



Third Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXI No. 5 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 18 APRIL, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 18 April, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to table the Annual Report for the year ending March, 1983, of the Manitoba Arts Council and the Franco-Manitoban Cultural Centre and the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to file the annual return of the Administrator of The Fatality Inquiries Act in respect to persons who died in the year, 1983, while in correctional institutions, jails or prisons, or while in voluntary residence of institutions in the Province of Manitoba.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 18 students of Grade 6 standing from the Garson Tyndall School. They are under the direction of Mrs. Stefansson. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Business Development.

There are 24 students of Grade 9 standing from the John Henderson Junior High School under the direction of Mr. Earl. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Power sales re Memorandum of Understanding

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines. It follows upon his statement yesterday to the House of the agreement to sell hydro-electric energy to Northern States Power in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement refers to a Memorandum of Understanding which was recently signed with Northern States Power. Will the Minister table that Memorandum of Understanding in the Legislature, please?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, that Memorandum of Understanding is the basis of negotiations for the final contract which will be concluded in early June. When that is done I will table everything, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, since the negotiations are taking place between the two parties who have signed the Memorandum of Understanding, I see no reason why the Minister couldn't make that public. It's not proprietary information that would be used by anybody else, it's simply an agreement between the two parties. Will the Minister please file and table the Memorandum of Understanding now?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I already answered that question. I said, yes, I would table the information at the proper time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Manitobans would like to know more about the agreement, would like to know more about the details of the sale, will the Minister consider tabling that memorandum sooner so that it may be the subject of discussion in committee when Manitoba Hydro comes before the committee, so that we on this side of the House and, indeed, all Manitobans can have a greater appreciation and understanding for the potential benefits that will accrue to Manitoba?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I fully intend to make myself available in my Estimates Review to answer questions. There will certainly be sufficient time for the public to be apprised of that; the opposition certainly will have the opportunity. I certainly do believe that the people of Manitoba are very interested in that development. They believe, from what I heard from various people in the business community yesterday, they believe that this is a fantastic thing for Manitoba. They are very pleased, Mr. Speaker. They are very positive about it.

They also understand, Mr. Speaker, because they are business people; they understand commercial confidentiality. They are hopeful that, not only do we bring this development about which we are confident that we will do, but they want us to bring other developments about, as well. They want us to build from this to other ones because, Mr. Speaker, they do agree with us that we have a great future and they are confident, they're behind us, they're pulling with us. I believe that a lot of people in Manitoba will co-operate with the government, Mr. Speaker, to achieve our

potential. I hope even those people on the other side co-operate with us as well.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed in that spirit of co-operation that members on this side are asking for more information, and it is indeed only on the basis of having proper information that anyone, whether it be members of the business community or members of the public at large who are ratepayers in Manitoba Hydro, could appreciate what a good arrangement this is and how beneficial it will be to Manitobans. So, Mr. Speaker, following on that, if the Minister refuses to table that agreement in the House for people to be able to evaluate it, can he assure us that the rates that will be paid by Northern States Power will be less than the rates that will be paid by the average ratepayer in Manitoba, a customer of Manitoba Hydro, during that period of 1993 to 2005?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have certainly indicated that I do intend to table the appropriate information. So when the Leader of the Conservative Party says that I won't table the information, just after I have said that I would, Mr. Speaker, he is either inadvertently misleading the House or deliberately misleading the House. So I think the record should be clear that I've indicated to the people of Manitoba that I will provide the information to them, Mr. Speaker, and at that time all of the information will be very clear and we will show to the people of Manitoba that we will, in fact, derive tremendous benefit from this development. We are confident of that, Mr. Speaker. I state that and we will certainly be able to show it despite the petty negativism that I am hearing from the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Energy and Mines confirm that a few years ago when another Minister of Energy and Mines arrived at a similar position about announcing a potential major agreement with respect to Alcan, the then opposition demanded and asked for the Memorandum of Understanding to be tabled in the House and it was. Can he confirm that he asked for that Memorandum of Understanding from my colleague, Don Craik, and that it was supplied at that time?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly check on the exact statements to the bench, Mr. Speaker, because I know that whatever they tabled the Conservative Government at that time did not table the information that they had acceded to a request by Alcan, to not set a sale price in case Manitoba Hydro required the plant that they were going to sell to Alcan. They made a secret arrangement that they did not inform the public of, Mr. Speaker, so we intend to provide all the information. We won't be like them, Mr. Speaker, we won't be like them. Let us recall that when they said they signed something for the Western Grid, did they table it at that time, did they make it public at that time? Mr. Speaker, what I think we're hearing from the other side is sour grapes. We're hearing obstructionism; we're hearing negativism when we should all be pulling together.

We all know the process of commercial confidentiality. We all are intending to bring this contract to fruition by early June. We will provide the information at that time, Mr. Speaker. We have to go to the National Energy Board at that time. There is a very good process for consultation, Mr. Speaker, and we will welcome the constructive criticism and co-operation from the opposition. We hope we receive it, we are getting good intentions at this time.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, will the same Minister confirm that when another Minister of Energy and Mines was arriving at a major point in his negotiations with our sister provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, on the project known as the Western Grid and when the then opposition demanded for Memorandums of Understandings to be tabled in this House so that all Manitobans, including the opposition, could understand what direction and what commitments this, the then government, was making for future Manitobans, what were the general parameters, that that information was also tabled in this House for the benefit of all members?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I will check Hansard on that, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Questions to the Treasury Bench should be for current information, not to argue about historical events within this House. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister a question. How does he honestly expect reasoned, constructive advice or criticism with respect to a major economic agreement which we may well applaud, as I indeed applauded just yesterday, without some basic information, without some parameters about what the terms of references are - not the details - we're talking about a Memorandum of Understanding. What is this government, what is this First Minister hiding?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me dissuade the honourable member from his obvious desire to generate, wittingly or unwittingly, some paranoia with respect to the discussions that have been under way. The basic information, the detailed information is being made available.

As the Minister has indicated, during the Estimate review, he anticipates a great deal of questions pertaining to the agreement. In the meantime, there are commercial negotiations that are under way to finalize the agreement. There are other commercial negotiations that are under way that would not be in the commercial interests of Manitoba Hydro or the Province of Manitoba, to table Memorandums of Agreement while those discussions are under way. But honourable members ought to be aware that this government will not, as did the previous administration, provide only partial or incomplete information. This government will provide all information. All information will be tabled in the Legislature when it is in the commercial public interest that it be done.

Family Life Program in schools

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my question to the Minister of Education. The Minister on at least two occasions has referred to, and I quote, "our public attitude survey." I first heard it mentioned at the annual meeting when she gave an address to the school trustees and also she made reference to that in an interview she gave to The Manitoban. I wonder if she could tell us what questions were asked on that survey, how many people were surveyed, who performed that survey and whether she will table a copy plus the results of that entire survey here in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I don't have all the specific information that the member asked for, but I can give him some of the general information and perhaps look at the more detailed questions, that I can't answer today, very shortly. But I think it's very important that we continually keep in touch with and check out the feelings of the public about very important issues like education. You know, we think we know what they want us to do and we think we know how they feel about what we're doing, but the fact of the matter is that we sometimes get surprises and we did get some surprises in that.

I think when we're proceeding with very important programs that we should constantly go back and say, do you think the education system should be doing this, because we can't do everything that they want us to do. What do you want us to do the most? And how good a job do you think we're doing? Because if they don't think we're doing a great job, even though we think we are, then we've got a problem and we have to address that by telling them more about what we're doing.

So we did ask some questions and the questions were handled by the Research and Development Branch of my department. I don't have the numbers of people sampled. I know that it was done very well and in the usual manner of doing research questions like that. We did get some very interesting information that I shared with both the teachers and the trustees at their annual meetings, because I think that we have to pay attention to them. And what we found out, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — All right, we'll table it. And I'm willing to share the results with you; I've shared them with the key educational groups in the education system and I want all of us in this Chamber to know what the results are.

MR. C. MANNES: I'm certainly not admonishing the Minister for conducting the survey. I'm just curious as to only the rationale of the questions posed, Mr. Speaker, and I take it from her answer she will provide us with not only a copy of that survey but, indeed, the results.

The Minister indicated, Mr. Speaker, and I quote again from the article within the Manitoban, that "73 percent of the general public thinks there should be sex education in schools." Can the Minister indicate what

proportion of her sample survey was taken from rural Manitoba? And again, how many people were surveyed in total?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think the point that the Member for Morris makes is an important one. It was 73 - I don't have the total numbers that were surveyed in my mind right now, it was a reasonable enough number. But he's saying, did you get the same results? It was 73 percent of the public, although I think the poll that was done at the University of Manitoba showed a much higher percentage. It was up around 88 percent on the same question, which shows a lot of general public support. That does change from geographic area to geographic area. It is not the same in all areas.

I think that we would expect and we do see some differences of opinion or feelings from the country to the city, or from one area or community to another depending on the makeup of that community. It may be religious or it may be ethnic origin that has an effect on how they feel. And that of course is why we've handled the program the way we have, which has allowed freedom of choice for parents in communities, to have a total say on whether or not the program would go into their schools.

MR. C. MANNES: I am not encouraged by the fact that the Minister seems to give answers of the same length as she did the last Session.

A final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Will the final decision whether school divisions include optional family life education within the new health curriculum be left to school trustees or school principals or parents of the children, or will one or the other have the supreme right to have their child receive or not receive that type of education?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, in this case nobody has the supreme right, but everybody has a say and has the right to be involved in the decision. We have a very definite procedure for making the decision on whether or not the program will go into the schools.

The first decision has to be made by the school division. The school board has to decide that they are going to consider putting the Family Life Program into their schools. Once they've made that decision, there is a procedure that is in writing that they must follow. That includes calling a public meeting; informing all the parents and inviting them to the meeting; taking them through and showing them the entire program; letting them ask questions, respond, react. The final decision is with the parents. It's with the parents in total as a community group whether they want it to go into the schools, their school, and with individual parents about their child. The parents can decide to put the program in total, to put part of the program in, or not to put the program in at all.

If a community wants the program in, the largest numbers want the program in, individual parents can still choose to have their children not take part in the program. So there are both collective parent rights and involvement and individual parent rights.

Teachers - term contracts

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have a further question to the Minister of Education. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House if school boards can hire experienced teachers on term contracts for a full school year.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm not sure. I'll take that as notice.

David Sanders contract

MRS. G. HAMMOND: My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Has the Minister instructed Mr. David Sanders, former Deputy Minister who is under contract with the government, not to be involved with the North Portage Development Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it has been made very clear to Mr. Sanders that any involvement with the North Portage Development Corporation could put his contract in jeopardy should he become involved in any signing of any agreement with them or any contract with them.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: A supplementary question to the Minister. If he persists, will she cancel the contract between the government and Mr. Sanders?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member should not ask hypothetical questions. Perhaps she would care to rephrase her question.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Acting Minister indicated that it was a definite conflict and that Mr. Sanders has indicated he didn't think there was a conflict, could she then ask the Development Corporation Board if he is still doing business with the board?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sanders is not - and I put this sort of in quotes - "doing business" with the North Portage Development Corporation. The North Portage Development Corporation, in fact, was not incorporated or given the mandate to "do business" - and again that's in quotes - with anyone until the approval was given by the shareholders to the North Portage for the plan that they brought forward. That is a very recent development.

What has been made clear to Mr. Sanders is that if he concludes a contract with the North Portage Development Corporation when they begin to look for these contracts from the community-at-large, then he will be in conflict. This has been made very clear to him by the Acting Minister in my absence and by myself verbally to him as a follow-up. I think Mr. Sanders is quite aware of our opinion in this case and quite aware of the conflict of interest policy that has been adopted by the government.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Speaker, will she then, on behalf of the province as one-third partner, instruct

the North of Portage Development Board not to do business with Mr. Sanders?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it is our prerogative to tell the North Portage Development Corporation to do business with one consortium or group or one company, and not to do business with another. We are not issuing them a list of the groups with whom they may conduct business. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the shareholders are planning to meet in this next week to conclude the transfer of information and co-ordination of the North Portage situation to that corporation. They will then begin to move on the development of the North Portage area, but we are not giving them a list of whom they can do business with and whom they can't. That will be up to them.

I believe that they have all the wisdom of their experience and they will use it, that's why they were appointed to the board.

Tuberculosis in cattle herds

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister of Agriculture for his comments regarding the serious outbreak of tuberculosis in the cattle at Rossburn which he put in the record yesterday in the dying minutes of the question period and ask him, due to the number of phone calls today, if he can advise the House, the community and the cattle producers about the 25 head of cattle that have died in the interval when the cattle was first quarantined since '83?

The Minister said yesterday, "I'm advised that Avian Tuberculosis is not a health threat to humans or other animals. It would take many years for a cow to die from Avian Tuberculosis." Mr. Checkowski has lost 25 cattle since August '83 and I wonder if the Minister would comment on that please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, some of his colleagues were not that interested in my reply and there was other information that I could have provided to the honourable member.

Mr. Speaker, it was members on the other side that raised the question. . . .

A MEMBER: They're at it again. They don't want the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, some of the conclusions that I'm advised came from the veterinarians that attended at the farm during the period at which the cattle were in quarantine have indicated that the past disease problems which have caused some of the deaths of the animals, and problems that the farmers had, can be attributed to at least two factors that they felt, one is BVD or Bovine Virus Diarrhea, and another

virus commonly known in the cattle industry as Shipping Fever. Those are the two that the veterinarians determine.

The quarantine situation that the honourable member raised, as I indicated yesterday, was moved aside in the month of February and the herd is no longer in quarantine.

The question dealing - I think I can anticipate - with compensation, if the honourable member wishes further representations to be made to the Federal Government, we certainly are in a position to try and assist there on behalf of the farmer, but the regulations are federal in nature, they are not provincial.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. While I do not wish to be overstrict with the honourable member's constituent, questions should be addressed to the Minister where the government has the administrative responsibility and they should be asking for information.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a real problem. I've got about 300 petitioners asking for information about this infestation of tuberculosis in the Rossburn community; it's been there since August '83; 25 cattle have died. The community wants to know is there any future for this man to continue in the cattle industry. Is the yard infested? Is the infestation all over the area? Should the local people be checked out for health - I asked that of the Minister of Health the other day. The whole community is in an uproar wondering and, of course, what's going to happen? What's the future of that community? Of course, since the Honourable Federal Minister of Agriculture has put on his Swan River hat and is entering the leadership campaign, we're not getting any action out of Ottawa and neither is Mr. Checkowski since August '83 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: . . . so the matter is extremely serious . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have a question? If so, he should put it.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Can I ask the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Health if they're prepared to go into the Rossburn community and check out that area and see how serious the infestation is? The humans in the area are most concerned and should they be kept waiting to see how serious the disease is?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the responsibility dealing with infectious diseases in this country is the responsibility of Agriculture Canada. I'm sure that the community of Swan River would not be very pleased to be associated with somebody's hat. Mr. Speaker, I think the community of Swan River — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, we have, and are prepared to use our veterinary . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears the honourable members don't want a reply to what

we consider a very serious problem that is associated with one farmer and one farmer only in the area. We have indicated previously that our lab and our facilities are available to veterinarians for the use and diagnostic services so that any of the problems associated with the farm and with the disease can be tracked down.

I should mention to the honourable member that it is possible, and I say this because tests have not been done by us because they are not our responsibility, but it is possible that some of the tuberculosis disease in the animals could be traced back to the poultry flock on the same farm, Mr. Speaker.

Proudfoot Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. There's been a fairly extensive ongoing study being done with the Autopac facility recently known as the Proudfoot Report. I wonder if the Minister could give us indication of the results of that study.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Minnedosa is quite correct. MPIC last December engaged the services of Alexander Proudfoot to study the efficiency of the General Insurance section of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

The first part of the study has been completed. There have been a number of reassignments within the corporation. In the interests of efficiency, no one, not one single member of staff has been laid off as a result of that. There's just been a moving around within the corporation.

MR. D. BLAKE: I thank the Minister for the answer. I wonder if he might table that report in the House so that members of the Legislature may have the benefit of the findings of that study.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I don't have any specific report from MPIC. All I asked for was information from the general manager as to the extent of the consultation or the work that was being undertaken by Alexander Proudfoot, and all I am reporting is just the results of that inquiry.

MR. D. BLAKE: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, was this a request by the government that this study be undertaken, or was this undertaken by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation? And could he obtain a copy of that report and table it in the Legislature? There is some uneasiness with the staff out there who aren't too sure of the contents of that report either.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the study was undertaken at the initiative of the management of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. There is no report that I am aware of other than an ongoing study by staff from Alexander

Proudfoot, who make recommendations to management, who then decide whether or not to implement the recommendations. Management has apparently decided to implement some of the recommendations in the interests of better cost efficiency for the corporation.

MR. D. BLAKE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could give us some indication of the cost of this report, and did this report also cover an investigation into whether the corporation should enter into the life insurance field or not?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the cost, the study - the Member for Minnedosa makes reference to a report - it is a study, an ongoing study. I can't give a total to that as the study is still ongoing.

With respect to the second part of the question, if it has anything to do at all with the feasibility study of going into the life insurance pension management areas, those are totally unrelated.

Pesticide use on farms

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Environment. Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech mentions amendments to The Clean Environment Act which will cover the application of pesticides. I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment for his assurance that those amendments to The Clean Environment Act will in no way inhibit the pesticide use by the farm community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The act, when it is brought into the House - if it is brought into the House at this Session - will be the result of ongoing consultations with the interested parties into this area and the member will have his opportunity to provide the input at that time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister's answer gives rise to a second question then. The Throne Speech was fairly specific in that it mentioned only the public sector. The Minister indicated all interested parties will be consulted. Does this include such groups as the Manitoba Farm Bureau and the various farm business associations throughout the province, are being consulted? Is this what the Minister is now telling us?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I would actually have to get more detailed information for the member, in advising him exactly where we are at currently in the process of the consultations.

Winter road freight haul - Northern Manitoba

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that answer and look forward to his reply.

I have a question for the Minister of Highways and Transportation, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate whether the winter road freight haul into remote and Northern Manitoba communities was completed this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that it was.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, do I take from that answer from the Minister that all of the freight volumes that were scheduled did, in fact, get delivered to communities, not only in Northern Manitoba but east of Lake Winnipeg as well?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, that is my understanding as I have indicated to the honourable member.

Corporate income tax revenues

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In the Minister's Estimates of Revenue for 1983-84, he was projecting about a 9.7 percent increase in corporate income tax revenues. I note in the fiscal documents tabled by the Federal Government following Mr. Lalonde's Budget, that the Federal Government is only expecting about a 9.7 percent increase in corporate revenues for that same period.

Can the Minister of Finance give any indication to the House whether or not he expects there will be adjustments in the revenue to the province, or is he still expecting a percentage increase 10 times higher than the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, it's always easier to make statements a year after than a year before.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, the revenues that we estimated would be coming last year, were here. In fact, we're about 1 percent above what we predicted. The opposition said that if we got 15.6 percent, we would have a full economic recovery, that was their terminology. We got more than that. Overall, we got better than what we predicted and on some items we got a little less, on other items we got more. But overall, we were underestimating what we got so we are quite happy, overall, with last year's spending and revenue Estimates.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask the Minister whether he was happy or whether he was unhappy. I simply asked him whether he is still expecting the same level of corporate income tax, given that information provided by the Federal Government indicates that they are not expecting, in their own revenues, an increase of anything like the magnitude that was estimated in the Manitoba Budget.

My question simply was, does the Minister still expect that that revenue is going to flow?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, there's not one single item which we predicted last year that will be right on. We're either a little above or a little below. We're not right on on anything, any more than the previous government was. But I can tell the honourable member that his prediction of December of 1982 that we were going to have a deficit in 1983-84 of somewhere between \$800 million and \$1 billion last year, was more than 100 percent incorrect.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Minister will of course be aware that had he not followed some of the advice that he has been given from this side of the House, that prediction would indeed have come true.

The question to the Minister - and if he doesn't have an answer, I am quite prepared to accept that and he can take it as notice - but it was a straightforward question as to whether he expects the revenues from corporate income tax to be approximately what he predicted they would be, for 1983-84. Yes or no will do.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, all of the revenue items will be provided to the opposition in due course. There will be a fourth quarter statement provided to the House at that time. They will be able to see, not just the trees, but the whole forest, they will be able to see all of the numbers and not distort, Mr. Speaker, in the way that they do with their Tory Party statistics as, for instance, where they were showing the other day that December department store sales were the third lowest in Manitoba, as compared to other parts of Canada. They didn't show retail sales - department store sales are only 15 percent of total sales - they wanted to show the one tree that wasn't doing so well. They didn't want to show the forest that showed Manitoba, for the second year in a row, above the national average in terms of sales.

A MEMBER: Don't know the answer, Vic, eh!

Cost of fertilizer to farmers

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

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. The income for the farming community in 1984 is being projected as being 10 percent to 15 percent less over the previous year. This is due to lower prices for commodities and higher costs of production. Now one of these costs of production certainly is the price of fertilizer; the cost of anhydrous ammonia has increased by \$100 a ton.

My question is to the Minister. Is he going to have an investigation into the price of anhydrous ammonia, or all fertilizers, to see whether this tremendous increase in price is justified when there has been relatively no price in natural gas which is the major component of anhydrous ammonia?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, certainly the suggestion being made by the Honourable Member for Rhineland

deserves consideration and I, as well as I am sure all of my colleagues, are concerned with escalating prices. However, one has to look at what has happened over the past few years and of course the industry is, in most instances, national in scope. However, I want to take his consideration very seriously.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Members wishing to hold a private debate, perhaps they should do so outside of the Chamber.

On the matter of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I certainly am pleased to rise to take part in this debate and before I do begin my remarks I certainly want to wish you well in the forthcoming Session. I certainly hope that the level of debate will be more rational and more polite than it has in the past. We, on this side, certainly give our commitment that we will try and accomplish that. In fact, I have worn a blue tie today, Mr. Speaker. I do want to be part of a process . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . whereby, Mr. Speaker, people will look at issues, not attack personalities, and we are quite prepared to do that. We are quite prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker, and we look forward to doing it. — (Interjection) — And if that's the case I apologize, I will right here apologize for, in fact, raising that because I think that's a valid concern and I do apologize directly for that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do think it is important to speak about the issues. I think we are at a turning point in our history as a province, and I think this Throne Speech comes at a particularly good time because I do believe it is a turning point upwards. I believe it is a very good turning point upwards and the Throne Speech is part of a balanced approach with respect to the economy, a balanced approach that I think has taken us through the worst recession that North America has experienced since the great depression of the Thirties.

The balanced approach of the Throne Speech, which is the character of this Pawley Government, has taken us through that depression in the best shape of all other provinces in this country and we should be proud of that. We have been a caring competent government through two years of very difficult adversity, Mr. Speaker,

and if you check with the various groups and institutions in this society you will find that we are in much much better shape than other institutions and groups in other provinces in this country - and I'll take some time and go through the predicament of other institutions and groups in other provinces - they in fact are under a state of siege, Mr. Speaker, whereas we in Manitoba are at a takeoff point, and that's the difference. There is only one New Democratic Party Government in this country, it is a beacon and it is showing the way, Mr. Speaker.

We have had a balanced approach between economic development and social development; we have a particular thrust on economic development because we think that that is critical at this particular time and we have had a focus on unemployment. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that as many people as possible in this society should be employed; we have taken that position ever since we were elected; we were the only government in this country who took that position consistently, the only one.

Sure we've gone through a very difficult recession, sure we've gone through very difficult times, but which government has succeeded more than the others in achieving the lowest level of unemployment in this country, having taken off at a bad position compared to other provinces? We have been the most successful. We make a commitment to lower unemployment relative to other provinces and we succeeded, Mr. Speaker, that was our thrust, and a major part of that thrust was the Jobs Fund. We said we believe in jobs and we put our money where our mouth is. We did have to reprimorize; we thought it was important; we thought it was important to try and keep the institutions of our economy going through a depression, and we succeeded.

The construction industry is alive and well in Manitoba. It's not alive and well in Alberta or B.C. or other provinces. Mr. Speaker, our professional services are alive and well in Manitoba when they are in terrible difficulty in other provinces; that's because of the approach we took. We admit that for the first part of the Jobs Fund Program, we were trying to create work to keep people employed, because it is this party that believes in work rather than welfare, and it is the other parties in this country who put people on welfare because they can't get jobs. We are the party that believes that; we are the party that believes it is far better to spend money on employment projects and, hopefully, if you can move them into long-term employment projects, that's even better. But, even in the short term, we believe it is far better to have employment than to spend \$12 billion in UIC payments. Imagine the type of country we would have today if the \$12 billion in UIC payments had been funnelled into employment projects, as we have said consistently. We have been the party that said that.

So when we now say that we are at a take-off point with respect to the Jobs Fund, where we say we can move from a concentration on public projects because we were able to get those mobilized because the private sector, through the depression of the last two years, was not in a position to make major investment decisions - even minor investment decisions, Mr. Speaker - because they were desperately holding on by their fingernails to survive, so we filled in and the

public filled in admirably. We created employment for needed projects within communities and we kept those communities alive; we kept the work forces in those communities alive.

I've just been through Northern Manitoba and we were able to do it in Thompson. So now when the expansion is taking place in the Thompson mine the people there are a productive labour force that stayed in Thompson and they're ready for the take off. The same thing holds true with Leaf Rapids; the same thing holds true with Flin Flon; the same thing holds true with Winnipeg. That's because of the approach we took and we were criticized a lot because these were public projects. But, Mr. Speaker, the private sector was not in a position to move at that time and in our meetings with the private sector - because we continued to have the consultations - the private sector told us that, they said they weren't in a position to make those investment decisions.

We now believe that more of them are, and that's why we are changing the thrust of the Jobs Fund. We are saying we are at that take-off point, we can make those investments in a co-operative way within our society with respect to private sector development. We expect that we will have a balanced approach between public sector development and private sector development, Mr. Speaker. We are moving from short-term job development to longer-term job development and that is the same approach.

I wish other provinces were doing it, because we are the only one that has. Last year my colleague, the Minister of Finance, brought in his Budget before the Federal Minister. He set a model for the Federal Minister with our Jobs Fund. Imagine what type of society we would have in Canada today if the Federal Government had followed our lead through that Budget. But, instead, Mr. Speaker, there was a move to the right on the part of Conservative Governments in Canada at the provincial level and a move to the right on the part of the Federal Government, by and large, and we created a worse situation than was necessary.

So there is a beacon of light and there is a beacon of hope in this country and we are it. We have run into a lot of criticism, Mr. Speaker, because people expected instant results, and we have never said we would provide instant results. We have never said we would do this entirely by ourselves, but we said we would be that beacon of light, we would be that beacon of hope, we would be that catalyst that would bring together the various sectors in our society, and we are the party that brings together the community. It is the other two parties that fragment our community. We have consistently said that we believe in the community; we are the ones that go out and talk to the community. We can hear all of the negativism from the other side, but slowly and inexorably, our programs are working, Mr. Speaker.

If the programs of the New Democratic Party Government in Manitoba were not working why have we had the largest increase in our population in Manitoba for about 20 years? Why have we led the country in population increase in percentage terms and per capita terms for the first time since 1919? Why is that taking place during the administration of the Pawley Government which believes in that approach? Why did the opposite take place between 1977 and 1981? That

is the question that the people of Manitoba have to address. What accounts for the difference? There was an added feature, Mr. Speaker, between 1977 and 1981, generally, the economy in North America and Canada was doing quite well but, for some perverse reason, the economy in Manitoba did not do well between 1977 and 1981. There was a lot of research done on this; the basic . . . Report indicated that our performance was the worst of all provinces between 1977 and 1981.

A MEMBER: Len Evans said so.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Now, we had a change in government in 1981. We were hit with the worst recession in North America since the Great Depression of the Thirties, everyone will agree with that. We should have done far worse than the other provinces in this country.

And why have the results been so dramatically different? We basically still have the same business people; we still have the same workers, but we had leadership, Mr. Speaker, we had leadership that said that we believe that employment is important. We stuck our necks out, the Pawley Government stuck its neck out and it went to the people and said, we are going to promote this despite the difficulties. We were quite prepared to stick our necks out and we still are because we, in fact, follow the principles that we believe in. When we say we believe in greater employment, long-term employment, we will, in fact, achieve that. Yesterday's announcement was just the first step in that respect, there are other steps. It's basically about the tenth step, Mr. Speaker, because if you look at the specific record of the Jobs Fund there have been many, many successes and there will be many more. I will stack our record up against any province in this country over the last two years, and I certainly stack our record up against the performance of the Conservative Government between 1977 and 1981, because, Mr. Speaker, a New Democratic Party Government is a purposeful government. It establishes what it wants to achieve and it works in a patient, persevering manner to achieve that. That's the difference between a Conservative Government that says, we have no purpose; our only purpose is to limit government; our only purpose is to tie our hands and hope that things get better . . .

A MEMBER: Or to do nothing, ever.

HON. W. PARASIUK: That's right. Yesterday or a few days ago, the Leader of the Opposition said we should do only nothing. Or I guess they could be like other provinces; they could chalk slogans on the wall. The slogan in Saskatchewan is "Open for Business." Two years later, people are saying, where's the business, two years later? Where's the beef, Mr. Speaker? In fact, people have been trying to say that to us - "Where's the beef?" I thought yesterday we gave a number of people such a big chunk of beef that they might choke on it.

MR. H. ENNS: Remind me in the year 2000 to burp because I'm not going to get near that beef until the year 2000.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Lakeside is actually trying to be impolite - I don't think so. I can recall the forecasts of the Member for Lakeside when he sat on this side of the House where he said that their party would be in office for 20 years. Given his rate of predictions, he may, in fact, not even burp in the year 2000.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have confidence, that's the difference; we have confidence because we have purpose. We have the lowest level of unemployment. Now that may change because, given the basic structure of our province, we probably should be in the order of third lowest level. But there's a difference, we are trying very hard to change that, to make sure we have the lowest level of unemployment. Despite a lot of very trying circumstances, we have been successful.

We are also successful with what I would call the general climate in the province. We've had some destructive negativism over the last few months that I think a lot of us want to put it behind us because there is so much that is in this province that is so much better than exists elsewhere.

Look at the situation right now in B.C. Is that a healthy situation there? Would you want to have that type of milieu here in Manitoba, where you basically have a type of martial law? Is that a free society?

A MEMBER: That's what they like.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Now we have the comments on the other side. I'm not saying anything about personalities, but I'm getting told rude remarks. There is a difference there, I'm talking about the issue. The historical fact right now in B.C. is that they do not have a long-term, allied hydro contract like we have. They have to have martial law. That's what they have to have . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: Poland.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, that's true, and it's an interesting analogy. The Premier says, "Poland." We on this side are consistent. We believe that the rights of a union in Poland are very important just as the rights of a union in B.C. are very important. We don't say like some other people that we should squash the rights of a union at home so that we can mouth nice rhetoric about union solidarity and freedoms elsewhere. We practise what we preach at home, and it is not the New Democrats who want to oppress people. It is those people who object to those basic freedoms such as free collective bargaining.

We've also had draconian cutbacks in B.C. Would you like us to have that taking place in Manitoba? Would we want to follow the lead that the Member for Morris wanted to take, the road he wanted to take us down? Again it's not a personality attack. This is an attack on the policy that he espoused, that they would like to sweep under the carpet, but which is strong. I have been told that this man may, in fact, be a future leader of his party. In fact, you know, I'm not sure, there may be a move to find out about opportunity. Is that the underlying philosophy that exists there, the one that is just under the surface? That's important to know, because we on this side reject that. So we didn't like

that model in B.C. We don't like the cutbacks that exist in Alberta.

A MEMBER: We don't have those kinds of problems.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Remember in the old days, between '77 and '81, I can recall people coming around saying, buy housing tax shelters in Alberta. Things are wonderful there. They have such a full occupancy rate, low vacancy, that this is a sure-fire investment; invest in office space, residential space in Alberta. Right now we have a very difficult situation in Alberta. There are literally whole office buildings that are empty in Alberta. There is tremendous unemployment in Alberta. Is that the model for Manitoba? The deficit's increasing. So, Mr. Speaker, our situation compared in relative terms, not having had that oil birthright or the oil heritage, has been tremendous in comparison to that performance.

Take a look at Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan took a very strong economic base that had been given them by the Blakeney Government and in two years has fallen behind the socialist hordes to the east. Can you imagine the situation in Saskatchewan? How does the Premier of Saskatchewan explain to the people of Saskatchewan the fact that Manitoba now has a lower unemployment rate. As I said, the structure is such that Saskatchewan should have a lower one than us, but we've tried. They've just chalked a slogan, "open for business," up on the wall.

Look at the difference in Ontario. The whole Medicare system in Ontario is topsy-turvy, the building situation there, the cutbacks there. The situation in Quebec which in some respects unfortunately - unfortunately - is similar to that in B.C.; and the east, Peckford's policies right now. The whole country has run out of steam, and there's only one beacon and that's us.

So we're leading the way. We are leading the way in the country. We often get attacked from a number of sources. We are often the odd man out, or the odd person out and that's happened at certain conferences that we have been at. But, Mr. Speaker, we believe that it's important to show the way. We believe that it's important to be the beacon in this country and it's rather interesting that even when it comes to so-called mega announcements which we say should be part of a balanced package, right now it would appear that Manitoba is again leading the way in that respect.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's important that we look at all the aspects of the Throne Speech. There were a lot of comments from people on the other side and some people in the press, and I found them rather amusing because they said there was nothing in here.

Yet in terms of economic development - and using the Jobs Fund as the key instrument of development - we were saying we're investing in industry, technology and export development and there are new thrusts there. We are investing in small business, and there are new thrusts there. We are investing in both energy development and energy conservation. I thought the other side would kill themselves giggling when they heard that, but they aren't giggling after yesterday, Mr. Speaker. We're investing in agriculture, and I hope my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, will be able to point out to the people of Manitoba the fact that this

government has made more input into agriculture than any other government in Canada and any other Conservative Government in Manitoba.

We are investing in human resources, especially youth, because it is this party that has confidence in the future. We believe we have a very strong future, and we believe that despite our vast resources, such as Hydro, that our key resource is people and we are going to invest in those people.

We have been the leader in the country in putting forward innovative proposals for federal-provincial economic developments. People have talked a bit about the Churchill development, Mr. Speaker. We had Jack Murta who said it should be closed down and he's a prominent Conservative.

A MEMBER: That's right.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, when we got in office, within two years we pushed this proposal. We made the proposal to the Federal Government. We backed it up with documentation, Mr. Speaker, and we put it in the Throne Speech; and what I found a bit amazing about some of the press reports is that one of the reporters said that there was nothing in the Throne Speech, and then devoted an entire page to saying how great a federal-provincial agreement was that was right in the Throne Speech. I'm not sure if that was editing, or whether in fact someone fell asleep at the switch upstairs.

A MEMBER: Present company excepted.

HON. W. PARASIUK: But, Mr. Speaker, that was a very key development because it says that we, on this side of the House, have faith in Churchill, long-term, as a seaport in Canada. We believe that Churchill is important, not historically as a seaport for the grain trade only, we believe that Churchill has potential for an industrialized west. That's the difference and that's the basis on which we sold the package to the Federal Government.

We became innovative. We said we were prepared to put money into something that maybe one could sit back on and sort of just harangue the Federal Government in a negative, confrontational way. I know that the Member for Charleswood, the former Leader of the Conservative Party, said that we should do that. Mr. Speaker, I think he likes to fight, but not to achieve. We believe in achieving things, Mr. Speaker, so we have a long-term development agreement for Churchill which is going to be very good for this country, very good for the province because, after all, Churchill is 1,000 miles closer to the ports of Europe, Mr. Speaker.

So we on this side applaud that, we are confident about it. I am not sure where the other side sits on that. It's important for them to clarify their position on it.

We are making the long-term investments in minerals, Mr. Speaker; we're making the long-term investments in forestry; and we, in fact, are making the long-term investment decisions in Northern development.

I was amused when the Premier read the statement into the record here about the federal-provincial Churchill agreement, and we had the Leader of the

Opposition get up and say that somehow the New Democratic Party Government had sort of caused this calamity in Northern Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, when we got in, in 1981, we had a tremendous job of rescue to do, because four years of Conservative Government had just wreaked havoc in that place. We have had to work hard to pull up the North and we're working together, and they know that, Mr. Speaker, the Northerners know that, and they remember. They remember that era between '77 and '81, Mr. Speaker, the dark ages of the North.

So we've accomplished a great deal; we are going to accomplish more. That was all in the Throne Speech, laid out sector by sector with programs to achieve that. You watch next year, and page-by-page may, in fact, be important, Mr. Speaker. They are solid programs, that's the difference, they're solid programs. In fact, when we got in we had to implement some of the ones that they kept announcing but never achieving.

So, Mr. Speaker, we achieve things. We achieve things with energy conservation. We went through a depression, and we promoted energy conservation. People on the other side laughed, they thought that energy conservation isn't important. We believe very strongly in energy conservation. We believe very strongly in the environment, we take that position. It is not an anti-development position, it is a pro-conservation, it is a pro-environment — (Interjection) — That's right. Deep down that is the true Conservatism, Mr. Speaker, an approach that has been rejected by development philistines for many years, but we are the ones who led the way.

I spoke at a symposium at the University of Manitoba, there were a number of people attended from different parts of the country and, when I talked about our programs, person after person came up to congratulate me, saying that we had the best energy conservation programs in the country. They also had the added bonus of creating employment. We will continue those projects, we will continue those thrusts, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time we are at the stage of having energy development, as well, and both under a New Democratic Party Government are compatible, and both under the Pawley Government will be achieved.

So we come to the whole situation regarding power sales. We inherited a situation, Mr. Speaker, where there was this egg, pretty soft shell to it, announced in the midst of an election campaign without any documents being filed by anyone, I should point out to the Member for Lakeside, accompanied by government-paid ads hyping up something that didn't exist. Mr. Speaker, that was their approach all tied to Alberta's coattails, all predicated on Alberta and Saskatchewan having an overheated economy.

All of the options that we, in fact, argued - indeed, I can recall reading Hansard and finding that the then Member for St. Vital, that's you, Mr. Speaker - in fact, that we should look for southern sales as well, we should have a balanced approach. That was the approach that the New Democratic Party Opposition took. They said, let us have a balanced approach to development, let's not put all of our eggs in one basket. Let's ensure that we explore all the alternatives in a rational, systematic way so that we are not just caught in one position.

Mr. Speaker, when we took office that recession hit, and it hit Alberta with tremendous impact. It hit Alberta

and they said that they had to defer the Grid because of economic reasons. Mr. Speaker, that is still the situation with respect to the Grid. Alberta and Saskatchewan's economic forecasts have decreased tremendously, they are in a difficult situation. Their demands for energy are completely changed from what they were in 1981-82.

I sent them a letter while we were conducting these other discussions and negotiations with southern utilities. I sent them letters asking if they were in a position to give me forecasts in order to determine whether, in fact, we shouldn't revive the Grid discussions because we have said consistently that we believe in a Grid. It was Premier Schreyer of the New Democratic Party Government between 1969 and '77 who first proposed that in a real way in the country.

We said, we believe in that approach, and we are prepared to pursue it. I received responses from both Alberta and Saskatchewan. I know that the Leader of the Conservative Opposition tabled the letter from Alberta only sort of quoting a selective part there, Mr. Speaker, because it made his argument look a bit better. But what he didn't quote was the key paragraph. The key paragraph said, "I'm responding to your letter of March 9, 1984, regarding the Western Electric Power Intertie Project. I recall the agreement among Ministers in May, '82, to a two-year postponement of discussions about this project as a result of economic conditions and the accompanying decline in the demand for electrical energy in Saskatchewan and Alberta." If he would have read that he would have made his former leader a liar, Mr. Speaker, because his former leader said that wasn't the reason for it. But when he tabled the letter he didn't read that paragraph, Mr. Speaker.

The second paragraph said, "As you are aware, TransAlta Utilities, Alberta Power Limited and this department are currently examining the Slave River Hydro potential as one alternative for meeting our future electric energy requirements. Several studies are under way. These investigations are under way, and what they say is that, while studies on the potential Slave River Hydro project are longer term - there is no idea even when they'll finish them - our immediate and short-term needs for electric power are being reassessed. It should be noted, therefore, that our future electric energy requirements are now projected to be less than was anticipated in 1982. In fact, our Energy Resources Conservation Board has issued directives confirmed by Cabinet which delay the commissioning dates of four thermal generating units ranging from six to 18 months." He says that, "In these circumstances, I would suggest that further discussions of the proposed Western Electric Intertie should realistically be deferred again for a further period of two years."

We understand that and we're prepared to do that, but imagine the costs we would be in, Mr. Speaker, if they had left all of the eggs in the Conservative basket of only one alternative. Imagine the costs we would be in if we had not shown the leadership to go out and cultivate the other options, Mr. Speaker, one of which was successful yesterday. That was our initiative, not theirs. It was a new direction, Mr. Speaker, not their direction.

The same is true with respect to Saskatchewan where they say virtually the same thing, Mr. Speaker. They say, "Economic growth in the province," and this is

from a Minister of Saskatchewan and I'm prepared to table this too, "has not regained the momentum that marked the period when the proposed Western Grid was under active consideration, causing significant doubt about whether Saskatchewan would derive significant net benefits from purchasing power from the major hydro-electric project located in Manitoba."

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry for Saskatchewan and Alberta in that respect. We still hold out our hands. We say that we are still interested in pursuing the Western Grid at the appropriate time. We think that it's in the long-term interest of Canada and Manitoba. When their economy picks up we hope that we'll be in a position to pursue that. But, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime we won't sit around without the options like the Conservatives did. We will explore further options, Mr. Speaker. We will explore further options to the south and we hope that we'll be able to show even more successes and that will be the difference, Mr. Speaker.

We have a vision; we have a future; we have optimism; we have confidence. Mr. Speaker, what do they have? They are defeatist; they are antagonistic; they have no vision; they have nowhere to go but to cry about the past. Mr. Speaker, we can both explain the past and look to the future. There's a tremendous difference in approaches and we are quite prepared to take that difference of approach out to the people of Manitoba so that they can see that there is an approach that is positive. He did that deliberately, he said that he would take a look for a minute and show that all of the nay saying of the past of their side was completely and utterly false, completely and utterly wrong. Mr. Speaker, if we had to rely on them, not just the nay say but to provide leadership and to provide goals for achievement, where would we be?

A MEMBER: The lights would still be out.

HON. W. PARASIUK: That's right. So, Mr. Speaker, we have that option. We have persisted, we have pursued the other options, we have revived some. Some were in fact initiated by the previous administration and they were dropped, the ball was dropped. We picked it up, we checked out the alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, those discussions and negotiations are taking place. Last year, they kept saying that we were basically lying or misleading to the people when we said we had discussions under way, Mr. Speaker. They said we shouldn't be believed. Even as late as two months ago they laughed when someone mentioned something about Alcoa. They laughed, Mr. Speaker. Let me say this, he who laughs last laughs best.

Mr. Speaker, we are bringing forward development not at the end of a term in desperation, but systematically right in the middle of a term. It took two years to pull it together, Mr. Speaker, because we had no good base to start from. We are achieving that and we will achieve it consistently over the next year and the next year and, Mr. Speaker, the years after that.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about lead time; some people on the other side have talked about lead time. Why do you sign an agreement now for something that is required nine years from now? What was being signed in 1981 for 1989? Mr. Speaker, who is trying to kid whom? Mr. Speaker, the only people they are fooling

are themselves. The people of Manitoba know this is a good deal for Manitoba; they know it's very important to us. It's being done rationally and reasonably in the middle of a term. We will show success, Mr. Speaker, but it is being done the proper way. Did we do this with a whole fanfare of advertising yesterday? Did we have the government pay for the Premier's speech on television, as did the Conservatives? We didn't do any of that, Mr. Speaker, because we don't think that's the right way of doing it.

We don't want a lot of false speculation. We don't want people running around to different communities and buying up land, Mr. Speaker. Let me be clear that that was not a reference to anyone in this House. It was a reference to a meeting I had in Balmoral where people came to me and said, you know, we can understand that circumstances might have changed with respect to aluminum development, but they were telling me, Mr. Minister, we were led to believe it was happening right now. We went out and bought land and subdivided it. That is where you misled the people with this type of advertising, with false expectations. That's the wrong way of doing it, Mr. Speaker, and we don't do it that way. There may be a time where we need to talk to people about industrial development.

Let me make it clear that this government is going to go out and talk to the people of Manitoba about the implications of Limestone development and the implications of this deal. We will take sufficient lead time to talk to the industry, labour, limestone suppliers, to Northern communities. We will do the lead time to achieve our commitment and our commitment is the orderly development of hydro resources, Mr. Speaker. We made that commitment. We will be going up North; we'll be going into different communities in Manitoba. We'll be dealing with the industry people here in Manitoba and I invite them to those meetings over the next month, two months. We will have those meetings and we will talk positively and we will work cooperatively, Mr. Speaker.

That is our invitation to Manitoba: Come work with the New Democratic Party; let us build a greater future. We said we could. We went through the difficult times. We are now at that take-off point where we are achieving that. Mr. Speaker, we are the ones with the vision; we are the ones with the optimism; we are the ones with the confidence and we invite Manitoba to join us. There is no other government in the country right now that has that opportunity, that can provide that beacon and that can provide that direction.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

MR. SPEAKER: Less than a minute.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Finally, I want to say that we are on a threshold, a threshold that has been worked at very hard by the Pawley Government. Piece by piece we laid that foundation. We are at that take-off point. We said two years ago that we had a great future. We have confidence in that future, Mr. Speaker. I make the commitment that the Pawley Government will achieve that great future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My congratulations to you on assuming this position as Speaker again this Session. I would sincerely hope that things go well for you. I know the problems that were placed before you during the last Session and I must compliment you on the way that you handled your position and your office. Mr. Speaker, I also must say that I felt a little sorry for you and the two clerks - I didn't feel sorry for the First Minister because he wrote it - for having to stand through one hour and 10 minutes of the worst Throne Speech that I have ever heard in my life. I watched you over there. You were able to keep a straight face, and I'm sure that you wanted to. I didn't know whether the Clerks were going to collapse or not in front of me here, but I was really seriously very sorry for you because the people in the gallery were able to fall asleep, which they did. Many people in the Chamber were able to fall asleep in their chairs, which they did. So, Mr. Speaker, I compliment you for the efforts that you and your staff put forward during the worst Throne Speech I have ever heard in my life.

Mr. Speaker, I will comment on the previous speaker's remarks - I will get to them - but I will say right now that we just had a lecture in socialist philosophy, socialist dogma and I can expect nothing except that from him. He believes in it. He has espoused that in this House since he's been here, and he worked very hard with the Schreyer Government to put that type of operation or type of government into this province and quite frankly, when he says that they are on the right road to doing everything to make this province a wonderful place and move ahead economically, he is wrong.

I will only remind him of one thing. When he said that they would have an orderly development of hydro, I can only remind this House that the orderly development on hydro during the Schreyer years cost the people 150 percent increase in their hydro rates. It was the worst construction program and the most ill-thought-out construction program that was ever put in, which was ever done by any government within the Province of Manitoba. It cost the people absolutely a fortune, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I would only like to comment on the Throne Speech again. I heard from the Minister of Finance, and I'm sorry he's gone - oh no, he's there - but I would ask the Minister of Finance, if he was able to quote all of these marvellous figures yesterday, if he was able to put the figures in the record that he put forward yesterday, I would wonder why he can't answer an ordinary question in the Legislature.

It would be very nice if the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker would have the — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I know that members of the House chide across the House. I do it myself; my colleagues do it; the members on the other side do it. But I would have fully expected the super House Leader, the great parliamentarian that we get told about would have a little more common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I would only say that the Finance Minister who, as I said, was able to quote all of those figures yesterday was not able to give a simple answer in the House today. I will repeat, as I said a couple of seconds ago, it would make the job of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker very easy if we could get answers from the other side of the House.

You see, the First Minister stands up and he tries to copy his great mentor, the person he admires most in

life, Pierre Elliott Trudeau. You see, when we watch Mr. Trudeau in the House, if he's asked a question in the House of Commons, he never answers it. He comes up with a smart remark. He always has something to tell but he never answers the question. As I said, I repeated the question to the Minister of Finance today. Maybe he'll go to his office for once and find an answer. That may be where he's on his way to now. But, Mr. Speaker, let's get back to the Throne Speech.

I won't comment on the remarks of the Member for St. James. They weren't worthwhile listening to; they're not worthwhile commenting on. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I hear from the First Minister that I am getting vicious. In fact, I will be very calm today. Mr. Speaker, he wants to speak. I got him wrong. It's issues that he wants to talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I am now hearing from this great, super parliamentarian House Leader again across the floor. We would expect something else from him. You see, when we get the comments from across the floor on the other side, it usually comes from the way they're led and it's very obvious how they are led. We just heard it over the past five minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech, well, we heard about the consultation with business. I only refer to a letter I tabled in this House from Mr. Dick Martin - I'll table this one too - where he was complimenting the Summit Meeting, and they said they had another meeting that was a disaster. You know, I have talked to the business sector that were at this meeting, and there hasn't been one since. There has not been another meeting since, and we hear about these great discussions that are being held with business. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's obvious that all of this discussion within the Throne Speech about what they have been doing and what they have been putting together, there is one thing that is not factual. Mr. Martin said so in his letter.

Mr. Speaker, support the Regional Development Corporation, I haven't got it with me, but I read it and I can assure you it's there. It was in the Parkland News that said, "Development Corporation in danger." That was taken from a speech from the government man who's involved with the development corporations. He said there was maybe a possibility after the study that they might not be there. Yet, in the Throne Speech, it says, "support the Regional Development Corporation," and it says, "continue to support," and I might say, the word "continue" means that the previous government supported them very much, and worked with them very closely also. We had our problems with one who wanted to outspend the others. He thought he deserved more money than the others and we couldn't see that, but we continually worked with them.

The Port of Churchill, Mr. Speaker, isn't that ironic? It's too bad the Member for Churchill isn't with us at the present time, because during our time in government the only person that had any interest in the Port of Churchill in this Legislature, or who had more concern for the Port of Churchill was the previous Member for Gladstone, Mr. Henry Einarson. Well, Mr. Einarson used to get up and he used to wonder. I can remember him saying to all of us, his colleagues, you know, I can't understand why the Member for Churchill and all of the members on the other side who would have some interest in having the Port of Churchill be viable, never said one thing about it.

HON. L. EVANS: We set up that port authority. We set up the damn port.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I heard from the Member for Brandon East that he set up the Port of Churchill Authority, and that's fine, but Mr. Einarson was the only one that took any interest in it. We never heard from the Member for Churchill in all of that time . . .

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The facts speak for themselves; it's all in Hansard. We know that the interest — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'm now hearing from that super parliamentarian again, the House Leader of the Government, who is the leader and the one who gives the direction and gives the example to his colleagues, I am now hearing from him again. I now know where the example comes from, where their leadership comes from, Mr. Speaker.

I would say that — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I just heard the honourable member say that I never speak from my seat. Yes, I do, but I am not the Government House Leader, who is supposed to create an example in the House. See, that's the difference. That's the reason the House gets in the turmoil that it does, and that's the reason you have so many problems, and that's the reasons that your job is made harder because of his example. It's very very simple, because of his example. If he wants to debate with me anytime, what the example that a House Leader should give should be, I will tell him because he can't hold a candle to the gentlemen who were there before him. I don't regard this one as a gentleman, but he can't hold a candle to the gentlemen that were there before him. I didn't come to talk about the House Leader, he's not worth talking about.

Mr. Speaker, tourism. They were going to do a lot about tourism and they're saying that tourism's going to be expanded. Well, tourism has been expanded because of an agreement signed by the previous government and they are administrating that agreement. It was ready to go when they came into office; Destination Manitoba was all there. I'd be pleased to bring the previous Deputy back from Toronto; we'll discuss it publicly. I'll defend my statement . . .

A MEMBER: Bring him back. We accept your challenge.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I will, fine. If he'll come.

A MEMBER: Put your money where your mouth is.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: If he'll come, I will discuss it. It was all ready to go. Mr. Speaker, I'm now hearing again from that great parliamentarian. I know what was left there, I know what program was all set for you. The Minister changed it somewhat as far as the \$16 million is concerned, but that's what was carried on and now they've extended it. We extended Enterprise Manitoba at one time; they're extending the Destination Manitoba; they're going to talk about another agreement; they're going to come up with another agreement, and so they should. Now, isn't that wonderful that they're going to

pat themselves on the back because they're going to work hard to come up with another tourism agreement that all the provinces will be doing with the Federal Government. So that's another thing that's in the Throne Speech, they try to take credit for a lot of things but it isn't there.

Mr. Speaker, investment, they talk about investment. Well, the investment that we've had in this province in the past while has been really quite discouraging. We have a forecast, as it says in the Throne Speech, for investment to increase - what is it? 10 percent or 11 percent in the next year. That's total investment. That includes the government spending; that includes housing which is up; that includes all of the programs like the Core area which the government is putting their money into. That's the total investment that they're talking about. When you take the commercial part of the investment out which will be maybe shopping centres, or maybe some apartment blocks, etc., you find that it's not so good either, but it is up. When you take a look at the manufacturing part of the investment, it has been disastrous during the past two years. It has gone nothing but down during the past few years, private investment and manufacturing has been really really bad.

Well, I can tell you that the manufacturing investment is stated that it will be up considerably in 1984. Well, let me tell you, the forecast has it to be \$143 million. Mr. Speaker, you know that in 1981 it was \$170 million, in 1982 \$107 million - it dropped down - in 1983 it dropped again, and you know they're forecasting it to come back up this year and it won't even come back up to what it was in 1981, and the 1981 last half or last quarter was a bad year. It will not even get close to '79.

Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing shipments from this province, the manufacturing shipments of manufacture for the products in this province, we're ninth in Canada. The honourable gentlemen on the other side keep bringing up Alberta and Saskatchewan. I'd like to remind the honourable gentlemen on the other side that Alberta and Saskatchewan, although their resource industries are down, their manufacturing shipments in the past two years exceeded the Province of Manitoba's. They had a better increase, let's put it that way. So, they are obviously open for business and they obviously are doing business. They obviously are doing business, the facts are there which proves that this Throne Speech is not accurate, it's a bunch of flowery stuff that's trying to make people believe other things.

Mr. Speaker, bankruptcies. You know I heard the Minister of Finance talking about bankruptcies yesterday. He seemed to think that they were in such good shape on bankruptcies. Let me tell you that the bankruptcies started to increase from September through to December last year. It's very obvious that you can find it in the statistics, they're available to everybody. You know the bankruptcies that we had the problem with he seemed to think was farming. He seemed to think bankruptcies were in better shape when more farmers went bankrupt in 1983. Now, we did better on business, but we had 300 business bankruptcies in 1983, Mr. Speaker, but we had less bankruptcies in 1983 than '82 and he thought that was marvellous, except that the farmers had more bankruptcies. Maybe he ought to think that over - and

ought to think over the fact that bankruptcies started to increase the last four months of 1983.

Mr. Speaker, do you know that the bankruptcies - did the Minister of Finance give us the figure? - that bankruptcies were up in 1984 over 1983 in January, only upped by two, but they were 97 versus 95. And you know the Minister of Finance was talking about the past and how great it was.

Mr. Speaker, I referred to a letter that I tabled in this House about a year ago, or maybe a year-and-a-half ago. It was there. It was a letter addressed to the then Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member for Brandon East, from his Deputy, Mr. Vernon, and he was outlining a report and a study that was done by his department, and he was giving a summation of that report. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the summation of that report was that manufacturing during his time, the NDP time in government, since 1975-76-77, had dropped drastically? They were way behind the country and there had to be something done about it. Mr. Speaker, those figures are all available in this little report that this government put out. All those facts and figures are there. It tells you. They're all there, "Manitoba Ten Years Economic Review," and they're all available to us.

Mr. Speaker, it also tells us in the prospectus put out by this government - and they don't like to refer to this prospectus because they put it out - they show the figures of the advancement that this province made over the previous four years. This was put out in '81.

I get quite upset, Mr. Speaker, when I see young gentlemen come into this House like the Member for Thompson, and make a statement in this House to the effect that the previous government were the ones that cancelled the Hydro project on the Nelson. Isn't it rather disappointing to send a young person into this House, and it would almost seem to encourage him to make statements that aren't accurate. I can understand it from the Member for Flin Flon, but I didn't expect it from the Member for Thompson.

It says right in this prospectus that is put out by this government. It says, "The electric power construction, which represented 15 percent of the total construction expenditures in 1976, declined after reflecting the decision made in mid-1977" - I believe it was August of '77 - "by the Board of the Manitoba Hydro to defer the construction of further hydro-electric generating capacity until such time as additional markets are found."

That tells the truth, Mr. Speaker. The truth was told by the government in the prospectus. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Member for Thompson would have to be corrected by my colleague, the Member for Lakeside, when he made that statement - but there it is.

It also says that you're talking about electronics in the Throne Speech. It was the previous government that started the Electronics Research Centre under Dr. Kizner in the University of Manitoba. It was the previous government that started the Technology Centre that is being expanded by this government and I don't have any fight with that. But don't be hypocrites. Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't use that word. Don't be two-faced.

HON. A. ANSTETT: You've used everything else, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I am now hearing from that great parliamentarian again. Mr. Speaker, I just refer to what I said earlier. Everything was quite calm, and this is the man that comes along and decides the atmosphere of the House, the man who is responsible for the decorum. He's supposed to be the leader over there. He walks in, and the House falls apart again. So, Mr. Speaker, it's very simple. I would say that I would refer him to the other gentlemen who have sat in that chair and maybe he'll learn something.

Mr. Speaker, the electrical was up when we were in government, the electrical manufacturing, metal fabricating, transportation. They talk about transportation, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we put through a study that worked on new transportation ideas and the possibility of having electric transportation between the Lakehead and Winnipeg. The study is there, and I would hope that they sincerely follow through with that and if they can come up with a type of transit system that will operate it, providing they haven't sold all the power to the United States - providing they haven't - maybe we can have that type of transportation system if they follow through with the studies.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I heard the other day and we heard from the Member for Wolseley that she has been given the responsibility for technology by the Minister in charge of Industry and Technology.

A MEMBER: Read it again.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will read it again. I just was asked to read it again and I will read it again, but it seemed to me that's what she said to the Legislative Assistant, that that would be her duties. Well, I will inform her that she takes over a tremendous technology institute that's in Manitoba at the present time, and I sincerely hope it's expanded on.

They talk about consultation with small business. It was set up under Enterprise Manitoba. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the number of people consulting to a small business with the new department that has been set up is less than it was before? I will have those facts at the Estimates, but I believe and I'm very confident in my source of information that there are less now than they were before. This is more consultation with small business?

Mr. Speaker, let's start to get down to brass tacks when we write a Throne Speech. Let's really stop fooling the people when we write a Throne Speech in that this government has done all of these things, and they haven't. They haven't encouraged any private investment. They haven't got any program for private investment, and I'll guarantee you if they bring in a program for private investment, which really sounds in the Throne Speech like they're going to have incentives, they'll have incentives similar to other places to attract business. I am almost positive. That's why the Premier, when he was down in Minneapolis, had some discussions with them about what were their incentives to get business.

Mr. Speaker, we mentioned the bankruptcies. The Minister of Finance makes a big issue out of the fact that we talked about department store sales and the figure - I will check it, I believe he's wrong, we were talking about a whole year, but I will check it with the

people and it was checked out before - but he said department store sales are 15 percent of the sales in Manitoba. You know, he ought to go back and do some studying. Yes, maybe they are when you take car sales out and tractor sales out, when you take all of those big ticket items that don't go through department stores. But when you take the everyday goods out of those figures, I can assure you the department store sales are something that should be paid attention to in this province. I assure you that the department store sales should be looked at very closely. This government doesn't really care about analyzing figures, they just like to put them forward.

Mr. Speaker, you know we hear so much about the technology institute that is coming to Manitoba. We hear this government trying to take all the credit for it. I refer to a report of September, 1980 after, it was put together by Mr. Trick who is there now, a fine gentleman working in the department as the head of the technology; Mr. Les Tough, Director of Small Enterprise Development in the Economic Development department; Dr. Rea from transportation, another fine gentleman; three people from Ottawa from the National Research Council.

Mr. Speaker, let me just read to the honourable members, again, but they won't listen, they'll go out and keep misleading people. "The task force recommends the establishment of the NRC Institute in Winnipeg to conduct Applied Research Development in manufacturing science and production technology on a national scale while working closely with Manitoba Group Research Council employees who promote and apply this technology in Manitoba industry as a national laboratory." It is recommended that the detailed research program of the laboratory be formulated in close co-operation with CAD/CAM which is now happening.

Where did it start, Mr. Speaker?

A MEMBER: About 10 years ago.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: 1980 is 10 years ago? I thought that gentleman from Flin Flon taught school. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that it moved from there to the recommendation by the Minister, and the Research Council were asked to go ahead, Mr. Axworthy got involved and it was probably going to maybe go in the Core area. The decision as to where it was going was what was holding it up. So, Mr. Speaker, let's not have anymore two-faced nonsense in the Throne Speech like that.

Mr. Speaker, I can read it, I read it to you; that's fact.

A MEMBER: Whose facts?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the National Research Council's facts. Mr. Speaker, the House Leader again just said, come on Frank. He doesn't have the ability to lead the House, he doesn't have the ability to hear, he doesn't have the ability to believe what I'm saying. That honourable gentleman should know better than that, or that honourable person - he's not a gentleman - he should know better than that. I just read from a document.

So, Mr. Speaker, now we have the situation of all of the - I mentioned earlier - we had all of the manufacturing industry moving forward. Private investment was approximately 70-71 percent in the province and public invest was 30 percent and now it's turned around completely. You know they say that things were coming out of problems in 1983 toward the end of them; 1984 predictions for this province are basically based on an increase because of public investment; private investment in manufacturing is not going to be as big as it was in '81; commercial investment is not going to be as big so it's basically public investment, and they say they're working with private industry. Private industry in Canada looks at Manitoba and they laugh. I assure you that the business people within this country - (Interjection) - Mr. Speaker, I'm now hearing from that great parliamentarian who is supposed to give example in this House to help you, Sir. I assure you that since he got that position this House has been in turmoil.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that the industrial construction permits were down 26.2 percent in 1983, and this is industrial investment that they're talking about. I said that businessmen that regard, you know, the businessmen in Ontario, the businessmen throughout this country, when you talk about investment they don't think about Manitoba. Do you know that the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce and the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce know that the people aren't thinking about Manitoba? They have come forward and told this government that their programs and their stupid planning, their crazy payroll taxes, all of the things that they do to scare business away is doing just that. This government sits by and cagily goes along and puts out a Throne Speech which I say, Sir, is two-faced, because what it says is not happening.

Mr. Speaker, the Alcan that the member was speaking about. We dealt with a lot of companies, too, but we found that the Canadian company was interested and ready to go ahead. The comments from the Deputy Speaker the other day when he talked about Alcan having hard times during recession. If he'd read the report a year and a half ago he would have found that Alcan's sales increase during that time by keeping their prices more than competitive with everybody. Not only that, their sales increased and they increased because they had the ability to be able to produce in such a way that allowed them to do that and increase their sales. They lost \$50 million doing it - the member once said that in the House and he must have read it, too - but \$50 million, when one refinery costs \$800 million.

Alcan maintained their position in the market internationally during the tough time. They increased their sales, and when they wanted to expand, which they have to do now because they increase their sales and sales are getting better, they are doing it in B.C. and Quebec only because of the bungling of this government. Mr. Speaker, go out and talk to any of the people in business today, any of the people down east. - (Interjection) - Oh, I know that they said that it was, but you know the facts are there. - (Interjection) - I'm hearing from that yapper across the way now. Mr. Speaker, I'm telling you . . .

A MEMBER: If you can't take the heat get out of the kitchen, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: . . . that it's pretty obvious, if you increase your sales that you're going to need expansion and they were ready to expand — (Interjection) — Wait a minute, they said no, no, they said they were ready to expand. They were ready to expand and they were going to expand in Manitoba, and this government botched it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read this for the benefit of the Member for Inkster. I would like him to go downstairs and I'd like him to see the Minister of Energy. He has this report. He won't table it, but he has it. It was prepared for him, for the Department of Energy, in 1982. It's called, "The Chase Econometric Report, Prospects for an Aluminum Smelter . . .

A MEMBER: Try again, Frank. Try that word again.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Oh, well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure if somebody drops an "a" or a "z" or something, it's his mentality to laugh about it.

Mr. Speaker, "The prospects of an aluminum smelter and implication for electric energy pricing," that's the report. It says, "Thirdly, given that one of the objections of the authorities is to capture the economic rent implicit in the water resource, it should be recognized by all concerned that ownership is, in fact, a red herring since all material, all natural resource rights, including water rights, are Crown property. If the aluminum company develops its own power generating station, it will still have to pay royalty for water rights. The royalty can be used as a vehicle to collect economic rent," etc. And there was never an arrangement to give away a whole power station. That was misleading, the same as this Throne Speech is a two-faced Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, the government is really trying to pull the wool over the people's eyes. They have made an arrangement on hydro yesterday with the northern states in the United States. They haven't got the fortitude to table any of the documents that have been put forth so far. Yet they stood in this House and criticized us and even after we tabled them, we got criticized. They were documents saying that we had agreements in principle to be discussed, and they wanted to negotiate in public. They criticized us for it. Mr. Speaker, just to end up, what did we do in the Alcan case?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, what did we do in the Alcan case? The President of Alcan had a meeting right in this building for the honourable members to tell them how the agreement worked. The President of International Minerals and Chemicals sat in that gallery while it was brought forward. So our record of letting this House know what went on is very clear. It's pretty obvious that this government has something to hide with what they're doing at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege to be able to once again make a contribution

to the Throne Speech Debate. I use that word advisedly. I will try and do my best to avoid some of the more perhaps quotable aspects of making a speech, and avoid the personalities, try and deal with some of the issues that have been raised by members opposite in their contributions.

I guess, quite understandably, there is going to be some disagreement about what the Throne Speech contains and what is doesn't contain, and the direction or lack thereof that it provides. I'm afraid that I have to disagree rather emphatically with my honourable friends opposite with respect to the direction and the content of the Throne Speech and I think I disagree quite heartily with statements that were made yesterday that suggested that on the whole the public response to the Throne Speech was negative. Certainly that wasn't my interpretation of the results.

There is some question in my mind whether members opposite have actually read the Throne Speech, or whether they were in fact listening when the Throne Speech was made. Indeed it was long, and I don't think we have to apologize for keeping them here for an hour to do the business of the province. We won't comment on how much time they missed somewhat earlier in the last Session.

However, I did take exception to the suggestion that there was no thrust and no direction and I think anyone that would leaf through the Throne Speech and identify the various headings that deal with what we see as the most pressing and the most important topic and the most important concerns Manitobans have, and that's the issue of jobs and job creation, the question of investment and development of Manitoba's economy. I suppose we could have taken the position that we were going to rest on our laurels, and say that Manitoba's economy was in a better position than most other economies, that in fact the things that we had started to do through the Jobs Fund and through our other initiatives were satisfactory in and of themselves, but I don't think that's the case. If you look at the headings, you can tell that the focus of this Session indeed will be on long-term investment, on job creation, on the things that Manitobans and, I think, Canadians in general are still putting at the top of their lists in terms of their concerns for themselves and their families.

In going through and identifying specifically the initiatives that are going to be undertaken, whether they be programmatic or budgetary, I've identified at least 40 different initiatives. We're talking about a short Session hopefully, one that will give us an opportunity to deal with a couple of major issues, the economy being the foremost I suppose that we'll have to deal with.

The initiatives range from, as I said, programs which will continue to develop support mechanisms for small business, for farms, for the agricultural community in general, to other initiatives. Legislative initiatives will deal with consumer protection and the various aspects of worker health and safety.

So we did identify in the Throne Speech approximately 40 different initiatives that we're going to take in a very short period of time to solidify Manitoba's economic recovery where it's occurring, and to develop strategies for initiating growth and creating new areas of development and growth in Manitoba's sectorial economy where there hasn't been as much strength.

So I think we have to make the record clear. The Throne Speech perhaps is wordy, but it is packed full of ideas; areas that the government is going to deal with in a forthright and orderly fashion and we have made it clear that those are our priorities for this Session, and they will certainly have some impact as we proceed through the year, 1984.

I would like to shift gears somewhat when I deal with the contribution that was made by the new Leader of the Opposition, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am, without getting personal, somewhat disappointed in the role the Leader of the Opposition has played both with respect to his contribution in the House and his Leadership in terms of the opposition's role as I see it. I certainly have to feel that his analysis and his contribution, by way of the Throne Speech and other contributions he has made, have not been as decisive, as definitive, as direct as one would have hoped they would have been.

I still get the sense, after some months of his assuming the position of Leader, that there are other people, other stronger individuals in that caucus which are, in fact, wagging the dog so to speak. I use that in a figurative sense only, not in the literal sense. I'm sure that his own position in his caucus, while it's probably evident to us in the Chamber and probably to viewers on TV that he lacks a certain credibility in this House, is probably something that is going to grow over time. There are certainly occasions when his questioning in the House have certainly floundered, and that may be a polite word. However, I assume that he will continue to strengthen his role in that regard, and we wish him well.

MR. H. ENNS: We get this garbage from across the way all the time. Let's not deal with personalities. That's how you like to start . . .

HON. J. STORIE: I'm wishing him well though, Harry. The Member for Lakeside suggested I'm dealing in personalities. I am going to deal with his contribution that he made with respect to the Throne Speech. I use that term somewhat lightly.

I would just like to point out that, while his remarks were lengthy, he had some concern that the Throne Speech was somewhat devoid of rationale or reason for its length, and talked about platitudes that were self-serving. Certainly if one went through this speech you would see a continuum of self-serving statements. But I think it's important that we pick out a couple of the comments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition and look at how they relate to the Throne Speech and how they can be viewed in the context of last year's programming, or last year's activity and how they reflect on the future.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, on Page 35 of Hansard, Monday, April 16th, the honourable member talks about McKenzie Seeds, talks about some of the problems that have plagued McKenzie Seeds and, by implication, suggests that the problems didn't exist when the previous government were there. The record is clear that the ongoing potential conflict of interest, the problems that have plagued McKenzie's were developing in the latter stages of the previous government. That's something that I think the record

needs to be clear with. I am not suggesting there was any intentional misinformation or intention to mislead on that issue, but I think the record should be clear.

On Page 39, the member talks about, what is this government going to do about "The Western Grain Transportation Act?" What are we going to do about federal taxes on farm-consumed fuel? Mr. Speaker, I asked the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he would stand up and perhaps at some point in the course of the next few months clarify what the Tory position was and has been on the question of The Western Grain Transportation Act. I can recall early on when we started on the Crow debate some pretty reluctant support for our position that the Crow rate needed to be maintained, and it was only after they got out into the rural communities, the community that they supposedly represent, that they realized that the farm community was not in support of their position that the Crow rate had to go. So we're not the only ones that have to examine our motives and the direction that we have been taking.

On Page 40, Mr. Speaker, he makes some comment about an incompetent group running the energy side, talking about negotiations that are ongoing with the energy authority. Certainly it was only a couple of days later when, I think, we can all say that he should be reviewing his words and, if not serving himself up a platter of his own words, then conceding that the group that is negotiating on our energy side has done a very thorough job. The recent sale of firm power to the United States is something that is going to benefit Manitoba for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 41, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition complains in a sense that in the text of the Throne Speech, the words federal-provincial contribution or federal contribution, special funding arrangement with the Federal Government, is mentioned 11 times. He suggests that: "I'll tell you this, that they should have a little integrity at least in the manner in which they deal with it because that isn't going to be to the lasting benefit of Manitobans. That isn't going to be the kind of thing that, in the final analysis, is going to help this government after this election year. It's going to take a great deal more stimulus from the private sector to get Manitoba growing and working again."

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition seems to be belittling the fact that we have worked in a co-operative way to attract hundreds of millions of dollars into the economy of this province. I don't think anybody has disputed the fact that the agreements on forestry, on mining, on transportation, on any number of things, the overall ERDA agreements have not contributed significantly to the improvement in Manitoba's economy and that they won't contribute in a significant way to the continuing improvement that is foreseen for Manitoba's economy. To suggest that somehow the private sector isn't going to benefit from those federal-provincial agreements is ludicrous. Who does he think is going to do the work? Who are the contractors and Manitoba contractors that are going to benefit from these dollars coming into Manitoba?

We're talking about - and I don't know where the figure came from, it came from someone speaking on the opposite side - that talks about the largesse of the Honourable Federal Minister of Transport bringing in

some \$850 million, almost \$1 billion, of federal funds to Manitoba. That money serves a purpose here. It serves a purpose in terms of economic development, and it serves a more immediate purpose in terms of employment. It serves the private sector very well to have that kind of funding coming from the Federal Government.

So those kinds of comments suggest that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition isn't too clear on our historic development and the contributions that governments have made to develop the infrastructure that makes success more likely and more possible for private sector firms. So governments have their way of contributing to the economic stability, the long-term stability of provincial economies. I don't know that belittling the work that is done between governments is a very constructive approach.

Mr. Speaker, I'll refer just briefly to the motion that is made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and discuss some of the clauses of that motion to further elaborate on what I believe is either a misguided understanding of what has happened in the past two years or two-and-a-half years, or is an intentional distortion of what has happened over the past two years and what the future holds.

Mr. Speaker, for example, we read - and this is part of the motion that the Honourable Member for Tuxedo made - "(a) that the government's failure to provide a rational, long-term view in dealing with the economic and fiscal affairs of the province." Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines did an admirable job of outlining the successes that this province has had in developing a long-term strategy, in developing the economy of this province, in bringing this province to a position today when we can talk about being the leader in terms of unemployment in the province, where we can talk about the strength that our economy has felt in many areas. The Member for Sturgeon Creek talked about its lack of strength in manufacturing, and that's true, manufacturing is important to the province and we're working to develop our strength in manufacturing. We know that it's a growth, an area of tremendous potential for Manitoba's economy and we'll work on it.

But I think, in commenting on the Leader of the Opposition's motion that the government's failure to produce a rational long-term view, is ludicrous. We have, for example, on the record the following statistics: the population of Manitoba is growing, it's growing tremendously. Given that fact we have also the lowest unemployment rate in the province. Those two facts, and it's dramatic that we can have an influx of tens of thousands of people and we can have an unemployment rate that is going down. What happens to those people? Obviously, the employment creation record of this government is second to none. Now, that doesn't happen by accident, that's part of government policy. They have to admit, I hope, that government policy has a role to play in those particular statistics.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek and other members have talked about the importance of investment. The facts are that there was a 10.5 percent increase in 1983, the third highest increase in Canada, in Manitoba. It was the best performance in the west, the best performance. We're comparing ourselves to conservative, traditional economic development

provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta - some question about B.C. - but we had the best growth record in terms of investment.

The forecast for 1984 puts Manitoba in first position in terms of increased investment with 11.8 percent forecasted growth compared to a national forecasted growth of approximately .8 percent. We have a 20.3 percent public sector growth which will be second highest, and contrary to what the implied remarks of the Member for Sturgeon Creek, we have a 7.9 percent increase in private sector investment, 7.9 percent. So I think that belies some of the criticism that has been levelled with respect to some of the government's taxation policies, other policies; it belies that fact, that there is an increased investment. The outlook for 1984 is better than the past, which was in itself impressive.

Housing starts are up in Manitoba. The Minister of Housing has announced a number of programs which have stimulated housing activity in the province. Bankruptcies are down, there's a decrease, 10.4 percent decrease in public and private bankruptcies with basically what the national average was for '84; that again was the only western province to record a decrease. So, when we compare ourselves to our sister provinces to the west, we have a good record.

Retail sales, the Minister of Finance dealt with those in his speech and we have certainly something to cheer about in terms of our continuing high rate and growth in retail sales.

Building permits, 62.5 percent increase, largest in Canada, compares to about a 13 percent national average.

So, Mr. Speaker, the economic statistics suggest we were doing something right; employment statistics suggest we're doing something right; and I think that the Leader of the Opposition's first premise in his motion is erroneous, fallacious, not based on fact and suggests a weakness of rational thought on his part.

In "(b)" he suggests that "the government's continuing failure to demonstrate any commitment to deal with the serious problems which exist in the agricultural sector in Manitoba today." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is sheer — (Interjection) — I forget. The word sheer "two-facery?" - I was going to say hypocrisy but I know that's unparliamentary, but sheer nonsense. Mr. Speaker, this government, who members opposite feel has done nothing for the farming community, can put their record against any Conservative administration in history. Mr. Speaker, in two years this government has done more to attempt to relieve the real problem that farmers face than the members opposite are ready to give us credit for, for sure, but more than certainly the four years that they were in office was even considered.

For example, MACC has approved 675 loans valued at approximately \$44 million. The Interest Rate Relief Program has provided assistance to 1,300 farmers for \$6.9 million. The Guaranteed Operating Loan Program has assisted over 400 farmers for a total of \$22 million. The Interest Rate Reduction Program has assisted 640 MACC clients by reducing their loan payments over \$18 million. The Farm Financial Mediation Program has also been introduced to assist problems in their financing difficulties. The assistance for the Beef Stabilization cost the province approximately \$25 million and about 73 percent of Manitoba's cow herds are

supported under the program. Now, I haven't totalled that up but it's got to be over \$100 million in support for agricultural producers. So I don't know where that kind of criticism comes.

Mr. Speaker, in the four years the Tories were in government and former years that the members opposite were in government, they couldn't get their act together to develop a program to help beef farmers and when we came into office in 1981 the situation was critical; the situation was critical because the former Minister of Agriculture didn't have the time or maybe the ability to deal with that problem, but we have taken the initiative to do those things. So, for the Member for Tuxedo, the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that this government hasn't made the attempt, is ludicrous.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say, "(c) the continuing failure of this government to attract private sector investment for the establishment of meaningful long-term jobs in Manitoba." Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd suggest that members opposite start comparing our record to other province's records. As the Member for Transcona, the Minister of Finance suggested the other day, our record is comparable to any record. We have had more than our share of successes and at the same time while the member is suggesting that we haven't lived up to our obligation with respect to private industry, he belittles the initiatives that are undertaken by way of the Throne Speech that are designed to create additional incentives for private industry so that they can come and succeed in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the base is here, the record is clear. Our achievements in terms of the economy of the province is second to none in Canada. We have a record that we can be proud of. The Throne Speech deals in a very straightforward manner with that continuing priority of both the opposition and the government, and for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that the government somehow hasn't acted through the Throne Speech, simply doesn't make sense. He simply whitewashed the Throne Speech, suggested there was nothing happening, obviously hadn't read it very carefully or considered its implications for the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, I've gone over what I consider to be a fairly brief but well synthesized analysis of what the province has accomplished in the past couple of years. I tried to give an indication that we recognize that there are weaknesses and that the Throne Speech, in large measure, attempts to address those particular weaknesses in a constructive manner. I think one of the problems that we have as a government - and I keep hearing the word "incompetent" suggesting that somehow the government's activities and particularly some of the ones that have been more controversial have somehow been dealt with incompetently. I've tried to put that in perspective because it certainly has occurred to me that there were a number of issues which created controversy. I'm not saying that wasn't stirred well by members opposite and I suppose that's their role, but I'd like to contrast this government's approach, particularly in its dealings with legislation and the manner in which legislation proceeds through the House, with what happened during the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, in 1983 - admittedly a long Session - this government, this House dealt with over 100 pieces

of legislation. This government, despite what the Leader of the Opposition suggested, did not back down from any legislation. Mr. Speaker, we set our goals. We said these are the things that we want to accomplish, notwithstanding the objection on the farm lands, on election finances, in law enforcement review, on any number of others. We suggested there was a principle to be established and we didn't back away. But the controversy developed on those and other issues because this government really did want to listen.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose we can contrast the style of government by the approach that we take and to suggest that somehow that a government is incompetent because it creates controversy, because it listens, because it amends, because it takes into consideration and takes seriously what people say, is a ludicrous proposition. If we're going to take this process seriously and we're the only Parliament in Canada, we're the only Legislature in Canada which — (Interjection) — not at all - we're the only Legislature in Canada which provides the public an opportunity to come and give its opinion on legislation and that process should work. We shouldn't . . .

A MEMBER: And you've got it in spades.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about that. We'll talk about that later . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . That, for the information of the Member for Lakeside, was not legislation. The only contribution that the previous administration makes to the legislative process is to throw out legislation, have it accepted holus bolus or withdraw it. In 1981, we saw a perfect example. They introduced a whole bunch of legislation, saw that it was dishevelled, that the Ministers responsible didn't have control of it, it wasn't being accepted, it wasn't well-drafted, withdrew 14 or 15 pieces of legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the way you stand up for your principle, if you think as a legislator or as a Minister you have a piece of legislation that is worthy of being considered, then I'd suggest that you establish the principle that you want to enshrine and that you go in legislation and that you go ahead and do it, not that you'd back away at the least sign of resistance.

Mr. Speaker, we'll take legislation like - and the Member for Lakeside smiles - take the example of our Highway Traffic Act legislation, seat belt legislation. We took some criticism on that legislation but, Mr. Speaker, I said when speaking to that legislation that, I would be comforted in the coming year when the legislation was in place and I was sending get well cards to those people who had been injured in wearing their seat belts and I believe the task of sending sympathy cards for the people who were killed to the members opposite. Mr. Speaker, that is a law in Manitoba and I'm not concerned with the fact that there was opposition to it, and we took some criticism as a government for having the guts to do that.

Mr. Speaker, what does cause me concern — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I do have some concern for the fact that the Leader of the Opposition in a speech — (Interjection) — in February . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . forgot that he'd voted for it, because there is a man of principle. You stand up even in the face of opposition from your colleagues and you vote for something and two months later you've forgotten that you voted for it, but that's how strong that principle is ingrained. Well, that's a very interesting way of reinforcing your set of principles, forgetting about them and talking against them in the same Session.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this Session is bound to progress more smoothly than the previous Session and I suppose that will be due to the new enthusiasm, the new feeling that's being created in the province because of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, because of the last couple of month's figures on unemployment, I think that there's a definite new feeling here and I think that that will be reflected, that new sense of spirit, new feeling of optimism will be reflected in the Chamber and there'll be a lot less raucousness perhaps in here.

However, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to switch gears again to discuss for a moment . . .

A MEMBER: Well, are you out of low gear yet?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes. To discuss for a moment the northern part of this province, and seeing as this is a Throne Speech and it's a cover-the-waterfront situation, I'd like to take a few minutes to review, to rehash perhaps, some of the major achievements which this government has had with respect to northern development, with respect to the improvement of the life in Northern Manitoba - and members opposite can make light of that if they want - but, Mr. Speaker, one of the major factors I think of the growing sense of optimism, the renewed sense of optimism perhaps is a better word in Northern Manitoba - was spurred on because of the Jobs Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the 1983-84 version of the Manitoba Jobs Fund saw approximately \$23 million worth of activity in projects of tremendous interest to a number of communities go to Northern Manitoba. It meant jobs and it meant assets for northern communities. I could go through a very long list of projects that were sponsored through the Jobs Fund that weren't make-work projects, as members opposite seem to suggest from time to time, projects like water and sewer; water treatment facilities for, I think it was seven or eight communities; the Northern Job Creation Program which saw approximately \$4.6 million worth of benefit going to Northern Affairs communities.

But, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't just Jobs Fund money. It wasn't just the fact that there were more northerners working. It wasn't just the fact that the smaller communities saw assets being built in their communities with their money. It wasn't just the fact that we were prepared as a government to invest in Northern Manitoba. That wasn't the only reason for the growing feeling of relief that the recession was finally over, that Northern Manitoba could once again look to the future and start developing their own communities with a sense of confidence that the future was good for their communities.

Mr. Speaker, we as a government, and again, in co-operation with the Federal Government, had the

pleasure, if not the duty, to proceed with a number of projects which will have long-term lasting benefits for the residents of Northern Manitoba. We could start with our willingness and our commitment, living up to our commitment that we would see Manfor upgraded. We would ensure the long-term viability of that complex. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be able to be the Minister, and having only been the Minister for a number of days, to go to The Pas and announce that the retrofit upgrading project worth \$40 million was going to proceed.

Once again, we have to give credit to the Federal Government because eight million of that project came from a federal program and we're very grateful for it. The people in The Pas are grateful that not only was the Federal Government prepared to contribute funds, but the Provincial Government was there to lead the negotiations, to take the initiative, something that members opposite in their term never understood, that governments are intended to do something. And we've done something, and the people in The Pas, the people in Cranberry, the people in Moose Lake, the people in Wabowden, the people in Snow Lake, they know that the government took the initiative. They know that, had this government not been elected, the future would have been much less certain at this point. And perhaps it would have been sold, we don't know.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk about the Reforestation Agreement and what it means to Northern Manitoba. Much of Northern Manitoba and the communities I've just mentioned rely on the forestry industry. Reforestation is something that's been overlooked, and we have been proud and, I think, pleased to be able to move in that direction because it's in all of our interests and the long-term interests of the provincial economy that we do.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about the importance of the Transportation Agreement; talk about the money that is going to Churchill. I'll leave some of those comments to my honourable colleague, the Minister of Highways and Transportation, to comment about that. But again, the commitment to Northern Manitoba is there. Those agreements didn't get signed by accident. There was a commitment and there was a willingness to spend provincial money, to invest provincial dollars in the north.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about the impact that the Destination Manitoba Program has had on Northern Manitoba; the investment in small lodges in Cranberry Portage and Snow Lake and other points in Northern Manitoba. It's important to those small individuals that were prepared to invest.

We could talk about the Sherritt-Gordon, the various ways that the Provincial Government has interfaced with a major corporation to attempt to solidify its position in the communities of Leaf Rapids and Lynn Lake.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about this government's commitment to other more philosophical issues. The question of aboriginal rights, the question of Treaty land entitlement, the question of self-government and self-control for Northern Affairs communities have all been part of the last two years of work, work to develop Northern Manitoba, something that we are proud of. The next year, the year that we're talking about in Throne Speech '84, is going to be as progressive, is

going to be as meaningful, is going to be more meaningful than four years of the previous government. It is something that Northerners haven't forgotten. Never mind what members opposite suggest.

Mr. Speaker, as a final comment, I would like to thank all of the people in my particular constituency who have contacted me, who have supported me, who have been willing to work with me to make sure that the things that are happening in Northern Manitoba are in the best interests of not only them and their communities but all of Manitoba, because I think all of us in the Legislature believe that the development of the North is in the best interests of all of us.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me this time. I only hope that the member who's following me will live up to my standards and contribute in a positive and constructive way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, we're away on another year. To start it off, I want to wish you continued good health. I'm sure that your job as Speaker this year will be an easier one than last. So I wish you good health, and I'm confident that you will carry out your job as Speaker with distinction to the betterment of the entire Assembly and the province as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is one that I have looked through. I've looked through it for many things that I don't see there. If the Speech from the Throne is one that bears commenting on, it's for what it doesn't say rather than for what it does say. It took 21 pages and an hour and 15 minutes to repeat what had happened, and held out very little promise for the future.

I was expecting that there would be big things in this coming Throne Speech in the field of Municipal Affairs because if there is one problem in Manitoba today, it's in the assessment field in rural Manitoba and even more so in the City of Winnipeg. It was my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government would address that problem and bring into fruition some of the recommendations of the Weir Commission Report which they have had on their desks for over two years and have done nothing with yet.

But I went through the Speech, Mr. Speaker, and I find one paragraph. It says, "Members will also be asked to provide authority for the increases in assistance to local governments which have already been announced for 1984. Municipal authorities are to be commended for their overall success in keeping their planned expenditure growth within reasonable limits for the coming year. Those limits, coupled with the increases in provincial support for municipal services and education, generally have prevented excessive pressure on local tax bases."

A MEMBER: Not true.

MR. H. GRAHAM: "Excessive pressure on local tax bases." Well, Mr. Speaker, how do you square that with the number of calls and letters that I have received from irate taxpayers in this province who have complained about the excessive taxes and assessment.

In many of their minds, I'm sure, they don't differentiate between the two. All they know is they're paying an awful lot more and when they receive their assessment notice, they become irate. When you get over 300 appeals in one municipality, something is wrong, Mr. Speaker, seriously wrong. Here we find the Minister of Municipal Affairs puts one little paragraph in the Throne Speech.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with this later on in the Speech, because I want to get back to some of the things that were said by the Minister of Energy and Mines, and some of the omissions that he made today.

It was just last year, Mr. Speaker, that we had one of the rare pieces of legislation in this House, The Surface Rights Act, Bill No. 5, got the general support of all members of this Assembly, and the Minister when he brought it forward described the urgency and the problems that existed in surface rights in this province. So we were looking for great things once that Act was proclaimed and put into service.

To this date, Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been one decision that has occurred since that Surface Rights Board was set up. In fact, there is a mounting backlog, and they are now in the process of waiting for a court decision to see whether they can sit, or some members of that board can sit. I don't believe that at all is the fault of the legislation. I think it's the poor judgment of the Minister in the choice of people he put on the board — (Interjection) — the Honourable Minister will have his opportunity to make his comments in the Assembly.

We applaud them. If every member was in the Assembly, you would still have more on that side, but not for very long. Come the next election, the roles will be changed. Mr. Speaker, I have never in my 16 years or 15-plus in this House received as many letters of encouragement and support, for the role we are playing in this Assembly, as I have in the last six months. So that's an indication of what is going to happen when the next election rolls around.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other activities of the Honourable Minister of Mines was the putting in place of ManOil and the provision of some funds last year for the operation of ManOil. I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the visible evidence of ManOil in this province is such that, in comparison to the national scene and the activities of Petrocan, it bears a very equal position.

I think it's worthwhile for every member of this Assembly to take a little stroll downtown to Eaton Place and take a look at the offices of ManOil in this province. We can see why there was such a large amount of money requested for ManOil in their first year of operation. I would suggest that it's worthwhile for every member to go and see the opulence, and the atmosphere that prevails there, that would indicate that the oil industry in Manitoba, in particular, was a very very healthy operation. I wish it were so.

However, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the surface rights and the problems we have in this province, I would ask the Honourable Minister of Mines to seriously consider the appointments that he has made to the board and the present activities that are taking place in the courts, where one member of the board is now being challenged on the conflict of interest as to whether or not he is a fit and proper or she is a fit and proper

person to sit on that board, or does that person have a conflict of interest. I have nothing against the person. But I wonder why the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is not about to discuss a matter that is before the courts.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Not at all, Sir, not at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I wonder why the Minister, in his appointments, did not do some screening to make sure that the appointments he made to the Surface Rights Board in the first place were not people that could be challenged for a conflict of interest. I think that the Minister failed in his choice of people that he placed on that board, because I would think — (Interjection) — No, I'm just asking the Minister if he had done a very careful selection in the membership he placed on that board, because that board is charged with the responsibility of adjudicating problems between those people that own surface rights and those mineral and oil companies who are paying them for the use of surface for their underground operations.

It would seem to me that in his choice for people to sit in adjudication, he would not want to put people on there who have a direct interest. I have to chastise the Minister for not using good taste in his choice of members. That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that I personally condemn the individuals at all. I think the Minister was very unwise in not checking the individuals to see whether or not they were in a possible conflict-of-interest position when we placed them on the board.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is approximately 170 cases waiting to be heard by that board, so you can understand the urgency of the concern. These are people who feel that their present agreements for surface rights are not what they should be and they have filed their protest and wish to have their cases heard by that board.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the field of taxation also has a problem because we have literally hundreds of cases coming up appealing their assessment, but we find there has to be a reason for that concern. I was surprised last week from a constituent, and with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a copy of a letter that he received. This is a letter that was addressed to Mr. Wallace Gabrielle at Virden and it came from a Mr. R.L. Hamm, District Supervisor of the Department of Municipal Affairs, Provincial and Municipal Assessment Branch in Souris. The letter states: "The Municipal Assessment Act provides for the exemption of certain farm buildings, however, where the net income of the owner, tenant, lessee, or occupant of land from grain growing, raising or keeping farm livestock, growing nursery stock or market gardening, is less than the net income from other sources. The exemption does not apply to any dwelling situated on the land when the dwelling is not exempt from taxation" and that has been in The Municipal Act for a long time.

HON. A. ANSTETT: 1894.

MR. H. GRAHAM: "If you, as owner, tenant, lessee, or occupant consider yourself not liable to taxation on

your dwelling, a net income statement will be required as verification."

So, Mr. Speaker, you are guilty unless you prove yourself innocent. Well, there are a few more things . . .

A MEMBER: Is that included in there or was that an editorial comment?

MR. H. GRAHAM: That was an editorial comment. There were a few more lines in the letter, Mr. Speaker.

Then they imposed the guideline for net income request. It says farm income may include income from grain growing, raising or keeping farm stock, growing nursery stock and market gardening, and also would include Canadian Wheat Board payments and cash advances, insurance payments from loss of crop or livestock, insurance for loss, income from sale of vegetables, fruits, dairy products, eggs, honey, breeding fees for farm stock, sugar beets and straw - it doesn't include hay, says just straw - farm expenses, and it lists those.

Then at the bottom there's a "Note: Interest on borrowed money should not be included as an expense." Then it lists: "Income from other sources: wages, pensions, interest and investment income, including cash rents, unemployment insurance, custom work", and the final one is underlined and it says "oil royalties and surface leases."

Mr. Speaker, I may be jumping back and forth, but the Surface Rights Board was set up for the very purpose of determining the amount of loss that a farmer incurs from having his surface activities disrupted by the activities of those that are mining or pumping underground oil or mineral resources. That is the very purpose of that board and it is now almost stymied because of the appointments that the Minister has made to the board and the backlog is such that farmers are very frustrated.

Then they receive a letter like this which states that "surface leases will be classified as income other than farm income." Yet, payment for insurance losses are not considered as income, so we see there's a real problem here. I would hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will address this problem immediately because . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: I took it as notice two days ago, what do you want?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes, I suggest immediately. I hope he considers it an urgent problem.

HON. A. ANSTETT: The miracle I do immediately, the impossible take a little longer, Harry.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we can expect great things from the Minister of Municipal Affairs because this is the same Minister who at his first meeting with all of the municipalities of this province bluntly refused to represent them. That, Mr. Speaker, is a fact, that is a fact. I was at the meeting and I heard him.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, while I recognize that the Beauchesne Citation with regard to the facts allows for different interpretation of the facts so that two interpretations may appear on the record. Clearly . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: That is not my forte.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . I think the Speaker will determine whether or not there's a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I rise under the Citation which permits me to make statements as to the facts of which I am personally knowledgeable. The member alleged that I made a statement to the UMM convention last November in which he says that I made a specific statement and he quoted that statement. I bluntly said quote, "And he claimed to represent that as fact." Sir, that was not the statement, I know the statement I made. I have a copy of the statement and I would ask the member to either qualify those remarks or withdraw them because I was not only there, I made those statements and, Sir, I am prepared to provide the Citation under which the member and the House are obliged to accept that from me as a statement of fact and if the member wishes I will provide him, on short notice, with a copy of the transcript of the tape of that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable for that correction.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On the same point of order. If the honourable member would listen to what is being said he would recognize that I never said anything about any statement of his. He knows that. He is trying to twist words. Mr. Speaker, I never attributed any statement of his at all. The words were mine, not his.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank both members for making the issue clear to the House.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before the member resumes his remarks, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 12 Guides from the 13th Company of St. George's Anglican Church Girl Guides under the direction of Mrs. Wallace and Mrs. Russell.

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

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to carry on in this. For years, this guideline - and The Municipal Act has not changed - but suddenly, this year, farmers are being sent this letter. Nothing has changed. The same people that have surface leases have had them for 30 years. This year, they are receiving for the first time letters of this kind, almost 170 of them went out of the Virden

office. Now, Mr. Speaker, there were 170 surface rights appeals, approximately that number, before the Surface Rights Board. Where did the Department of Municipal Affairs get the names to send these letters to? It's a question I want the Minister of Municipal Affairs to answer.

It's rather strange that the same number of letters to people who own surface leases received these letters, roughly the same number as those that appealed before the Surface Rights Board. I don't know if they're the same names or not - that kind of information is not available - but maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs can tell me.

I would like to know if he requested that information from the Minister of Mines, because I realize that the Assessment Branch and the Taxation Branch have many powers, many powers. They've had this power for years; they all admit to it, but why is it this year that they are exercising it? Why?

HON. A. ANSTETT: The same letters are mailed every year since '78.

MR. H. GRAHAM: To these same people? No. First time they've ever received them.

HON. A. ANSTETT: The first time they've been reassessed since '78.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister can provide us with some answers, because it looks to anyone that has sat in this House for any length of time and listened to members opposite espouse their theory and their philosophy of ownership of land and those filthy land barons, and their philosophy is to go and get them, their philosophy is to go and get them. We have heard those speeches innumerable times.

A MEMBER: Who used those words?

MR. H. GRAHAM: These are my words, my interpretation of the speeches that you have made and others have made on that side. We know the philosophy that exists over there. The system is one of almost insatiable jealousy. They believe that those that own property are somehow well-off, and their philosophy is to tax anybody that's well-off, and they are jealous of anybody that's well-off, except those that are on the public trough. Well, they probably have a little bit of jealousy there too, they would probably like to have my seat as well, but that's political.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have serious reservations about how this department is operating because at this particular time we know that farm income is down about 10 percent. The past year farmers were 10 percent poorer than they were before. And yet, I think we find that the Department of Municipal Affairs is trying harder than ever now to collect taxes on dwellings on farm land. I think they will collect more taxes on dwellings on farm land this year than at any other time in history, and that at a period when the farmer is unable to pay because his income is declining, and his taxes are going up. And we know . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: Are you recommending we not enforce the law?

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . this government. We know their philosophy on the ownership of farm land, it was well stated before, and we know that if a farmer can't pay his taxes that it goes up for tax sale or reverts to the Crown. So is it possible, or is it even feasible that because this government got hammered on their land ownership policy they will say, well we'll come in the back door and we'll get at land ownership another way? it makes an interesting discussion and I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs - he tells me he can do anything immediately, the impossible takes a little longer - so during the course of this Session, Mr. Speaker, I will be asking him for information. He tells me he can do it in next to nothing, so I hope that Orders for Return requesting information will be promptly looked at and that information he has promised us he can deliver almost immediately.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I thank the House for the indulgence of their time.

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

MR. D. SCOTT: I have hardly enough time to get warmed up here with what's left. But, Mr. Speaker, I shall begin.

A MEMBER: Let's hear it for Ronald Reagan.

MR. D. SCOTT: You won't hear anything from me for Ronald Reagan. You can bet on that. — (Interjection) — I'm afraid not, Harry.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech, above everything else, shows our care and our concern for the people of Manitoba in both the maintenance of services that are provided to the citizens of Manitoba, and the working towards the strengthening of our economy with long-term planning in the years to come. We have already seen the fruits of two years of exceptionally skillful negotiations on behalf of our distinguished Minister of Mines, who instead of following Conservative policies of sort of leading with their chins in negotiations, carrying all of their eggs in a basket out front like the Easter bunny hopping along, and wondering why, when they get to the final negotiations package they end up with such rotten deals.

We had, back in the '60s I guess, the preamble for all of this, when they were advertising worldwide, that we have a piece of land the size of Poland for you to come and take. That, of course, was the famous CFI proposals. They were advertising in business journals, the size of Poland for your taking. It's all Crown land and we'll give it to you if you come and build a plant.

They checked through the Canadian companies. They weren't interested.

A MEMBER: Who put all those ads in the paper? Who did all this?

MR. D. SCOTT: Who did that? That was about 1964-65, I believe was the period. it would have been Duff Roblin, I guess. I think the Attorney-General at the time was the man with the invisible ink, the present, former Leader, but still actual Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Charleswood and I believe the present

House Leader was also in the House at the time. I'm not sure if he was Minister of Natural Resources at that time or not when they were doing these negotiations with their chins way out front and centre — (Interjection) — he didn't come in? Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize to the Member for Lakeside for any inference that he may have been involved with such terrible negotiations — (Interjection) — He tried to clean it up with the former Premier, Mr. Weir, I guess. The public responded very well to their cleanup by kicking them out of office.

The public responded equally well to the opposition's ability to run the economy of this province and to be involved in the economy of this province by being turfed out on their ears in 1981.

It is somewhat incredible when you get publications coming forward from the opposition like this garbage here that they are sending out to their people, hoping that they will swallow it. There's a little chart in here of the Province of Manitoba deficit. Mr. Speaker, they cannot even get straight what years they were in office, what Budgets were their Budgets and what Budgets were opposition Budgets or NDP Budgets at the time. They have in here in blue, darkest blue - believe me, it is dark - 1977-78, well that happened to be an NDP Budget.

They also put it in as they fixed the books and juggled the books to increase the deficit by some \$50 million. They started right in mid-year - not mid-year - towards the end of the year they changed the accounting procedures just like I've explained in this House before. So actually the first blue should actually be red, and it should only be about two-thirds the size of that, the first little blue bar chart. Oh, they're misleading the public in the grossest of terms. They can't even get the years straight of when they were in office.

A MEMBER: Did they sign it?

MR. D. SCOTT: I'm sure it is signed in here somewhere.

A MEMBER: If they didn't sign it, it's okay.

MR. D. SCOTT: It's got PC all over. It's got a big smiley guy on it here, the Man from Glad with black hair. I don't know what he's glad about. I don't know what he has to be glad about when he looks around him, but he appears glad.

The next year, 1978-79, they're right, it's blue, solid blue. But the only thing is, they only have it in as two-thirds the size that the thing should be, once again because of other accounting changes where they took \$50 million worth of revenues from the previous year and included them in revenues in 1978-79. Frank still doesn't understand this yet, I don't think. He's shaking his head there, he's looking a little bit disgruntled.

The most deceitful part of it all, when they come forward to the public and they put this out in '81-82, well, we did not take office until December 1, 1981. The Budget was in the previous April or previous March, and yet they have that in red. And it goes way up. What more blatant dishonesty is there than that. To show the sudden rise in a deficit under their mismanagement of the economy, as they had previously driven the economy into an early recession, they had under their four years driven the economy of Manitoba

into a recession faster than any other province in Canada. So when we took office, the country as a whole was going into its deepest recession since the depression, but they had already pushed Manitoba into that, unbeknownst to most Manitobans except for those who were being laid off, except for the people at Eaton's and The Bay and other retail outlets in the country who were looking at their dismal sales. Those people knew what was happening to Manitoba, and that is why that government got kicked out of office.

This little line here which they've got in the wrong colour - the next one should have probably been as well - but they did not have the gumption and the support of their own caucus to go forward to another Budget. They called an early election so they did not have to come up with a spring Budget.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The honourable member should watch his language and not use unparliamentary terms in this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: What did I say that was unparliamentary?

Well, Mr. Speaker, when you see and when you look at what happened with the state of the Manitoba economy and the state of the economy that we were left with when we took office, then you understand all the more clearly why they called an election in September for an election in mid-November. You know why they made that move because they did not want to? They did not have, I don't believe, the gumption to come forward with a new Budget the following year. They knew what the problem was going to be, they knew what the deficit was shaping up to be which was way over what they had forecast.

The only time the former Minister of Finance, the Member for Turtle Mountain, what he's been after in his Budget Estimates, he may be fairly accurate with his \$100-and-some-million, he said that ours was going to be over, he's inaccurate in this year, but he would have been accurate if he would have gone back to his last Budget which he gave and when he was out some \$100 million over what he had proposed in what actually came out as a deficit of this province. But then, they have the lack of ability to go to the people with the straight goods and they try to tell the people of Manitoba that the deficit started going up under an NDP administration. That, Mr. Speaker, is — (Interjection) — I don't know if maybe deceitful would be an unparliamentary word, but it borders on that.

Our administration has emphasized the role that the Province of Manitoba has in the economy. We've emphasized the responsibility of a provincial government to its peoples, to the maintenance of our education system, any improvement thereof, and likewise in our health system. In no other administration that I'm aware of in this whole country has increased over the past two years health funding and education funding to the extent that we did. As a matter of fact, at a time when the federal contributions to the Manitoba

revenues have decreased in percentage terms, in other words, when they were in office that about 35 percent of their total funding came from the Federal Government - currently we get about 30 percent of our funding from the Federal Government. The rest of it is made up by the Province of Manitoba.

We are carrying that much more of our own weight. We are earning and drawing ourselves, 65 percent is the total figure for own source revenues now versus 60 percent when they were in office. So we are becoming less and less a ward of the Federal Government. We are standing more on our own two feet, we are facing the public honestly. When we had to raise taxes we raised taxes, we didn't go in with tax decreases and end up slashing programs so that we would — (Interjection) — No, we are not the people who signed the last federal-provincial fiscal arrangements agreement. You people were the ones that negotiated the agreement and it is because of your total lack of any understanding of what federalism means and what co-operative federalism means, that Manitoba got the rawest deal that was ever had in federal-provincial relations as far as financing goes, and the Government of Canada contributing to the Government of Manitoba because of the gross incompetence of that previous administration.

When one looks at something like day care, one can see just how much programs that are so important to working men and women in this province, and especially to the women in the province to free them to be able to participate in the work force because we're living in the 1980's, we're not back in the 1940's, 1950's. Some members over opposite, the Member for Assiniboia, when we were dealing with the child care legislation at the time, he says, "as far as I'm concerned, a woman's place is in the house, and I don't agree with all this day care stuff." That was his total contribution to that committee reviewing the legislation, and we see what the NDP has done.

I had a number of letters that were sent to me concerning day care funding from concerned parents worried that they would not be able to afford to continue sending their children to day care if we did not increase the funding provisions for day care.

If you look back when day care started - I believe that was in '73-74 or '74-75 - there's about \$600,000 a year committed to that. When we left office in '77-78, the amount was \$4.1 million. For the first three years of the Conservative Administration that never even doubled, it only went to \$5.9 million after three years of funding by the Conservatives. Finally in an election year they put a little bit of a speed-up on the thing and it got up to \$8.7 million. This year, we have now doubled that, in two short years we have doubled the funding for day care to a level in excess of \$17 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, when we next reach this matter the honourable member will have 28 minutes remaining.

This House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Thursday).