with their term in office, which we predict will be a short one because of . . . that we will again see them going back into the buying of farmlands because the pressure will come on. If you control every buyer that is going to be there, you control every Canadian buyer that is going to be coming trying to buy land in this province, land is going to go down. So why don't you expand your credit program to the young farmers instead of giving lip service?

The other thing, unfortunately, I won't make reference to the fact that certain people aren't here, but the one that I'm directing my remarks to to some degree. We've never had a position taken by him in terms of, does he agree with supply management in beef, Whelan's proposal? He's never come out and said that. What he's done, he's fudged around it, then he comes up with regulations in the present beef program that controls it, total industry for anybody that signs up.

The Member from Springfield sort of cocks his head a little bit and looks, but have you read the regulations? Read them, read them and weep because it's dramatic.

The thing that bothers me a little bit, and I'm talking from the position of a layman, a farmer, and people that I represent; as long as we continue to promote a cheap food policy which we have in this country of ours, we're going to have the farm community in difficulty. We've squeezed these people to be so efficient.

Costs of operations are going up, the product price isn't going down in many cases, and we've got them squeezed so tight, and we keep on promoting a cheap food policy.

Land prices at the present time are dropping and you know they'll possibly drop more. People who have worked 40, 50 years on their farm would like to sell their farm. What happens? The Federal Government nails them on Capital Gains Tax, they get a lesser value for the land now than they did. But what do these guys care? What does this government care that's in power today? There's nothing in the Throne Speech that's even coming close to doing anything for the farmers and the rural area and the small businesses - nothing in there for them. We have 12 pages in the Throne Speech Debate of, like our leaders have capably said, of "wind and rabbit tracks," and a few social programs. I can see the members opposite are going to have extreme difficulty trying to defend that. We've had some diversified speeches, we had the Member for St. Norbert who spoke on the city aspect of it, the effect it had there. We had the Member for Rupertsland who expressed the concerns and the effect that his people are having. But what are you going to defend - those people that speak in defense of the Throne Speech. What are you going to defend?

Actually, I'm pleased that the Premier is here because, Mr. Premier, I would plead with you not to fire the Minister of Agriculture. We were talking about not getting too personal and this type of thing, but I don't want him fired, but would you please transfer him out of the Department of Agriculture so we can get anybody in there that is at least going to make some effort at being concerned for what's happening in the farm community. I think we'll take anybody because this present Minister is giving lip service and nothing else and doing nothing for the farm community, and all you have to do is read the Throne Speech. Then when we talk, the Minister of Finance is talking about we have to cut back. The Attorney-General says every farthing will be checked before we spend it and they show us a \$500 million deficit. It blows your mind. I have trouble with these things, but I suppose when the speech was written, it's a well-written speech, lots of words there, it looks like it covers a great many things until you get into the meat of the matter and there's nothing there and there will be nothing. It will be interesting what you do with the Estimates once you present them.

So when doing some of the assessments of the Ministers that affect basically the rural area, I'd like to touch on the Minister of Natural Resources a little bit. He's always a bit of a feisty individual. When he got up yesterday he was sort of giving it the shots a little bit, there was very little substance in there but he was having a go at it. Here is a Minister that - just to illustrate the moment pressure comes on - passes a hunting regulation, "no hunting on roads," you know - bang. Then all of a sudden the pressure comes on and then he has to back off a little bit, then he backs off and changes regulations. —(Interjection)— Yes, then why doesn't he have consultation before he does these dumb things?

The other thing that happened, then he passes - informs all municipalities - your costs of engineering services are going to rise from \$75 a day to \$175 a day,

every municipality is informed. In the meantime, the Federal Government is talking 6 and 5 percent restraint and our Premier is talking well, maybe nine. He doesn't quite agree with these things because he's special. Then the pressure comes on from the municipalities - so what does he do - he retracts. It's back to \$75 a day for engineering services, but we know it's coming somewhere along the line, it's just a matter of how can we jockey it in there.

This is what I say about not having guts to make decisions. The moment you do something and you think that you're right and when the pressure comes on you back off. I want to say in all fairness and I want to try and be nice too, I compliment the Minister of Natural Resources and his position with Garrison. —(Interjection)— Please tell him.

The other thing is that actually this fight has been going on for many years and it's a continued fight regardless who was in Government, but now this Minister gets up and he's trying to take all the glory - boy I'm stopping it all by myself. When we consider the record of people like the previous Minister of Natural Resources —(Interjection)— Well, talking of Mr. Scott, I think he's genuinely concerned as we all are and I think we have to join forces with something like that. In fact, Mr. Scott and myself attended a meeting in Emerson, we sort of were almost patting each other on the back there for a while.

The other thing, we've had some indication that there's going to be changes to the wild rice industry, the early indications are - I think they're positive. I'd like to see exactly what the Minister is going to bring in, how it's going to be controlled, there's been changes needed. I take exception though that we had a study done that cost a fair amount of money and when this Government got into office they scrapped that study, hired Bostrom and did another study and basically it said the same thing.

Our Minister of Natural Resources yesterday got up and he says - insinuating that we weren't consistent - he says, "You're screaming about a high deficit and then you want all kinds of work done." —(Interjection)— Yes, yes, I'll tell you something, there are ways to do it. When I look at the little things that you are doing in the rural area and we have a half a billion dollar deficit staring us in the eye, I wonder where is the money being spent? Where is it being spent? I want to just relate it to the Minister of Natural Resources before I leave him. We'll be meeting with the Ministers shortly, in fact this week, to discuss some of the drainage requirements in southeast Manitoba. One thing, you have to be realistic. When we started the sale of Crown lands and the LGD vested lands and more land got opened up, there were requirements for more roads, there are requirements for more drainage, obviously, and it creates problems. We need major drainage undertakings in the southeast. What have we got? Nothing. And the Minister of Finance indicated today that we'll probably be cutting down on roads because the deficit is too high.

Those are the things that bother me with this Government. There is no compassion for the rural area at all and the Member for Springfield is going to have to reap the benefits of that policy as well.

Now, I'd like to get down to the Minister of Municipal Affairs - the man that passes perfect legislation —

(Interjection)— perfect Peter, yes. Last year we were questioning and questioning and it's almost a year ago when we were questioning him about the Main Street Manitoba Program. We questioned him and he got up and he turned towards the camera and he was just as sharp as could be, he says, "When I bring it in, it's going to be a perfect program." God, here we are almost a year later and what have we got? We've got one project approved - and he's cocky. At the Union of Manitoba Municipalities he gets up and he says we approved one project. But we will ferret that out too. The man with the perfect program, we'll work on him a little bit.

I would just like to say that having been a Reeve of a municipality, that this Minister is just ducking everything and the municipal people are not that naive, they're going to come after you, because there are many problems in the municipalities. He always tries to say everything is fine, I'm looking after everything. Well he's had that Weir Assessment Report on his desk for a year, isn't it a year? Just about a year - I want to be fair. I want to be fair, but this man doesn't know what to do with it and when finally the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs questioned him today, and he's being a little foxy - like they all try and won't answer - he says, there will be hearings.

The Member for Swan River specifically asked what is the policy position of this Government regarding the Weir Assessment Report. And you know what? He says there are recommendations in there and we'll see what the people say. Well, if this man has any concern at all about the municipal people then put forward a policy position so that they can debate it. They can look at it and say, yes we like this, or we don't like this, but that's not what he's going to do. When we consider the fact that there are major problems in the municipal field in terms of taxation, the assessment situation, and there's a lot of unhappiness out there and he sits there, yes, the man that makes perfect legislation does things perfectly. He doesn't do a thing and they're going to come after you and I will help them - guaranteed.

Then the man that is concerned about the municipal people representing them, nails them with a 1.5 percent payroll tax. I don't know whether he took a position within his Cabinet in terms of what the Minister of Finance was proposing; I don't know whether the Minister of Agriculture did. Obviously, the Minister of Finance is sort of the domineering factor because the Premier certainly isn't. We now know after today that he is the "invisible man." He doesn't get involved in these things, we saw that today. Instead of rising to the defence of his minister he sat there and let them take it all.

I mentioned after that I thought possibly when he got up to speak there would be some banging and saying, leadership thing. I'm a little disappointed that you didn't do that —(Interjection)— well, that's been the biggest contribution that you'd think you've been making. Every time someone gets up you throw a knot in our face. I'll tell you something, that doesn't wash too much, not very much at all.

I would just like to touch briefly on the Minister of Education. I think education affects everybody. What has happened with the Minister of Education, great grandstander? And I was thinking about this thing. We

had a difficult situation in the Seine River School Division regarding a school issue. The Member for Springfield has been involved, others have been involved, it's been very controversial. But the school board was elected; they made a decision and what happens? The Minister of Education got involved. The Minister of Education got involved and started creating pressure in terms of what the school board should do when they had made their decisions. Well, the Member for Springfield will have his chance to justify where his position is in that case, but there's great difficulty to this day and if the Minister of Education wants to run the whole school system, we don't have to have school boards any more. But then maybe she should also remove school taxes from real property, which is something that the municipality people want. And that changes have to be made but I don't think that these people have got the intestinal fortitude to make some of these changes that are required. They're fudging along and when we read their material they say, we're waiting for the economy to turn around and then we'll get on the saddle and we'll ride again. In the meantime they're fudging things. I daresay before we get through with these people - you know, through their term of office, it depends when they crack up - but I daresay that we're probably looking at even doubling the present deficit. Where are you going to get the money?

Last year when we were debating in this House, we told you people you will blow; we told the Minister of Energy and Mines at that time you're going to blow all the Mega projects and he's sort of fudging around and trying to defend this and that and what have you. What have we got here? Less than a year later - nothing. And this was a private incentive that we needed - major job creation. What have you done? Nothing. And you know, 12 pages of what? Twelve pages of what? Absolute stuff. My gosh, I don't know how you can go out there and face the people sometimes.

To the Minister of Housing, I would just like to make a few remarks. I raised a question today and he's indicated to me that he'll give me the information regarding the closing of the Sprague Construction, the low income housing. He's indicated that he'll give me that information but I just wanted to take this opportunity to tell him - I just have to get back to this a little bit, where there was reference made to all the jobs that have been created in the whole thing. I have to get my notes a little better here —(Interjection)— That's all right, I'll get around to it. Anyway, it says here - and this was part of the review that they've done of the time that they've been in Government and keeping the promise - and I'll get back to that later on. But it says, is it enough to say that already more than 3,000 jobs have been created in a direct response to the depth of the recession that virtually every community and organization has been visited and involved by the outreach from the Cabinet.

In the meantime the Minister is shutting down an operation in the southeast, which is extreme southeast —(Interjection)— yes, you're considering it and I urge you don't do it. Jobs are very scarce and when we talk of job creation in the rural area, you rural members tell me how many jobs have been created in your areas? How many jobs have been created?

When I look at small communities like mine the

construction industry is dead, has been dead, which brings me back to all the things that you promised when you won the election. If you went out there, and this must be the big hypocrisy we should call it, I don't know what we want to call it. I think I'm on safe ground with that one, Mr. Speaker, I didn't call anybody a hypocrite. I said the big hypocrisy that you all practise. You said you could turn things around and people voted for you, each one of you, because they believed that you could help them out because they saw the hard times coming. There were hard times. You said that our government created the hard times and you would change it.

Well, let's look at the bankruptcies we have in the farm community now; let's look at the bankruptcies we have in business. And then we have this famous manifesto there - do you remember this sheet? "Manitoba economy slumps" and here, "RIP, businesses close," it lists eight or so. Well, I'll tell you something, if we're going to start listening to all the ones that have closed under your Government, head offices moved - it's a fallacy. And that is what you got elected on and you're not performing. You can't perform - you can't - not in terms of the recession the way it is, but you promised you would but instead of at least keeping a stable situation, you're spending more money doing nothing and we have a half-billion dollar deficit in our hands.

I'm looking back here - I'm back to the smiling Premier at that time, now the Premier, he wasn't at that time, helping people solve problems. "Despite its advantages, Manitoba is going downhill. Sterling Lyon dried up public investment and economic activity. One of the results has been the failure of many businesses large and small." Well, what have you done? In business opportunity and job opportunities that we had in terms of the Mega projects, you've shut them down. You promised to start Limestone and then you find out after you get into office, you can't do it; you can't do it; you haven't got it. You've blown everything and I think some of the other Ministers are going to be more capably looking into exactly what happened with Limestone and with the Western Grid, with Alcan, with the potash. The Member for Thompson during the campaign - it was the Conservative's fault that Inco was laying off people. Well, how many people have they laid off up North now, how many? The scholar gets up here and is trying to defend the position of his Government. —(Interjection)— The Member for Thompson, yes. I would suggest the Member for Thompson keep looking over his shoulder because there's a big man that's coming after you, and he'll get you too.

I'd just like to touch on the Sprague plant a little bit. I would suggest to the Minister, in keeping with what you're trying to promise the people in Manitoba, that you try and keep that plant going out there. There's a need for it out there. I'll tell you something, the repercussions if you close that, and I would also say to the Minister that there's apparently some suggestion that you might consider doing it under a contract basis, that you will probably allow somebody like the MMF, the Manitoba Metis Federation, to handle some of these things through a contract basis. If you do that, I will be right here questioning you whether that is a payup or not.

There's a project in place right now and we're going to watch it very carefully. I think the Minister is quite frank. He will check into it, and will do what is best for the people in the southeast, and then can at least say that somebody in this Government has done something for the southeast beside bankrupting them.

I find that coming back to the farm aspect of it, the NDP have agreed that the agricultural community is the backbone of this province. We have very little else. We have the water resources. The Minister of Natural Resources touched on that a little bit, that we have to guard those things. I think that is fair game; I think we have to use our resources wisely. But our main economy in the province is agriculture, and what has been done? When we look through here and the lauding that goes on about all the social programs that you're promoting, you're talking and repeating the Interest Rate Relief Program that you had for the farm community. I don't know how many guys have been able to take advantage of it; the limitations and criteria were such that it hasn't saved one bankruptcy.

The Interest Rate Relief Program for the small businessman, I haven't heard of one that has saved him. I don't know how much money has been expended, but what bothers me a little bit, you talk of spending \$21 million in interest relief to certain people, homeowners, stuff of this nature. You know what, you've expended only very few millions of dollars of the total thing, and come up with a \$500 million deficit. Now, where's the money gone?

When our Leader says incapable - yes, incapable - and when you ask for suggestions, I have one suggestion that basically I should make. Resign, call elections, get you out of there, we'll try and get back on the right track again —(Interjection)— oh no, the Member for Springfield is dreaming.

I had a very interesting document here. We've sort of pounded this document a little bit, the NDP manifesto, all the things in there, and I think our Leader suggested that maybe we take and run off copies, and send each person in Manitoba a copy of that one, just to show the fallacy and the hypocrisy of that group over there.

Then we have things like this, your garbage that you sent out prior to the election, and that's what it is, garbage. Now, we have a new one. It says "Meeting the challenges in Manitoba, a report of action taken by the NDP Government, December, 1981 to November, 1982." I scan through this thing and I can't believe it. I don't want to read all this stuff, but it should be read into the record really. "The good start made by the NDP Government has taken place against the backdrop of the worst recession that North America has suffered in more than 40 years."

But, now here, I want to get down to this other thing here that I found. Here we are. "Keeping the promise" —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes remaining.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say, the conclusion of this document that they have says, "Rather than spend a great deal of time celebrating the impressive start to this term of office, Manitoba New Democrats would prefer to keep work-

ing in ways to better use this province's limited means of grappling with an economic downturn that has brought such human misery and waste of a rich economic potential." Rather than spend a great deal of time celebrating an impressive start - the Premier, you must be shaking in your shoes when you say, yes, that's what you've indicated in here. Your record of performance as Government has been dismal. It has been dismal and it's going downhill.

Then he travels down to B.C., and he's telling the NDP in B.C. how to win an election, because this is what we did. We should send the same information that we are receiving now, a \$500 million deficit, we should send all this information down there, and say this is what the Premier that is blasting the Federal Government and what have you —(Interjection)— by and large.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think I've pretty well finished my remarks. I will be watching very carefully as I think my colleagues will. I think that this Government has no feeling for the farm community except lip service; they have no feeling for the small businessman except lip service. If they continue this, their term in office is going to be very, very uncomfortable. We hope, Mr. Speaker, that somewhere along the line, the Premier and some of his Ministers, including the new Ministers, will be able to gather their fortitude together and have the ability to make some decisions that will at least affect the rural and the farm community.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind all members that they should address their remarks to the Chair.

The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me begin by congratulating you once again on holding the position you hold, and may I take this opportunity to wish you every continued good health. Having served now for about four days as Deputy Speaker, I can assure you that I will rely on your wisdom and guidance even more this year than I did last year.

I'm sure that if most people don't know by now, they never will, River East is a heavily populated residential suburb on the northern fringe of Winnipeg. As such, it covers a wide range of people ranging from the relatively affluent down to the relatively poor people of society. Yet, despite this diversity, Mr. Speaker, our Government was able to come up with programs to assist every one of the people who lives in River East last year.

In particular, I would refer to the \$1.2 million special grant to the River East School Division. I don't think I need to expand on why it was necessary to give this last year, but suffice it to say that it will continue again this year. This particular grant, Mr. Speaker, relieved the property tax burden in River East by about seven mills, and saved about \$50 on the tax bill for a \$65,000 to \$70,000 house. Another aspect in school taxes which helped in River East was the extension of the Pensioner School Tax Credit Program to include a lot more pensioners in our area.

But perhaps one of the big success stories of the Session was rent controls. One block in my area, Mr. Speaker, Edgewood Estates, is composed of about 475 suites. They had originally posted rent increases

of 12 percent for 1982 and 18 percent for 1983, but with the coming of rent controls they have voluntarily rolled back their rents to 9 percent for 1982 and 8 percent for 1983. This saves tenants in those blocks up to as much as \$50 a month in rent next year. This is money which can be put into the expenditure on other goods and services in the local community and will help stimulate the Manitoba economy.

Other programs of assistance to homeowners in River East was the Mortgage Assistance Program, the expanded Critical Home Repair Program and the Homes in Manitoba Program. The last two of these programs, in particular, are important to the residents of River East. My constituency has an unusually large number of people who work in the construction industry and these programs, which create employment, have helped directly to create jobs for these people in a heavily unemployment-ridden sector of the economy.

River East has almost 100 businesses in the construction sector; they range from small trades-oriented family operations up to large house-building firms and contractors. Many of the small companies have benefited from Government-sponsored home renovations projects and energy retrofitting programs. At the other end of the spectrum, Flair, Qualico and Manor Homes are building large numbers of new homes in our constituency under the Homes in Manitoba Program. According to the Business and Law Journal Digest, since the beginning of October there have been 47 building permits in my constituency, this as opposed to 93 for the previous 10 months. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Homes in Manitoba Program has had a great impact on the construction industry in River East. The extension of the Homes in Manitoba Program into next year will further stimulate construction in River East.

However, we can't rely on house-building alone; other Government construction projects will also create jobs. There's the million-dollar shared-cost program with the City of Winnipeg for watermain and sewer renewals; there's a \$4 million accelerated Provincial Capital Works Program which the Minister of Government Services will expand on shortly; there's a \$20 million Law Courts Building which will employ people for the two years it takes to build this structure; there's a \$30 million Deer Lodge expansion which will also employ a large number of people, and on top of this there's a \$20 million improved and expanded Home Insulation Program which was recently announced by the Minister of Energy.

Other employment programs will also create short-term jobs in other sectors which are not as hard hit as the construction industry at the moment. There's a \$2 million Manitoba Employment Action Program which will create 750 jobs between January and May for this year. Just yesterday, the Minister of Labour announced a \$24 million federal-provincial agreement for the new Employment Expansion and Development Program which will create up to 3,600 jobs in the next year.

We realize these are short-term work projects, Mr. Speaker, and we also have to concentrate on long-term job creation. We must strive to create jobs in the manufacturing sector and in the resource sector in particular. I believe one of the myths that we've heard in the last few days is the myth that this socialist Government is driving out private capital. I think that's

an easy myth to dispel, Mr. Speaker. Just two weeks ago, Northern Telecom opened a 500-job plant in Winnipeg - 500 jobs provided by private capital. This 500-job plant raised hardly a ripple of comment in the press, Mr. Speaker, hardly a ripple of comment compared to the mass media coverage given to a 600-job aluminum smelter a year or two ago. Mr. Speaker, the aluminum smelter was merely a bird in the bush along with two other birds in the bush. Northern Telecom is a bird in the hand and it's worth far more than three birds in the bush.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, our approach is to co-operate with private enterprise. We want to stimulate development in Manitoba; we invite their moving into this province and we invite their participation in the economy. There are problems that many companies experience when trying to set up in this province though, and that can be a shortage of capital. For small and medium-size manufacturing and high technology firms, we have set up a venture capital program which can help supply the capital that cannot be found in the private markets.

In the resource sector, Mr. Speaker, I was happy to see that the Minister of Mines was expanding the mineral exploration capacity of Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. While markets are low we can at least be exploring for deposits; when these deposits are found they will be available for exploitation when the metal markets recover in the world. This will provide Manitobans with jobs, as well as revenue for the Provincial Government.

The same can be said of Manitoba oil and gas, Mr. Speaker. It is time not only to increase Canada's share but also the provincial role in Manitoba's oil industry. Until recently it was dominated by Standard Oil of California. Standard Oil of California, unfortunately, has one of the worst records of good corporate citizenship in Canada. It refuses to undertake research and development in Canada; it refuses to allow Canadians to participate as stock holders and as a Canadian subsidiary, and perhaps worst of all, it insists on repatriating dividends rather than spending money for further oil and gas exploration in Canada.

It's no coincidence that Manitoba did not have active oil and gas exploration until recently. It's only been with the development of private companies in Alberta and in Manitoba that we've had active exploration in this province. Many of these are small companies, however, and they need assistance. It's a fact of life, whether the Opposition likes it or not, that many of these companies have already approached the province and asked for participation from the proposed ManOil program in joint ventures in Southern Manitoba. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, ManOil will provide three benefits to this province; it will provide capital for expanded oil exploration and production in Manitoba; it will allow the Provincial Government an additional source of revenue in future years, and it will help develop a diversified resource base for a long-term development of this province.

Perhaps, most significant of all, Mr. Speaker, in this Session we expect to allow Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation to expand into life insurance and pension management. We wish to give Manitobans an alternative to the private plans which are now offered; we wish to make the capitalist system effective to

ensure competition. MPIC, Mr. Speaker, already has \$115 million invested in Manitoba. These investments go into hospitals, schools, municipalities, personal care homes. For the people in my area, I'm sure they'd be interested to know that MPIC provided a good bit of equity for the Bethania Mennonite Personal Care Home. With the expansion of MPIC into other areas, further funds will be developed for other projects of this type, good and useful social projects for Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

One of the problems which has faced large organizations in Canada over the last decade or two, whether these large organizations be corporate or Government, they have had problems with access to capital. Many of the largest corporations have solved this problem by moving into insurance and pension management. I'm sure I don't need to tell the people in this House that Power Corporation took over Imperial Life, Great-West Life and Investors Syndicate. I don't need to tell them that Canwest Capital is controlling Monarch Life. The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is that these companies wanted access to large pools of capital; they wanted access to pools of capital which could help to finance capital growth and corporate expansion. All we want is equal footing with the large corporations.

One insurance executive I've heard has expressed a concern that the province would invest its money in social programs at a lower rate of interest than might prevail on the free market. Well I would turn this question back to him. Can he demonstrate that his parent company is not diverting money from his insurance company to another subsidiary at an abnormally low interest rate? In 1978 the return on investment for insurance companies ranged from a high of 10.6 percent to a low of 4.1 percent; 4.1 percent is a pretty low return on investment capital. So I would ask the insurance companies to show to us that they are not investing their money at abnormally low rates of interest.

MPIC investments, Mr. Speaker, will be public knowledge. You can pick up the corporate report now and see where that money is. You can't do that with an insurance company. They adhere to the doctrine of secrecy, to hide where their money goes and how it's spent.

This covers some of the important points in this Throne Speech which I would like to deal with tonight, and these are points which I am proud of. I am proud of the record that we have developed in this province in the last year. I am proud of the directions we are taking in the next year and I would invite the Opposition to make some constructive comments to these types of suggestions. We have had enough of the vicious invective that we've seen from the Leader of the Opposition in the last couple of days here. The people of Manitoba after four years are tired of this kind of performance. They want to know what's happening; they want to know what you think. Let's dispense with these vexatious and frivolous points of order which are raised at the beginning of every period. Let's get on with the Throne Speech Debate; don't hide from it. If you have something to offer, come out and say it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the opportunity to join in with other members and participate in this Throne Speech Debate. May I say, Sir, to you at the outset as so many others have done, that we as members all wish you continued good health. I know from personally being involved in the Ottawa Parliamentary Seminar with you some few weeks back, that at that time you had indicated to me that your health is coming back and you are feeling much better these days.

May I also join with others and congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech and also since we last sat in this Legislature last June there have been four new faces that have been added to the Premier's Cabinet and congratulate each and every one of these individuals upon their appointments and their new undertakings. Also, we have a new face on this side of the House in the person who is the Deputy Speaker along with the new Chairman of Committees, whom I would like to wish well in their endeavours over the next number of months.

I made reference, Mr. Speaker, about the Eighth Canadian Regional Seminar of the Canadian Parliamentary Association and I would like to make mention, Sir, to the members of the Chamber that I particularly, when I was there with yourself and the Member for Springfield, enjoyed the opening morning debates in the Senate Chamber which included Senator Duff Roblin, a former premier of our province; Gerald Baldwin, who is a man who served many many years in the House of Commons and who is a person who has been very well known for the rules and order of parliaments; a Dr. Victor Goldbloom from Quebec, a medical doctor but who served in the Quebec Legislature some years; and a fellow, even though I don't agree with his politics but I admire him considerably, a Mr. Roy Romano from Saskatchewan, a former Attorney-General who I had the privilege of spending some time with when I attended conferences relating to the constitution.

These four gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, made a great contribution that morning, each of them participating in the debate for some 15 or 20 minutes apiece and then they had a period of time for rebuttal and Senator Duff Roblin spent a great deal of time talking about the value of an elected Senate and his proposal, which was very much like the one used in Australia. Dr. Victor Goldbloom and Roy Romano took the approach that Parliament and the Senate didn't really need an overhauling and I'm sure this was difficult for Roy Romano because I have never met a Socialist or an NDPer who thought that the Senate had any use, but that was the particular assignment that was assigned to Roy Romano and as he always does, he performed very well.

Then on the Wednesday, Sir, was the opportunity for Manitoba, and particularly yourself, to get involved in the program and that was when you presented your paper on, "How effective is Parliament in exercising financial control over the executive?" You had a well prepared paper in which you dealt with how our legislative Session operates and particularly how our Estimates procedures are followed, and made refer-

ence to the fact that in recent years we've gone to the dual committees where two departments can be scrutinized and have their Estimates before the Members of the House at one time.

I would like to make some comment, Sir, about the Quarterly Financial Report which was issued today by the Minister of Finance that shows almost the \$500 million projected deficit and it has been said, by certain informed persons, there is a good chance that by 1985 or 1986 that Manitobans might be facing a \$1 billion deficit which would be approximately the time that we would be into a provincial election.

I think the Minister of Finance is going to have to watch over all the departments very very closely to try and keep down the spending. Two areas I think, and I hope he will pay a great deal of attention to, and that is the hiring of new employees. We have had an increase in the public sector of some 500 persons on the pay-rolls of the Province of Manitoba over the last year. I ask the Minister of Finance, are all these people really necessary? Do we have to enhance and see growth in the public sector within the Province of Manitoba?

The other area that I would ask him perhaps that he might give a lot of thought to in the year to come, is government grants to organizations. Do we need, firstly, Mr. Speaker, all these organizations within our community? Secondly, can we really afford to subsidize so many of them? Those are two particular areas that I think the Minister of Finance and his colleagues are going to have to have a long hard look at.

The Auditor General in Ottawa today released his report and over the supper hour I happened to see some of the television news and the Auditor General makes reference to the fact that the Federal Government is spending far more money than they're taking in in revenues, much as our own Government is here. You can tell that we're in tough times, Sir, when you see in the quarterly report today, that where sales tax revenues are down, some approximately 4 percent in Manitoba, and liquor taxes are down approximately 5 percent. So you can see those are two areas that, if you're in a tough economy, people aren't out purchasing goods and services to the extent that they would if we weren't in tough times; and secondly, Sir, liquor being a luxury item, you can see where liquor revenues are down. It's not because people don't want to drink as much today as they did yesterday, it's just they don't have the dollars in which to spend on that particular product.

An article that I saw in a magazine recently written by Diane Cohen when she talks about eight steps to salvage the nation, and she makes reference to the fact that we should be phasing out of universal coverage of Old Age Security and Family Allowances and Government Pensions, and we should begin by taking the people at the top income groups out of such universal programs. She makes reference to the fact that Government should get out of business and here we have this government, Sir, wanting to get into the life insurance and pension management business, which I'll have a few comments on in a moment.

Also she makes reference to the fact that Government should reduce the size of the public sector, as I have just finished making that statement that Manitoba today employs 500 more people than when our Government left office and this Government came

into office.

She makes comments that Government should sell such assets as Air Canada, Petro Canada, and some Crown Corporations to pay off some of their deficits. Perhaps what the Province of Manitoba should be doing is following some of her advice and certainly not getting into the life insurance industry.

As I said, that the life insurance industry and the pension management was referred to by the previous speaker, the Member for River East, I would just like to point out to the First Minister, and he was the Minister who was the architect for the public automobile insurance back in 1971, and I'm sure that the First Minister is very much aware of the activities of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation - and the particular Minister who is responsible for Autopac is not present at this moment - so I would like to make my remarks regarding the life insurance industry to the First Minister and say to him that there are 800 licensed agents in Manitoba. There are over 120 companies doing life insurance business within the Province of Manitoba. Of these 800 licensed agencies, many of them have taken courses through the Life Underwriters Association and a goodly number of them have their CLU degree. These companies invest literally thousands of dollars in training these people, and then through their Association, the Life Underwriters Association, many of them go on to even further enhance their training.

Their training in the estate planning in the fields of tax is very extensive, Sir, and I am one who doesn't believe that a person who markets general insurance and does a good job of it necessarily can be a person who can market the life insurance pension and estate planning because it's a very complex field, and it is very much different from the general insurance where you're marketing home insurance and automobile coverage.

In Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, we have 2,000 persons employed with four home offices here of life insurance companies between the Great-West Life Assurance Company; the Monarch Life; Wawanesa Mutual and the Citadel Assurance Company on Broadway Avenue. There's 2,000 persons that are employed by these four companies in their home offices. On a per capita basis, Mr. Speaker, that is more persons being employed in the life insurance industry in the City of Winnipeg than in any other city in Canada, including the two large centres of Toronto and Montreal who do have large life insurance companies with their home bases there.

So Winnipeg, and in Manitoba, has more than its share of persons employed in the life insurance pension field as home office employees. These four companies, as do many other companies have mortgage offices in Winnipeg and do invest a lot of money in our Province of Manitoba. In fact these companies invest more money in the Province of Manitoba than they take in in premiums from within the Province of Manitoba and from the Manitoba insurance purchasers.

The Great-West Life Company, for example, Mr. Speaker, was the company that bought the debenture that was issued by the Health Sciences Centre when they put up the new parkade on the north side of William Avenue opposite the Health Sciences Centre.

The Health Sciences Centre just a few months ago, sold debentures again and it was a major life insurance company, not one from Winnipeg, but one from Toronto that purchased the largest share of that debenture from the Health Sciences Centre. The Selkirk General Hospital - in the Town of Selkirk, the home of the Premiers - Hospital Board issued debentures recently and the largest portion of that debenture was again purchased by people in the life insurance industry.

So I say to my friends opposite that the life insurance industry in Manitoba does invest in public places; public facilities; in the health field. They also are large purchasers of municipal bonds, Provincial Government bonds, Government of Manitoba Bonds and various debentures that are issued by the various municipalities and school boards when they're doing some capital financing.

I also say to the First Minister that when a new life insurance company starts up, it usually takes that company a number of years before they get enough capital to make their investment portfolio a profitable one, and as I say, it takes years before these companies are on a money-making footing.

I was surprised that Harold Thompson, the President of Monarch Life said, and I quote from the Winnipeg Free Press where he said, "The companies would tolerate competition from the MPIC only if the Crown agencies worked without Government help." Well, I think that Mr. Thompson is rather naive if he thinks that Autopac, the MPIC is going to work without Government help.

I can see where if the Province of Manitoba is going to assist farmers in agricultural loans, they're going to insist that these farmers insure themselves to the face value of the loan. They're going to insist that the party must buy the coverage from the MPIC, much the way MPIC used to insist that the various school boards and hospitals had their automobile and their general insurance purchased from MPIC, as did the Public Housing Corporation.

It was our Government that said that it shouldn't be automatic, that MPIC would be given the business automatic, that other companies could tender for it, and surprisingly, in a number of cases, the private sector was able to beat out MPIC for this insurance coverage. Well, I could see that the government will want to help MPIC get off to a big start in the life insurance business, so therefore, the 15,000 or 16,000 provincial employees, the employees of the Telephone System and the Hydro and other Crown corporations are all going to likely be covered for a group insurance through MPIC, rather than Sun Life who is the current carrier of the government program.

Sun Life got the government program some 20 or 25 years ago through competition, and I have heard of Ministers responsible for the Civil Service Commission in answering questions at Estimates, all make the statement whether they be from this particular Government or from our particular party when we were Government, saying that the Sun Life people have done a real good job for the civil servants of Manitoba in the way of employee benefits, group insurance and on a number of occasions have reduced the rate or given monies back to the employees.

So I would hope that the Premier of the Province,

Mr. Speaker, keeps in mind that there's 800 persons in Manitoba currently marketing life insurance and many of these people are well trained, far better trained than the general insurance agents in that particular area; that there's 2,000 persons employed in Manitoba with the four home offices that are located here and that insurance companies do invest far more in Manitoba than they take in in premium income within Manitoba. They have been good buyers of government bonds, they have been very helpful in buying debenture issues from public organizations, such as, the Health Sciences Centre, which I cited earlier.

So I would hope that the Premier doesn't proceed with going into the life insurance, pension management business because I think the public is well served by the 120-some-odd companies that are dealing in Manitoba now. As I say, it usually takes life companies a number of years before they show a profit from their endeavours.

The only way I can see MPIC being an advantage to the Manitoba Insurance buying public is if the taxpayers of Manitoba subsidize it and I don't think that's fair, to have the taxpayers of Manitoba subsidizing it, or reducing commission scales to automobile agents when we had the previous system which used to earn 15 or 20 percent commission scale. Today Autopac pays 7 percent on the first grouping of business and then it drops to 5 percent. If they're going to reduce the commission scales to agents and force people who currently sell Autopac to sell life insurance - and life insurance particularly and only with MPIC - I think they're going to interrupt the Manitoba economy considerably and I personally don't think it's worth it.

Speaking of the economy, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, as I have said, that the Government with their financial report which was issued today with almost a \$500 million deficit, has got to watch its spending, and in the future what we're going to have to do is watch the numbers of persons we're adding to the payroll of Government and really have a close look to see whether these persons are really necessary and needed by the various departments. The Government is growing at a far more rapid rate than the province is and I think it's the responsibility of the Treasury bench to try and put some controls on Government growth, and so on.

In the years to come I think with organized labour, particularly in Canada being stronger than it is in the United States, organized labour in Canada often being more militant, that we're going to see where organized labour is going to have to make some concessions when they go before management to try and work out a collective agreement. I think the Chrysler plant walkout in Windsor, Ontario is very evident. When I speak of Chrysler and the car manufacturing business and the fact that Chrysler doesn't sell as many cars as G.M. or Ford, they are a poor third in the car manufacturing business, but they do employ about 9,000 Canadians in Ontario and do have dealerships throughout Manitoba. In fact, they've got five in the City of Winnipeg.

These dealerships do employ a lot of people and I, for one, would not want to see Chrysler go out of business but they may be forced out of business if the unions are going to continue to demand more than Chrysler can afford to pay. I have an article out of a

business magazine which says that at G.M., for example, it costs \$18.60 an hour for each employee, where in Japan with the major Japanese car manufacturers it's only \$10.78, so there's an \$8.00 per hour labour edge to the Japanese people. Then in the employee benefits area the G.M. people pay over \$5.00 an hour towards employee benefits, whereas in Japan it's only about \$1.25 per worker.

Just a few years ago, 1980, Mr. Speaker, 20 percent of all car sales in Canada and the United States were the Japanese models and now they're up to 31 percent. The reason is that they can put a car into Canada for \$1,200 less than Canadians can manufacture cars and we, in Canada, can't really stop the Japanese from marketing cars in Canada because we are an exporting nation ourselves and if we start putting roadblocks in the way of foreign cars coming into Canada then they're not going to buy our agricultural products and other goods and services which we're trying to sell. I'm not trying to say that Canadian workers should work for the same rate of pay as Japanese workers but we've got to increase our productivity, we've got to be gentle with our demands for employee benefits and for wage settlements in the future.

Speaking of Chrysler, when we talk about plants closing and many plants working below capacity, a good example right here in Manitoba, not far from my constituency, is Canada Cement who are closing down their plant here with approximately 100 persons who are going to be laid off. Perhaps one of the reasons that Canada Cement is closing down is because the Hydro aren't going ahead with Limestone and why is the Hydro not going ahead with Limestone? Well, we don't have the Power Grid and the Manitoba Government, in my opinion, fumbled the ball on the Power Grid. Robert Moncur, the former President of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation said that Manitoba was trying to get Saskatchewan to pay more, get less and assume virtually all the risk involved with the Power Grid. He went on to say that the NDP, upon coming into office, were very suspicious of the former Conservative Government and were of the opinion that the Conservatives were giving away their resources. Well, if we were going to be selling Hydro power to Saskatchewan and to the Province of Alberta, Sir, I would say that that's not giving away our resources.

Secondly, the water is going to flow down the river anyway and if we don't use it and harness it for power purposes it's going to just flow right out into the Hudson Bay area. This Government, when they fumbled the ball on the Power Grid, they caused the Manitoba Hydro from advancing and going ahead and working on the Limestone area; they cost both Genstar and Canada Cement many hours of productivity within their two cement plants here. In Manitoba we do have the luxury of having two major cement plants, most provinces only have one, from one or the other company. In Manitoba we've been very fortunate over the past years of having the two companies here, both of them employing a number of people and now with Canada Cement having a fairly old plant, more than 50 years old in that Fort Whyte-Tuxedo area, it is becoming more and more on their part worthy of closing down because the plant hasn't been updated and isn't as modern as the Inland or Genstar plant is. So, I

would say it's unfortunate that the Provincial Government fumbled the ball on the Power Grid, and therefore, we haven't got Limestone.

I also would like to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, and this is from a letter that Herbie Schultz, a brother-in-law of the former Premier, wrote to the newspaper some time ago where he mentions that the Member for River East said the primary responsibility of Government is, therefore, not to convince an aluminum producer to locate here in Manitoba. I always thought that was the job of the Department of Industry and Commerce or Economic Development and Tourism, that their primary responsibility was to go out and try and secure manufacturing businesses for the Province of Manitoba, but according to Herb Schultz, the Member for River East doesn't seem to feel that's the responsibility of Government.

Harvey Patterson, that great gentleman, who is the Executive Secretary of the Winnipeg Labour Council states that an Alcan plant in Manitoba is impractical. Few Manitobans would want to work in the dirt and the extreme heat in the plant. Well, there are 44,000 Manitobans unemployed. Is it 52,000 Manitobans unemployed? I am sure that Alcan, like General Motors, which I was mentioning earlier, Mr. Speaker, pay fairly substantial wages. I am sure that literally hundreds of those unemployed persons would dearly love to have a job working in Balmoral at an Alcan plant smelter.

I would also point out, Sir, that some 3,500 Balmoral residents were annoyed when the Alcan plant didn't proceed, and when two days after they announced that they weren't going to proceed in Balmoral, they go out and purchase 2,200 acres in the Province of Quebec. So, it's obvious that Alcan wanted to have a smelter. Manitobans didn't make them welcome, so therefore, the Province of Quebec ends up with the smelter, ends up with the 800 new jobs, and Manitoba is the loser.

I'd like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, in the area of education, and where the university enrolment is up some 13 percent, yet this Government has said to the universities, we'll give you 9 percent more money this year than we did last year. That 9 percent must all go into wages and not into plants or into the replacement of equipment or anything, it must go for wages. Again, an example of Government telling the universities how they can spend their money by insisting on where the increased financial assistance goes, and goes for wages. True enough, amongst the employees at the universities, particularly amongst the professors, the NDP Party enjoys a wide degree of support.

I'm sorry that the Minister of Education isn't present at this moment, but I would like to say to her that the University of Winnipeg a few years ago were trying to get in place a program where registered nurses could be given credit for their training as registered nurses, and go back on a two-year basis, receive a Bachelor's Degree in Nursing, where the University of Manitoba today does not recognize any of the training that the R.N. has completed and forces the R.N. like any other student coming out of Grade XII to take the four-year program, and the full program. The University of Victoria in B.C. has such a program as the two-year program, and there are two universities in Ontario that do recognize the talents and the skills that the R.N. has acquired. I would hope that the Minister of Education,

who herself is a Registered Nurse, would encourage the Universities Grants Commission to allow the University of Winnipeg to proceed and have this program.

If you ever checked the business pages of the newspaper, the career page, Mr. Speaker, you'll notice that every week there are three or four ads in that paper asking for nurses for various hospitals within Manitoba, and if you ever see the nurses' monthly magazine, the last quarter of the magazine is strictly advertisements from various places across Canada looking for nurses. So, I think that would be money well spent if the University of Winnipeg were to provide that two-year program for R.Ns. Many of them could go back on a part-time basis; many of them could be evening students. The University of Winnipeg, Sir, is more than 50 percent part-time students. They have wanted to have this nursing program put into place for a number of years.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I could make a few comments in the area of urban affairs. We've heard a lot of talk recently about the Core Area Initiative Program. We've heard a lot of reports in both the paper and on television about the Logan Industrial Development Program where some people want to have the industrial aspect of that program scaled down. Some people want to leave it the way it was outlined in the original report, which was tabled in June of 1981. I would just say that I would hope that the Minister of Urban Affairs will continue to work in conjunction with the other two levels of Government and see that this Core Area Initiative Program is proceeded with as quickly as possible.

I recall last fall being on the campaign circuit and David Sanders, the current Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs, on more than one occasion at Town Hall meetings said that if the Conservatives were re-elected, they would never proceed with the Core Area Initiative Program. I know that from my discussions with the Member for St. Norbert over the last number of years, that he as a former city councillor, and the Member for Tuxedo and myself as former City of Winnipeg councillors, we all wanted to see this thing and this program proceeded with. I know that the Member for St. Norbert was very much in favour of seeing the core area of Winnipeg upgraded. I often thought that David Sanders as a public employee at the time, was misquoting and misleading the public in relation to his then Minister.

I would say, Sir, that there is no doubt that the Logan Industrial Park is going to cause some problems. It is very, very difficult to have a housing mix in and around an industrial area. All the more modern industrial parks like the Inkster Industrial Park and so on, there isn't as a rule, any residential area alongside those places. The drawback in the Logan area unfortunately, is that there are a lot of homes that have been vacated, and they're boarded up, and then alongside some of these boarded-up homes, there'll be a home owned by a couple that have spent a lot of money in upgrading their particular home, and naturally they feel very uncomfortable living next door to a vacant, boarded-up home. Nobody, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, has the magic answer to such a problem. but I think that the original industrial program and the allotment for it should be proceeded with. Unfortunately, in a lot of cases people are going to have to be relocated if

you're going to see this plan to its end. As Mr. W.C. Watts, who is the President and General Manager of Northwest Cycle, said that the residents will fight to save their neighbourhood and he considers it a joke, because he says that he's delighted to hear that the Core Area Initiative Program will clean up a lot of the junk. I am sure when he refers to junk, he is referring to the vacant homes that are boarded up — (Interjection) — Well, people move out of them and they don't want to live in the area any longer, and so on. So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister of Urban Affairs will work and cooperate with the city and the Federal Government and this Core Area Initiative Program and see that it's completed to some degree.

Another area of that program I would like to see proceeded with, and proceeded with fairly quickly, is the Chinese community's plans. The Chinese community isn't asking Government for a whole bunch of help as some of the other aspects of the program are, and of \$96 million - \$1 million of \$96 million - so what's that, 1.25 percent, or something?

The other area that I would like to see proceeded with fairly quickly, and I wouldn't think that it's going to run into the many road blocks that the Logan Industrial Park is, where they're running into residents, is the North of Portage Redevelopment Program. They are proceeding with the Air Canada building and I heard a person on the radio the other day complaining that there is going to be no parking provided for this particular building, while Winnipeg in its downtown area has a lot of off-street parking as it is now and we have a lot of vacant lots that have been turned into parking areas.

A good example of the downtown area that can be continued with is the skywalks. The Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Mr. Speaker, have 22 crossings between various buildings that tie some 20 city blocks together in the downtown area, and businesses have been moving back into the downtown area as a result of some of these crossings that exist between various buildings. Well, Winnipeg has had a good start in the area of crossings. We have them where you can now go virtually from the Bay to Portage and Main and only in a few instances do you have to go outside on the cold January days. I would hope to see the Minister of Urban Affairs and the city fathers continue to work in this general line of direction and see that more of these crossings are provided over the next few years and let's revitalize our downtown area as much as we can.

I would also encourage the Minister of Urban Affairs to go back to the block funding and to try and not be running City Hall from the Minister of Urban Affairs' office, from here on Broadway in the Legislative Building. I think that the Mayor and the 29 councillors are fairly capable of running the affairs of the city. They have an excellent team of people that make up the Board of Commissioners and I don't think they need a lot of interference from the Manitoba Legislature or from the Minister of Urban Affairs.

One comment I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is in the area of public financing of elections. I might say that I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that I am opposed to election financing from the public at large and I can see why a number of the members opposite might want to have public financing of elections,

because when I look through the list of contributors to the NDP Party who contributed large sums, many of those persons are elected members of this Legislature on the Government side. They have made substantial contributions and in my own area of River Heights, there are a couple of persons that have made substantial contributions to the NDP Party for election financing, and I can certainly therefore see why the Government wants to have elections paid for by the public — (Interjection) — our money raised from the public and I notice that a number of persons who donated to the NDP Party also donated to my campaign, so there are lots of people who go both ways.

One area that is going to be very interesting over the next few months, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the abortion clinic - the storefront abortion clinic - whether it is ever going to proceed with and so on. I notice where the Minister of Labour's husband is very much in favour of it. I doubt very much if the Minister of Health is in favour of it and we may now see another split on that side of the House, as we did over the financing of private schools a few years back. We may see a nice split in that Caucus in the months to come. My position on it is I am not in favour of it, in any way, shape or form.

So, I wish to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I would hope that the First Minister and the Members of the Government would stay out of the life insurance pension management area and leave it to the private sector. They have done a good job in the past and I think they can continue to do a good job, and I would hope that the Government would let the Mayor and the elected councillors run the City of Winnipeg's affairs, without too much interference from Broadway here and from the Provincial Government, and I would hope that they would not proceed with the public financing of elections, Mr. Speaker. I am very much opposed to that and I would conclude on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me say that having had to sit in that Chair a number of times last year, it is very good to see you back and in good health. I know that we spent a number of days together in the CPA Conference this summer, and I can say that while your health had improved at that time, it has certainly improved a great deal more, and it is good to see you in fine form. We certainly look forward to your guidance over the remainder of this Session, and only hope that we all abide as close as is possible to the Rules of this House, to make your job that much easier.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't congratulate the Member for River East on his appointment to the Deputy Speaker's role and to the Member of Burrows, as well. Both of these gentlemen have important and onerous duties in front of them and I know that they will fill those roles with distinction.

I would like to, as well, congratulate the Member for Morris. He hasn't done anything but I would like to congratulate him anyway — (Interjection) — I know you'll get me later for that - I will worry about that tomorrow.

As well, my congratulations to the Mover and Seconder. I think that the words of the Mover of the

Throne Speech set the tone for this Session. I think the points that she made were worth considering, and I would advise the members opposite to review those words and to consider them because over the last year, whether the Members of the Opposition want to acknowledge it or not, there is a good deal of public support for what this government has done.

It is not an accident, and it is most certainly not because of the vitriolic and sometimes ill-humoured comments of members opposite; it is because, in fact, despite the circumstances that we're facing, both economic and psychological in some respects, this government - psychological in the respect that there is a certain sense of uneasiness, a sense of uncertainty that continues in a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy to create further problems for the economy - nevertheless, we do face some real economic problems and economic problems which are created by and large by the kinds of policies that members opposite adopt and hold dear to their hearts.

They laugh and scoff at that, but we have a clear difference of opinion on that. However, let me say that, despite our differences and despite what the members opposite might like to feel, that there is public support for the programs, for our initiatives, for our willingness to consult; and despite the suggestions on the part of members opposite that the consultation is somehow not real, it is somehow only a cover up for implementing plans that we intended to go forward with anyway. Let me say that is clearly not the case.

If members opposite doubt that, then I would suggest that they talk to some of the people who made representations to the then Minister responsible for the Rent Regulation Bureau, and they ask those people whether they had any impact; whether they made any changes in the legislation in the Residential Rent Regulation Act; whether they made any changes in the regulations. They will tell you that they did. The fact is we did listen, and I could cite other instances where we did listen and people recognized that and all the suggestions and all the crying from members opposite won't change that fact.

So, Manitobans are indicating their support, and I recall not too long ago that I listened to a questionnaire period on CBC radio when our Premier was on an open-line program, and there was more than one occasion when the caller said, yes, I voted Conservative before, but I am really impressed with the honesty, with the openness and with the willingness of this government to listen and to act in a responsible and a conscientious way. That's not our supporters speaking.

Mr. Speaker, I have digressed already from my speech that I prepared. Let me return to what I had originally intended to say and beyond the congratulations that are due, the members that I mentioned, let me say that over the past ten months my experience has been gratifying to say the least. I think the past ten months have been very instructive for me as an individual, as a person, certainly as a Member of the Legislative Assembly.

I have learned a great deal about the process that we're involved in and for that I am truly thankful. I have learned a great deal also about perhaps human nature in the fact that before I speak, in this instance to the newly elected members, and I say that when you are first elected, I think there is a tendency for us to come

into the Legislature assuming that we understand a great deal about the rules, about the laws and regulations that govern society. I'm sure that in my case, I was going to say it was a rude awakening to the facts of life, that there is a great deal out there that needs to be digested, and digested slowly before we can actually fulfill our functions as legislators. The last ten months have been very instructive to me in that respect.

We become aware, I suspect of the responsibility that we have and despite the fact that everything that we have done in the past ten months has not been lauded uniformly by Members of this Legislature, the fact is that everything that we have done has been done with a sense of responsibility to the public, to the people of Manitoba, to the businesses, to everyone. I think that's recognized as well by the general public.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege and an honour to serve the Constituency of Flin Flon. I am very grateful for the support that they have given me, for the letters that I have received, from the comments that I've received. I am also thankful and grateful for the criticisms that I have received, the suggestions that I have received. I wouldn't be telling the whole truth and the unadulterated truth if I said that all of the comments have been positive, but I will say that the comments that have been made to me have been taken in a positive way. The criticisms that have been levelled, I believe, were intended to be constructive and I have taken them as such.

I think that the people of the Flin Flon constituency more than ever have had an opportunity to express their concerns to myself and to my colleagues, and in particular, to my Cabinet colleagues. I think the North has never seen the representation from the Cabinet in Northern Manitoba like they've seen through the past year. Almost all of my Cabinet colleagues at one time or another have been in Northern Manitoba, whether it be the Minister of Cultural Affairs or the Minister or Labour and Manpower, or the Minister of Health, the fact is that they've been there. They've shown their concern; they've been listening to Northern Manitobans and, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans, Northerners in particular and Manitobans in general, appreciate that.

I suppose that Northern communities, more than most southern communities, have felt the deep sense of uncertainty with respect to the future. The continuing recession is playing havoc with Northern communities, particularly the traditional industries of mining and forestry, but also to some extent fisheries. The concern the Northerners have is a legitimate concern. There are problems that they face on a daily basis that hopefully most of us won't have to face, and that's fears of unemployment and fears of security, not only for their own jobs, but for their families futures in the communities that they have chosen to live in; they're genuine concerns. But, Mr. Speaker, as I travelled through my constituency and talked to people I recognized that the concern that they have is not despair and I think there's a fine difference there. While they have concern - legitimate, rational concern - there is no despair, and part of the reason there is no despair is that the policies of this Government and the activities of this Government have seemed to be in the interests of northerners and I could cite numerous policies, numerous things that this Government has imple-

mented, procedures and policies that have been to the benefit of northerners. There is a feeling that this Government has a desire to co-operate with Northerners to make good things happen despite the difficult circumstances, and I know the Member for Thompson was on his feet speaking to that point. The fact is that in 1977-78 when the 700-plus steel workers were laid off in Thompson permanently - there was a workforce cutback, is that the term we use? - there were certainly no temporary layoffs as there have been over the past number of months. But let's take what has happened in communities such as Thompson and compare the atmosphere of those communities back then with what they are now. Then there was despair, now there's concern, now there's uncertainty but not despair, and part of the reason is, not only the image this Government has but actually the way it deals with people in those situations.

Mr. Speaker, I heard some derisive laughter when someone suggested that this was an activist and imaginative Government, when one of my colleagues mentioned that. Perhaps the members opposite do not view some of the things that we have implemented, some of the things that we have tried, as particularly imaginative, but let's just say that they are first-time happenings and that leads me to the conclusion that they're imaginative. We could take the Economic Summit as an example and —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I was just going to —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the feeling at that meeting was one which I, quite frankly, was amazed at. We have been led to believe that we had to be locked into these adversarial roles and the fact was that in those meetings there were more positive statements, more ideological breakthroughs in terms of our representative attitudes of the other groups than I could have anticipated and I think that it would be fair to say that most people who participated in that, anticipated.

It was an education for us all, Mr. Speaker, including I might add, some very prominent members of the business community and some very prominent members of our labour group. It was instructive and it was enlightening and the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there was no question that we face certain difficulties, we face certain differences of opinion, but those were set aside in favour of being constructive and I think that's the tack that has to be taken, particularly in these times.

I notice you're getting nervous, Mr. Speaker, I will continue tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We've arrived at the adjournment hour. When we next discuss this motion the Honourable Minister will have 25 minutes remaining. The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow.