



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. 8A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 24 APRIL, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupert's Island	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, 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.	Fiin Fion	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 24 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 Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to table the Annual Report of the Communities Economic Development Fund for the year 1982-83.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 1982-83 Annual Report of the Department of Highways and Transportation, and the Report of the Board of Internal Economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the Annual Financial Report for the year ended March 31, 1983, for the University of Manitoba, and the Annual Report of the Universities Grants Commission for the year ending March 31, 1983.

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 a number of MLA's visiting from Alberta: Messrs. Anderson, Carter, and Paproski.

There are also 20 students of the Applied Linguistics School under the direction of Miss Kalinowsky. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

There are also 58 students of Grade 5 standing from the Dr. D.W. Penner School under the direction of Mrs. Horn and Mrs. Goodman. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Worker Protection - Convenience Stores

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Labour. During the past two Sessions, in questioning from our side of the House, the Minister of Labour has indicated that the government was considering legislative changes that would provide additional protection for workers in all-night convenience stores. I'm wondering, as a result of continuing commentary and continuing requests that I'm getting, whether or not the Minister could indicate whether the government is planning to act on this matter or has anything in mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will turn that question to my colleague, the Minister for Workplace Safety and Health. It has been in that portfolio for the past year, the responsibility for safety in the workplace, and that is the title under which this would fall.

Grain transportation rates

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the announcements that we're hearing today that the grain transportation rates are going to increase by some 35 percent to the farmers in Manitoba and Western Canada, has the Minister of Agriculture calculated what that will cost the farmers of Manitoba and what has he done to make the case to the Federal Government that it far exceeds the increases that the farm community can stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that this Legislature passed resolutions, had meetings throughout rural Manitoba, objecting as forcibly as we could as representatives of the people of Manitoba against changes to the Crow rate. We estimate, Sir, that the impact of the changes to the Crow rate over the next decade will move approximately half-a-billion dollars, \$500 million out of the Province of Manitoba over the next decade, Sir, and it will reach in proportions of over \$100 million a year near the turn of the century. It is far beyond what Manitoba farmers can afford to pay. We have said that. It is basically a transfer of funds from the farmers of Manitoba to the coffers of the railway, Sir.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that last week the Premier held high on a pedestal in this Assembly the Minister of Transport, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg, and gloated over being a great friend of his, will he put the case forward as the Premier of this province to the Federal Government and the

Federal Minister of Transport, that the increases of some 35 percent are unacceptable to the farm community of Manitoba? Will the Premier take action, Mr. Speaker, because he seems to be such a good friend of the Honourable Minister of Transport in this country?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I assume in the midst of all that rhetoric that question was intended to be directed towards me, and I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the question, despite the fact it was not very well indicated as to who it was directed toward.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated very clearly last night for honourable members across the way that this government would not place party or jurisdictional differences in the way of provincial-federal agreements, witness the transportation, the agricultural agreement, the mining agreement, and the other agreements that had been signed. Those agreements are good for Manitoba and we do not intend to dump on the Minister responsible for the Province of Manitoba and the federal Cabinet in respect to those agreements.

But, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that unlike honourable members across the way, we will not be reluctant where need be to condemn the Federal Government and the federal Liberals in respect to policy. And, Mr. Speaker, where was that better demonstrated but on the part of this government in respect to its opposition to the Crow when I can recall the honourable members being so wishy-washy that I believe it took us, if I recall correctly, days and days to get honourable members off the fence to take a position in opposition to the Federal Government in respect to the changes on the Crow?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, it's been indicated by a well-known politician in the federal scene - I can ask the First Minister and if he's not the Premier, that's who I directed my question to. Mr. Speaker, when will the First Minister quit dancing cheek to cheek with the Federal Minister of Transport and put the case of Manitoba farmers before him saying that we are seeing a record number of bankruptcies in Manitoba under our administration? Let us not have a further problem added to that by additional freight rates by the Federal Government. Will he calculate what it will cost the farmers this coming year for increased transportation rates and will he protest that increase in the most effective way possible?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can understand very well the honourable member's expertise in talking about dancing cheek to cheek. They not only dance cheek to cheek, they dance bum to bum with the federal Liberals.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was the former Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber.

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

I would hope that all members would use proper parliamentary language within this Chamber.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The point is that if there were two parties that were in cahoots in respect to the Crow rate changes it was the honourable members across the way because it was the Leader of the Conservative Party in this Chamber that a year-and-a-half ago indicated that he supported changes to the Crow rate, and that is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker. It was the federal Tories in the House of Commons in Ottawa that in a wishy-washy way indicate that they are prepared to oppose Crow but only for a three-year reprieve, three years of reprieve.

Mr. Speaker, it was a New Democratic Party in Ottawa, it was this government that took a steadfast position and the record substantiates that very very clearly against Crow rate changes. When the honourable members want to talk about being in bed, it was the honourable members across the way, it was their federal counterparts that were in bed from the very beginning in respect to the Crow rate and only tried to wiggle out when they found they had popular dissatisfaction amongst western farmers in respect to their support of the federal Liberals in regard to the Crow rate.

Brandon University Building Fund

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education. Mr. Bill Potter, the chairman of the Board of Governors at Brandon University is quoted in the Winnipeg Free Press as saying that there were many people who did not want to contribute funds to Brandon University while Dr. Perkins was president. Can the Minister of Education advise the House how much the Brandon University has received by way of contribution since Dr. Perkins has been fired?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the Member for Turtle Mountain that while their fund-raising drive may not have been quite as successful as they had hoped, recently it has been much more successful than it was in the two previous years; that when they first received approval for the \$6 million building, the fund-raising drive was under the responsibility of Dr. Perkins. It is my understanding that in that first year and perhaps even year-and-a-half they did not raise any money. In other words, the first year of the fund-raising drive prior to any questions of Dr. Perkins being the president of the university, although they had committed themselves to raise a million dollars, they did not raise any money. They have presently \$500,000 in pledges and I believe they have about \$250,000 in hand, although I'm not sure about that figure. I understand they have recently had an on-campus fund-raising drive that they feel has been quite successful, so the direct answer to his question is they have not raised as much as they wanted. I think the \$1 million was they were taking a very big bite and

taking on a very big job, and I said that to them in the beginning. I don't know if you can raise a million dollars, but they're trying and those efforts have been more successful in the last six months than they were previously.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister undertake to find out and provide those figures to the House? I'm not talking about pledges that were made prior to that and that the money has flowed since, but how much money has actually been raised since the firing of Dr. Perkins? Could she provide that information to the House?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I tried to indicate that they had, I thought, half-a-million dollars in pledges and I thought \$250,000 of that was in hand, so I did address that question. I can try to get the exact information, but I think it's important to say that the fund-raising drive that was undertaken was undertaken by the university with them making the commitment and taking on the responsibility to raise the funds, with the government saying that they could not support a \$6 million building nor did they think it was justified, and if the board wanted to approve it they were going to have to take the responsibility to raise the additional million dollars.

So in terms of your question about how well it's going and how successful, and if you're really concerned I would think that it would be very useful if you did something productive to help the university instead of trying to create continued controversy, your negative points about the university.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether this is a final supplementary question or a point of order, but surely the Minister is not in a position to be questioning whether or not members of this House are sincere in seeking information.

My question to the Minister was would she find out how much money had been raised? I wasn't interested in entering into a debate over the issue. I asked her a straightforward question, not what she thinks might happen, but will she actually get the figures?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I answered that.

HON. A. MACKLING: You didn't have a point of order and you didn't have a fresh question.

Worker protection - convenience stores

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

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

In reply to an earlier question from the Leader of the Opposition, I wish to advise that the regulation having to do with persons working alone is expected on my desk in about a week's time.

MANDAN Interconnection - Hydro

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the Minister of Energy and Mines. In the current flurry of information with respect to the Minneapolis power sale, the MANDAN project seems to have been somewhat set aside. My question to the Honourable Minister is similar to the one asked by my colleague, the Member for Morris, on behalf of my constituents, has a decision to locate that line been arrived at by Hydro officials?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I took that question as notice. I'll have to take this one as notice and get back to the member as soon as possible.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I remind you, Sir, and members of the House that we are talking about a facility that would have the capacity of transferring 1,000 to 1,500 megawatts of power on a scale equally large if not larger than the one that was recently announced in the House. My direct question to the Minister is in the release of the information and with respect to the MANDAN Line indicates that the last step is to obtain approval of the National Energy Board and that the target date for that approval is set for September 1, 1984. Is that still the target date for approval of the MANDAN transfer of power - if it's north, south - with this government, September 1, 1984?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, that would depend on how the court cases are proceeding in the United States, and I'll have to take that question as notice as well because we have no control or jurisdiction over court cases that are presently being fought in the United States regarding the transmission line.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that this government has provided far more information about the northern States power deal than any of the information provided by the Conservative Government with respect to a tentative and not concluded negotiation with Alberta and Saskatchewan regarding a Western Power Grid. They provided no information at that time, Mr. Speaker, and now they are condemning us for not providing sufficient information when we have provided far more information. Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis we'll be able to show quite constructively and clearly for the people of Manitoba that this is a very good deal for the people of Manitoba, despite what the opposition is trying to say in a negative way about it.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to start to debate the Western Power Grid with the Honourable Minister, but I'm simply asking him a question that relates to the MANDAN Line, is this government, is this Minister aggressively pursuing that major project known as the MANDAN line?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have consistently said that we are pursuing the MANDAN Line. I said that last year in my Estimates and we have said that at the Public Utilities . . .

MR. H. ENNS: We haven't heard that lately.

HON. W. PARASIUK: We have said that consistently, Mr. Speaker, and I'm surprised that members of the opposition would say otherwise because last year in Public Utilities Committee, they raised a whole set of concerns about routing for the MANDAN Line. I wasn't sure from their comments whether in fact they wanted the MANDAN Line or not, Mr. Speaker. That was the situation last year when they were being obstructionist, Mr. Speaker. We can assure the people in this House that we are in favour of those types of development that are for the people of Manitoba by a utility that is owned by all the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. We believe that the future of Manitoba is best served by a utility owned by all the people of Manitoba and we hope that all the people in Manitoba will be constructive in assuring that that take place.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs concerning reports that the Franco-Manitoban Society is now going to take on the City of Winnipeg in regard to French Language Services and is threatening court action. I would like to ask the Minister whether she has received any official complaints concerning the lack or supposed lack of bilingual street signs in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like direction as to whether a discussion of French language rights in this province is in order.

MR. R. DOERN: Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions.
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister again whether she has received any complaints by way of telephone or letter or telegram concerning the views of the Franco-Manitoban Society about alleged breaches of The City of Winnipeg Act, which is provincial legislation?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, while this is a city affair, it is still under the jurisdiction of The City of Winnipeg Act, which I'm sure the honourable member is aware. The complaints, if there are any, I would think would be directed to the city and the city offices. I read the same article he did that is in the paper and that is what the complaint seems to be about.

With regard to The City of Winnipeg Act, the member knows that this act will be reviewed over the next year-and-a-half. If there are any complaints forthcoming, they will be dealt with by that review committee.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. In view of alleged breaches of The City of Winnipeg Act, the provincial

statute, and the view of the Franco-Manitoban Society that they would prefer an amicable out-of-court settlement, has he been approached by the SFM, or is he now working on another out-of-court, out-of-sight agreement? — (Interjection) — Thank God.

Hydro employment - northern preference

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

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Hydro. Earlier this year, I raised the concern of myself and other northerners about the fact that northerners have been by-passed for recall to hydro contract work in the North. In view of the fact that the question of northern preference would become that much more important with the prospect of renewed hydro development in Manitoba, I would like to ask the Minister if Hydro will be enforcing the policy of northern preference for employment on all aspects of Hydro employment?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for Thompson for that question. I know he's had a continued interest in the matter of ensuring that northerners have the full opportunity to partake in development in Northern Manitoba, and it certainly is the policy of this government. My leader said it in the election campaign, and we have certainly reiterated it since our election that we believe in northern preference. We believe that northerners should have the fullest opportunity to participate and benefit from northern development. We are ensuring that the policy is clearly understood by all that northern preference applies to hiring; it applies to layoffs; it applies also to rehiring; and I think it's important that all the mechanics of that be put in place so that if there are further developments, and we are extremely hopeful that there will be major developments in Northern Manitoba, that northerners will be able to participate more fully than they certainly have had the opportunity of doing so in the past.

MR. S. ASHTON: As a supplementary, I would like to ask the Minister if his department and Hydro will be developing mechanisms to monitor such future hydro development to gain the benefits that the Minister mentioned we should get for the people of Northern Manitoba?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it would be our intention to ensure that not only is the policy there but that it is actually implemented. We have said, as I said, consistently, that northerners should participate to the fullest extent they can in northern development.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions for the Honourable First Minister,

more in the line for information or advice or instructions, and especially because we have a lot of ballroom dancers in this caucus. I notice some of our friends from Alberta are well-known ballroom dancers. Would the First Minister explain to the House and the people of this province what is this new bum-to-bum dancing that's going on between him and Axworthy and the feds?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please! The question is frivolous.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't take it very frivolous when the Honourable First Minister put it on the record.

Papal visit

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I have another question, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable First Minister, using the same type of guidelines. Schools, municipalities, towns, villages, cities in the province today in my constituency - I don't know about the rest of the members - are wondering if there are photographs, framed photographs for the Papal visit of Pope John coming to our province, that we can in some way, by this Legislature, commemorate this historic visit of Pope John coming to this province and mark it with an historic picture or something for these jurisdictions.

These offices, I understand today, already have pictures of Her Majesty and Prince Philip hanging on their walls and they are asking today if there is some way that we in the province could commemorate, not maybe by a picture, but some special memento for this extremely important visit for His Honour Pope John.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Russell for the question. Indeed, I am pleased to hear, as indeed all Manitobans are, in respect to the upcoming visit of His Holiness to the Province of Manitoba. Insofar as just what will be available, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to take that question as notice and check with the committee that is responsible for the arrangements in regard to the visit by His Holiness to the Province of Manitoba and report to the honourable member as well as to other honourable members as to what material will be available in the province at that particular time.

Assessment Review

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. It's regarding the activities of the Assessment Branch and the requests of certain farmers in Manitoba for information regarding their off-farm income. Last week I asked the Minister

a question, if he could give us the information as to what method his department was using in selecting those farmers that they sent letters to? Could the Minister inform the House how that selection process was carried out?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank the honourable member for his question. I had taken it as notice last week. I don't have all the information that I felt was necessary to answer his question; however, I do have partial information.

One of the questions which I believe the Member for Arthur asked, which is very similar to the one now asked by the Member for Virden, relates to the question of how individuals are selected to receive the letters asking to justify income sources. Those letters go only to farmers who have income from sources other than farming. Under those circumstances where there is other income the assessor then must determine whether or not the net income from farming exceeds the income from all other sources as provided in Section 30 of The Assessment Act.

The letter, which was referred to last week by the Member for Arthur, was sent from the Souris Assessment Office to farmers in the Rural Municipalities of Albert, Arthur, Brenda, Cameron, Edward, Morden, Pipestone and Wallace. A total of 164 letters were sent in all of those municipalities.

Those letters were sent only to those farmers with exempt farm dwellings who have one or more oil wells situated on their property. In those circumstances, it's the duty of the assessor to determine whether income from farming exceeds income from the oil wells. The practice of sending letters requesting income information is not something new. It's been done for at least the last 10 years and it's no different from when honourable members opposite were responsible for the administration of The Assessment Act.

I should point out though that one of the questions which has to be addressed in determining the income question is the question of whether or not the farmer owns the mineral rights and therefore receives the income directly from the oil wells or instead just receives surface compensation; and that surface rights compensation can be quantified into compensation that is compensation for land no longer in production versus compensation directly for crop loss, which then can be adjudged to be similar to awards of compensation with regard to crop depredation from wildlife or similar to returns under the Crop Insurance Program.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Virden also asked whether or not the Minister of Municipal Affairs would consider delaying the Court of Revision to allow this process of income information gathering to be accomplished and to allow farmers to determine whether or not they wish to appeal. I pointed out at that time that they were two separate processes.

As well I should point out to the honourable member, Section 44(1) of The Municipal Assessment Act which reads, "Upon completion of the assessment rolls of the municipality the Court of Revision of the municipality shall sit to revise the assessment roles." Clearly under

the statute the Minister of Municipal Affairs does not have the authority to delay or otherwise interfere in the Court of Revision proceedings.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A supplementary question to the Honourable Minister. Was it because of the wording of the act or was it an arbitrary decision of the assessors to ask for information within 30 days?

HON. A. ANSTETT: The provision in the statute in Section 21(2) of The Municipal Assessment Act is that requests for information must be complied with within one week. The department, as always, in trying to provide as much accommodation as possible to the public in meeting the demands placed upon them by The Assessment Act, allows 30 days, which is approximately four times the time required by the act. If anything, the department is in breach of the statute by being too lenient but I certainly concur with the provision of 30 days. I think that's a reasonable request in view of the fact that many farmers, particularly those who maintain their records with accountants, etc., may not be able to comply within the week provided for in the act.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A further supplementary question to the Minister. Can the Minister confirm that there has now been a second letter sent out to those people telling them or asking them to provide the information, when it is convenient, and to disregard the first letter?

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that and if that has happened it's happened in only the last few days. Certainly my staff have not advised me of any such letter and in accordance with Section 21(2) of the act, I don't know that staff have the authority to provide an unlimited extension. The request for information must be complied with in accordance with that provision in the act.

Fires in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Due to the slight change in weather we have today and the very light rain that we're having, is he considering lifting the province-wide ban on fires that was announced over the weekend?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: The short answer, Mr. Speaker, would be no. I think that it would be prudent for us to await a period of time to see whether or not sufficient precipitation will reduce the continuing hazard. I want to point out that throughout southern Manitoba we've had below normal ground water tables, record low winter precipitation, lack of spring rains, and above average temperatures and below average humidity, all of which have caused vegetation to be tinder dry. So therefore it will take a considerable amount of moisture to remove the hazard and I think it would be imprudent to remove it.

While I have the floor, I would like to indicate too, that there is, I think, some misunderstanding, provincially, as to the role of the government in respect to fire. In the southern part of the province, unless it's in a wooded district, municipal governments do by-law regulate fire and the Fire Commissioner's Office, of course, also has a role to play. He can impose more stringent conditions where necessary. It is in the wooded districts, as defined in the act, that the Ministry of Natural Resources plays the leading role. In that area we did impose a ban. We are looking at selective relief from that ban because, as I've indicated, there are portions of the province, particularly in the North, that received an excellent amount of precipitation and where that ban is really not appropriate.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I thank the Minister for recognizing that there is not anywhere near sufficient rain to cut down or to lift that ban on fires currently.

Would the Minister, Mr. Speaker, also work and ensure that his department will work alongside the officials in the rural municipalities and with the Fire Commissioner's Office to ensure that those people who have been the firebugs out there lighting these fires, destroying the valuable habitat and in the south it's incredibly important because much of what is being burned is the remnants - the wee remnants we have left with habitat in the Province of Manitoba in the south. Will he ensure that his department will be made available to assist rural municipalities and the Fire Commissioner's Office to lay charges against those firebugs who have been starting the fires?

HON. A. MACKLING: In answer to the honourable member's concerns and contrary to the snickers and the jeers from opposite, Mr. Speaker, on the question of hazard from careless fires, this ministry takes that question very seriously. All of the fires that have occurred in southern Manitoba, both brush and prairie fires, have been caused by human neglect and it is a very serious matter. This government takes the loss of resources very very seriously and will assist municipal government not only in fighting fire but where negligence has been established, assisting municipal governments or the Fire Commissioner to take appropriate action, because it's not just good enough for people to be fighting fires when conditions are hazardous as has occurred in this province.

Sports funding

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Sport. Could the Minister inform the House whether he has communicated with or intends to communicate with the Federal Minister of Sport, Jacques Olivier, with respect to his decision to cut back funding to sports organizations until they indicate they've improved their bilingual coaching or administration?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the department is studying the meaning which is ambiguous to say the least, of what the cutback will be and besides that, we're also making representation to the Minister that they should stay the hell out of the lottery field in Manitoba.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Minister indicate whether he'll be joining with other provincial Ministers of Sport in making representations to the Federal Minister?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, we will be.

Flyer Industries Limited

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister responsible for Flyer and would ask the Minister if he could provide the House with the information dealing with the projected losses for Flyer Industries for last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, I cannot provide that information. The figures for the year ending December 31, 1983 have not been finalized in terms of the audit and the board acceptance of that. Once that material has been concluded by the board I would expect that it would be tabled then and shared in the usual manner.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House as to what firm will be conducting the audit or the efficiency study with regard to Flyer, and if he could tell us roughly what the per diem or the cost of that particular undertaking will be.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'm not certain if there were two separate questions there in terms of the audit and the consulting studies that are being undertaken by Flyer. In terms of the audit I believe the firm of Touche Ross is the approved auditors for Flyer Industries. In terms of the consulting studies, I will provide that information to the member. There are a number of firms that are involved in the consulting studies, looking at specific areas of Flyer Industry in terms of manufacturing, engineering, human resources, marketing, inventory control and information management systems. I don't have the information of the specific companies but I would be pleased to supply that information to the Member in the near future.

MR. R. BANMAN: A further supplementary, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether or not one of the areas that the consulting firms will be exploring is the possibility of privatizing or finding a sale for Flyer Industries.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, that area is not the subject of any specific study by the consultants at the present time.

Bingo regulations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister in charge of lotteries. Since there is a great deal of concern in my constituency and other constituencies in the Province pertaining to the new regulations concerning the operation of bingo games in the Province, can the Minister tell the House whether or not senior citizens' clubs which operate bingos only for their own membership, will they be required to purchase a licence and turn over a share of their receipts to the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the final policy should be announced any day now. The bingos, as far as the playing and receipts, or profit from the bingo, every single penny stays with the local club. I'm talking about the bingo.

MRS. C. OLESON: Will these senior citizens' clubs be asked to purchase all their bingo tear sheets from the government when they already have all their own equipment?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: If the definition of the small group, as defined by the member is correct, no, they would be in the percentage that will be exempted. But everybody will be encouraged to be very careful in the security that they must have, and I think on a long run they'll improve their mark-up also in the profit that it will make if that is done.

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

HANSARD CORRECTION

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Orders of the Day, I should point out that Hansard carries on page 181 a typographical error attributed to me. I would not say such a thing to an honourable member.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe there may be an inclination on the part of Members of the House, after some consultation with the Opposition House Leader, to delay momentarily the resumption of debate on the Throne Speech for purposes of allowing the Minister of Agriculture to move a motion of some urgency with respect to the Western Grain Stabilization Fund. I believe, Mr. Speaker, if there is leave for the Minister to move that motion, he is prepared to do so at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister of Agriculture have leave of the House? (Agreed) Hearing no objection, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MATTER OF URGENCY

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, this resolution:

WHEREAS the Western Grain Stabilization Program has been in effect since April 1, 1976; and

WHEREAS the Western Grain Stabilization Act has not been amended in light of the experience gained in the operation of the program since inception; and

WHEREAS the fund of the program has accumulated approximately \$900 million to date, which sum has triggered a reduction in the rate of contributions to the fund; and

WHEREAS many grain farmers in Manitoba are experiencing severe financial difficulty and require funds to plant this year's crop;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Government of Canada to amend The Western Grain Stabilization Act as follows:

1. To reduce the averaging period to three years from the current five- year period;

2. To base the calculation of cash receipts of a crop year basis in order to reduce the time lag between the low cash flow period and the receipt of payments by farmers;

3. To include an adjustment factor for increased sales volumes so that the effect of increased volumes does not fully offset price declines;

4. To compute net cash flows on a provincial basis to make the program more sensitive to farmers' requirements;

5. To permit farmers meeting hardship criteria to discontinue paying contributions to the fund while maintaining participation by establishing a contingent liability to the fund for the unpaid contribution;

And that the Clerk of this Assembly forward this resolution to the Government of Canada.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that members in this Assembly and in all provinces across Western Canada and in many provinces in this country, but precisely, specifically in western Canada, realize that farmers are experiencing financial difficulty in difficult economic times.

World grain prices are depressed, which led to very low final payments this year, and the recent reduction in initial payments is going to make things even worse. Adverse weather conditions over large parts of Manitoba, the drought in 1980, the early frost in 1982 and the heat wave in 1983 have contributed in no small measure to the difficulties.

High interest rates have placed a large burden on beginning farmers and those who expanded just prior to the onset of the difficult economic times.

While farmers are experiencing these difficulties, they see the \$900 million dollar Western Grain Stabilization Fund, which is of no use to them. It doesn't make sense

for farmers. Sir, to contribute more money to the fund when some of them are going bankrupt.

Manitoba farmers desperately need a payout. That is why, Sir, I have moved the resolution to forcefully state to the Federal Government that the amendments must be made quickly. I am pleased that members opposite are joining with me to add their weight to the urgency of the situation.

In brief, the changes we have recommended make sense and will make the program more efficient and more sensitive to conditions in each of the prairie provinces. By reducing the averaging period of five years to three or four years, the impact of poor years like 1977 or 1978 could be minimized. We could speed up payments by several months if the net cash flow calculation is changed from the calendar year to the crop year.

As it now stands, the administrative procedure results in a long lag before farmers receive any payments. The 1978 payment, for example, of \$273 million was paid in two installments during the spring and fall of 1979. Of course, looking back, grain receipts rose strongly in 1979, up 875 million over 1978. It's obvious that farmers needed the payment more in 1978 when they were experiencing the cash flow problem.

If payments are based on cash receipts for the crop year, the final payment could be speeded up by several months. It would be beneficial to include an adjustment factor for the long-term trend increase in sales volumes. By doing so, increased volume would not offset declining prices as we have seen. This would give western farmers the same advantage afforded to eastern farmers under their program. I should point out, Sir, that in 1977 and 1978, when western farmers received \$368 million under the Grain Stabilization Fund, at the same time the smaller eastern grain industry received \$33.9 million under The Federal Agricultural Stabilization Act.

Just lately, Sir, for 1981 and 1982, eastern farmers received \$35.2 million from the Federal Government while western farmers facing the same conditions have received nothing. Sir, there isn't equitable treatment under this basis given to western farmers.

Sir, how can the Federal Government justify treating western farmers like second-class citizens? Sir, while the western farmer contributes on the basis of one-third in terms of the contributions to The Grain Stabilization Act, eastern farmers' support is paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government.

Historically, Sir, export prices and volumes tended to move in the same direction and the program was designed to deal with the situation. However, in the recent period, export volumes have increased due to an aggressive marketing effort by the Canadian Wheat Board.

We are recommending, Sir, that net cash flows be calculated on a provincial basis rather than on a prairie-wide basis. Under the present formula, the problem in cash flow must be severe enough to depress the entire prairie average. It is now possible, Sir, for a widespread drought to trigger payments to some farmers who were totally unaffected by that drought. This possibility was demonstrated by the 1980 drought in eastern Saskatchewan and in Manitoba. No payout, and yet because of the increased sales, even though with depressed prices, increased sales and no drought effect

on western and central Saskatchewan and Alberta, no payment was triggered during the period of the 1980 drought.

On the other hand, farmers in a limited growing area may suffer from a total crop failure, while farmers in the other two provinces experience a bumper crop. As a result, the hard-hit farmers will receive nothing.

The final change, Sir, that we are recommending, is to enable farmers experiencing financial difficulty to continue participation without making contributions. It makes little sense for a farmer about to go bankrupt to contribute to a stabilization fund that will not make a payment until he is out of business.

Sir, there should be some provision for farmers meeting certain criteria to cease contributions, but maintain their participation in the program. Contributions that were not made would be contingent liability to the fund and they could be repaid by reduction from future payouts. All major farm groups unanimously are in favour of amendments to the western grain stabilization program. The Wheat Board Advisory Committee appointed by the Federal Minister of Agriculture and chaired by Mr. Don Mitchell from Douglas, Manitoba, has recommended changes relating to averaging and changing the calculation of cash receipts to a crop year basis.

The Manitoba Farm Bureau has expressed dissatisfaction with the operation of the Western Grain Stabilization Program, but have not advocated specific amendments. As well, Sir, the National Farmers Union has advocated changes and a payout in the Western Grain Stabilization Fund.

Sir, Manitoba Pool Elevator delegates passed a resolution at their annual meeting recently, in November of 1983, calling for several amendments, including the three-year averaging period and on the calculation of production costs. I'm advised that they sent a telex to the Prime Minister this week indicating quick action and urging them to move.

Representatives of all prairie Conservative Caucuses, Sir, and Conservative MPs, I believe they met in Regina when I was at a meeting recently in MacGregor. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, during his comments to the meeting, did raise the matter that a meeting of representatives of the Manitoba Conservative Caucus, along with other prairie Conservative Caucuses also recommended changes to the fund, although I'm sure the line of suggestions that we have made certainly should not be a matter of concern to them as well, Sir. The UGG are also encouraging changes to the fund.

Sir, at a time when western Canadian farmers - and our surveys, Sir, within our own department show that farmers who are in the most severe financial situation are those who are predominantly in the grains industry. There are of course farmers who are in financial difficulty who are in livestock and mixed farming operations, but in the main, the largest number of farmers facing financial difficulty are in the grain sector. Sir, if ever there was a time that a fund that has been built up and paid for one-third by the farmers of western Canada, this is the time for the Federal Government to move and make those changes immediately to assist, not only Manitoba farmers, but all western Canadian farmers at a time of greatest need. So you see, Sir, the changes we are proposing are not only logical and

beneficial, we are also in basic agreement with our major farm groups, all of whom represent grain farmers and farmers in various sectors.

Sir, I hope that all members of the Assembly will join together to stand up for Manitoba farmers and to make our concerns known to Ottawa as soon as possible and urge that the Federal Ministers there make those changes immediately. I am certain that opposition members of Parliament would and will give speedy passage to any changes that will in fact trigger a necessary payout to western grain growers.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Minister. I was wondering if it would be asking too much as a courtesy to provide us with a copy of his resolution. I have no copy.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will get his copy.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to make the official opposition's response and in support of the resolution, in seconding it, I want to as well put a few facts on the record and make sure that the public clearly understands precisely how we stand not only dealing specifically with this issue, but how we have approached them and how we feel they should be approached in the coming weeks and how they should have been approached in the past.

More than joining with the members of the government today, Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely pleased to join with our federal counterparts, the Progressive Conservatives and our agricultural critic, Charlie Mayer, who, I believe it was the last question - before the House was to prorogue or to close for a short period of time - was placed to the Minister of Agriculture, the Federal Minister responsible for grain stabilization, whoever that is, and asked him to deal with the legislation so that the payout could take place immediately. So we, as the opposition here, are more pleased to join with the official opposition in Ottawa pressuring for a payout from the stabilizer. So not let it be said that this Minister is taking the initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I as well want to deal with another matter which I want to point out and it's on the record and certainly publicly been stated that I want to acknowledge my colleagues from the Legislature that joined with me and the Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan with the precise objective of triggering exactly what we're seeing today, so I thank the Minister and the government for responding to opposition pressure and pressure from those people who are concerned about the farmers in Western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Emerson, Albert Driedger, was there, spent two days of his time to work for his constituents in that area. We had the Member for Roblin-Russell, Wally McKenzie, who put forward his time and his efforts and as late as last week, on Thursday, asked the First Minister of this province when he was going to take urgent action to help the farmers of this province and either put together a committee

of the Legislature or a committee of his Cabinet to deal with it, and we're again pleased to see that we've had response to that loyal member's request.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie, as well, was at that meeting and joined with us to put pressure on and did report to the Minister at MacGregor, but the Minister didn't tell the whole story, and I'll get to that in a minute as well.

As well, we had the Honourable Member for Rhineland spending much of his valuable time speaking out on behalf of his farm community and the industries depending upon the agricultural community there. The Member for Morris was there as well, and of course the Member for Minnedosa, Dave Blake, participated in that trip. We are pleased today to see that the government did hear.

Following on that trip, Mr. Speaker, I forwarded to my leader the results of that meeting and as well asked him to participate in a follow-up meeting that was going to take place or will take place this summer in Manitoba when those other provinces come to join us to keep pressure on both this government and put pressure on the government in Ottawa.

I have a letter which I will table, Mr. Speaker, asking this Minister of Agriculture to join the other western provinces and put pressure on the Federal Government to get a payout of the stabilization program. I have a copy of that letter which I am going to table as well. That letter was sent on March 13th, so finally we got some action out of this government. I will table that letter as well as the press release, and I want to thank Mr. Campbell out of Alberta and Mr. Peterson out of Saskatchewan for their participation and the manner in which they treated us when we visited the fine Province of Saskatchewan.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I issued a press release at the same time of which I will table a copy of it after I'm through referring to it, but there is another press release that I want to refer to and that of course is the one that the Minister of Agriculture is putting out with the current resolution, and here again he's playing the big game of politics. He's trying to tell the farmers of Manitoba that here he is, the best Minister of Agriculture that ever lived, and that his government's policy put forward all those good ideas. He hasn't done anything within the internal problems of farm financing when we see Manitoba as a record increase in bankruptcies of some 400 percent since 1981. He doesn't talk about that, but what does he say?

Here's what he said in one paragraph and I'll quote, Mr. Speaker, "In addition to moving a resolution in the Legislature, Mr. Uruski said he has asked the Saskatchewan and Alberta Ministers of Agriculture to join with him in applying pressure to the Federal Government." He is now asking them to apply pressure when it's the other way around, Mr. Speaker. He's trying to take political credit and I think the people of Manitoba should know precisely where he's coming from. As well, and I would have thought he mentioned this in his comments, Mr. Speaker, "It is my hope that they will agree to an emergency trip to Ottawa to express our grave concerns to the Minister." You bet, Mr. Speaker, every member of the opposition will go to Ottawa if we're given the opportunity to put the case of Western Canada farmers before this government in Ottawa who care not for the contribution that they make to Canada.

Everyone of us, God preventing, and the government will help pay for it, we will go to Ottawa and put that case to them.

But why hasn't the Minister, Mr. Speaker, talked about the other concerns? Why hasn't he talked about the fact that the freight rates are going up by some 35 percent? Are we going to be able to put that forward? Well, I don't care whether there's a resolution or not Mr. Speaker, we'll put that before that government in Ottawa when we go on that meeting, and I hope he does it immediately, the first of the week if possible. I'm sure I can go and many of my colleagues will be prepared to go to make that case, Mr. Speaker.

What does it mean to have payout out of the grain stabilization? The Minister didn't refer to that, but what he did tell us last week, that the reduction in grain prices cost some \$200 million to western Canadian farmers. Some \$200 million. An increase in freight rates of some 35 percent, I would think in the coming year, could equal the same thing to some \$200 million if it's a billion dollars over 10 years. You know, there is \$400 million taken directly out of the pockets of western Canadian farmers. Where is he on this statement on freight rates, Mr. Speaker? Those are other items on the agenda that we want to talk about when we go to Ottawa. Why did this government not support the opposition the last two years, hand running, on the removal of federal farm tax, federal fuel tax? Where was he? They voted against it. We'll bring that out on the agenda as well, Mr. Speaker, because those are immediate things that we think can help.

I, Mr. Speaker, am pleased today to be able to help to second this, as all my colleagues are, to participate in asking the Federal Government to trigger an immediate payout, an immediate payout which would mean how much? There are approximately 100,000 farmers in the program - 70 to 77 percent of the farmers are participating in Western Canada. He says \$900 million. I think it could be closer to a billion by today because the interest is adding up daily on it. It would mean an average of probably \$10,000 per farmer; \$10,000 per farmer would have a tremendous multiplier effect to the machine dealers, to the fertilizer dealers, to everyone who is dependent upon the farm community, and to the auction sales, the record numbers, and I'm sure the banks would finally take a little different attitude toward some of the farmers who are going to see them. So, Mr. Speaker, it means a lot to the economy of Western Canada. It means a lot to the economy of the machine building industry of Eastern and Central Canada. It means a lot to everyone in society that depends upon the No. 1 industry in Canada.

So therefore we take pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in actually initiating the action that this government takes today and we will be determined to continue to show leadership so that this government can stumble through the next two years of their term and we can get to an election and the people of Manitoba can place the "X" to put us back where we should be to run this province, back to prosperity.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Sir, by leave I would just like to thank the honourable members for participating in the debate and to put on the record that there was unanimous consent for this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, by leave I'd like to thank the Minister for listening, but as well I promised that I would table the press release which I had put out on March 13th, or about that time, so that the media and the government can have a record of the action that was taken by the opposition.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the debate is open. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Co-op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As usual it is both a pleasure and a privilege to have this opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech debate. As is customary I'd like to join the others who have extended their congratulations and good wishes to you, Mr. Speaker.

It is also a great privilege to be able to offer my sincere congratulations to the Mover and the Seconder of this Throne Speech. Their contribution to the debate has been both excellent and beneficial to all of us by providing new insights into the many initiatives that are included in this particular Throne Speech.

This speech will stand out in years to come as a blueprint of a vision that my government has consistently put forward to the people of this province. It speaks to the difficult economic times that every provincial government has confronted during the recent recession. It pays tribute to all Manitobans who have worked long and hard under adverse and sometimes trying circumstances to ensure that the provincial economy survived that recession. More importantly, it identifies the emerging recovery that we believe as a government is coming to pass. It charts a course for that vision that will provide new opportunities for all Manitobans in future years as we look to both our strengths and the great potential of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I've listened with some interest to the contributions of all those who have spoken in this debate. Throughout the course of that discussion it has become increasingly obvious that the Conservative Party, through the members opposite, does not share that vision, a vision of a province of hardworking individuals who look to the coming years with optimism and enthusiasm as we stand poised to take hold of a fragile recovery by investing their time and their energy in our future.

Members opposite have had very little of a positive nature to say about the major initiatives that were outlined in the Throne Speech. They have had absolutely nothing to add by way of positive comments or suggestions other than the gratuitous suggestion every once in a while that we should call an election. Well

there will be an election in due time and given the nature of this Throne Speech, given the nature of the economy today and the progress that is being made, none on this side fear that election. We welcome it.

But all things in due course, Mr. Speaker. Their continuous course of negativism quickly betrays their total lack of ideas, of imagination, of innovation. It highlights their dogmatic and ideological approach that so characterized their recent term of office and brought the province to its economic knees through their mismanagement.

As the Premier indicated last night, Conservative members of this House have cultivated a cult of complaint. But I don't want to dwell on that negativism. I don't want to dwell on their comments because they have already said far too much by way of complaint and criticism. But I do want to say that as an opposition party it is my belief that they have totally abrogated their responsibility of constructive criticism and positive suggestion. — (Interjection) — They say "not true" from across the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. The record is clear. The record is consistent. The record demonstrates to everyone who will take the time to read it or to listen to it that they are bereft of any ideas, any imagination, any innovation and that they have no vision for this province or this country.

Notwithstanding their failure during the course of this debate to play the role of a useful opposition, I do want to spend some of my time today addressing three specific areas that I believe are indicative of the potential and the promise that is part of this government's plan - a New Democratic Government's plan for the next few years.

The first of those initiatives is the recently announced federal-provincial agreement on the development of the Port of Churchill. This historic \$93 million agreement will provide long-term stability for the port and the community through a number of different imaginative and long overdue programs. It includes the construction of a Hydro line, \$35.5 million worth of hydro line to the community, and think for one moment about the investment potential that will be created in that community because of the construction of that hydro line. Think about the quality of life in the community that will be improved because of construction of that hydro line and think about the opportunities that they as an opposition had when they were in government to even talk about it, much less start that hydro line that they failed to accomplish.

The agreement will include work on the grain elevator that will make it an even more efficient operation. It will include dredging of the port area so that they will be able to accommodate larger ships. The agreement includes rehabilitation of 1,000 existing boxcars in the development of prototype cars that will serve both Churchill and a number of branch lines. I want to make the point that those boxcars, those prototype boxcars that are under development are not solely for the Port of Churchill but that they will serve many branch lines in this province throughout the next number of years.

There is a new Air Terminals Operation Building in the Port of Churchill which has great significance on that community's ability to respond as an air and marine re-supply centre. And finally contained within the agreement is a major study of Churchill's opportunities as a port, as a tourism centre, as a resource centre,

and as a re-supply centre. In other words it ensures Churchill's long-term viability through recognition of its importance and prudent investment in its future. This agreement is a major accomplishment for the people of Churchill who have been promoting the projects within it for decades to a long list of different organizations. They should take great pride and credit in this agreement. I can assure you, having been in the community most recently to talk about the agreement, they do. The members of the Hudson Bay Route Association and the other associations who have worked long and hard towards this agreement should take some pride and credit in its existence. Credit should also go to many thousands of individuals throughout the province who have spent numerous hours, weeks, years, of their time and their energy to encourage governments of all stripes to provide for a future such as is contained in the agreement.

It has been interesting to watch the reaction of the Conservative members of the Legislature to this major initiative. I think they're embarrassed by it, either that or they're trying to hide through bluff their inability during their tenure to do anything substantive for the port.

HON. H. PAWLEY: They held a meeting.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, the Premier says they held a meeting, and that's what they did. That's about all they did. They're suggesting now that all this came about as a result of that meeting in Dauphin. I should also take this opportunity to correct one misconception that the Member for Sturgeon Creek holds. He seems to suggest that it was only his colleagues that held interest in Churchill and its future when they were in government and members on this side were in opposition. He stated quite equivocally that I, as MLA for the area, never - and those are his words not my own - spoke to this issue. Mr. Speaker, that blatant misrepresentation of the facts caused me to search the records of this Legislature so that I could counterbalance his rather fictional and self-serving portrayal of the past with the actual facts.

The facts are, that when we were in opposition, my colleagues and I asked twice as many questions on both the port and the community of Churchill and that there is no individual in this House that spoke more to that issue than myself. The facts are, that when there was a Tory Government in this province, they did address the issue by holding the conference, by asking a few questions, by a little bit of fed-bashing every once in a while when the urge came over them, but they did nothing for the development of the port; they did nothing for the development of the community; but rather when they did ask questions in this House, they either took a run at the Canadian Wheat Board, which is not out of character and sometimes necessary for them and for us, or they dwelled on the possibility of a strike. They were fixated by the possibility of a strike in the community. The port of Churchill has the best labour relations record of any port in the country.

What did they do? They spent the bulk of their time asking questions about strikes that never took place. So that's an obvious reflection of what they consider to be their priorities for the development of the Port of Churchill.

The facts are they prevented the introduction of a Private Member's Resolution because they didn't like the wording that was put forward by myself. The facts are that they had four years to do something for the port and the community and they wasted it. — (Interjection) — "What did they do?" says the Member for Thompson. They held the conference, they talked about strikes, they closed the prefab plant, they failed to consolidate the tourism potential and they looked backwards throughout their tenure at the potential and the opportunities that port held.

Now, let's not dwell on what they did in the past because we have the agreement today, because I would suggest of the far-sightedness and the vision of this government. I would suggest to you that we would not have it if the Conservatives were still in power. We would not have it firstly, because they don't believe in co-operative federalism. They have been unwilling to put aside their vitriolic attacks on the Federal Government long enough to negotiate such an agreement, and even today we heard the Member for Roblin-Russell suggesting that, because we are negotiating agreements that are for the benefit of the province, we are locked in some sort of dance with the Federal Government which is certainly not the case. We would not have had it because they lacked the vision necessary to put together a package of this magnitude.

Just last year, the Member for Morris, when speaking to a Private Member's Resolution put forward by the Member for Thompson, that called for the development of the rail line and port in a process much similar to what we have today clearly demonstrated the lack of vision, when he pessimistically stated the members of the government didn't understand the disadvantages of that port. He should look back to the record because those are his words.

We on this side did not understand the disadvantages of the port. Well, maybe that's true because we didn't always look to the negative aspects of the port, we looked to the potential, to the opportunity, to the future of that port and that community.

Now, in fairness to the Member for Morris, — (Interjection) — the Member for Morris is saying, read the whole speech. I want to be fair to him. He did say that Churchill, the community and the port, particularly the port, had tremendous potential. He did say that. He also said that he felt that potential would certainly come and he's nodding his head, agreeing and he also said, "But it's not going to come in the next short number of years." That's what he said. He talked about the disadvantages, while out of the other side of his mouth he talked about the potential, but straightforward he gave it to us, it's not going to happen for the next number of years. Well it's happening now because we didn't listen to them and we wouldn't have that agreement had we listened to them.

We would not have had this agreement because members opposite are unable to put aside their dogma and their ideology that locks them into the past. Last year, when we first talked about a possible federal-provincial agreement on Churchill, the Conservatives greeted that announcement with skepticism and derision. They said, they, the Conservatives, would never be party to such an arrangement. Now, they said that last year. We have the agreement this year. What are they saying now?

Well, just the other day, the Member for Arthur, who was the Minister of Agriculture for his government and paid lip service to the port during his term of office confirmed that he would not have this agreement if he were still in power. He said in his reply to the Throne Speech that he believed that the Port of Churchill is a major port, but he was opposed to the Provincial Government putting money into its development. He specifically said that he didn't believe, "that funds that go into harbour development should be provincial money."

Well, if we had approached the Federal Government on that basis when we undertook the negotiations, there would be no agreement today. So it becomes more and more apparent that this initiative for Churchill could not and would not have taken place under a provincial Conservative Government who is of that mind or under a federal Conservative Government whose members have clearly indicated that they believe the Port of Churchill is a luxury they can't afford.

Now, my government, the New Democratic Government, has negotiated a good agreement on Churchill on behalf of the people of that community, the North in the province, because we believe in its future and we're not content with just holding conferences or bashing the Federal Government or looking over the fine lines of jurisdictional responsibility. We are proud of that effort. We are proud of the results and I would commend that agreement to you, Mr. Speaker.

There is another set of negotiations that have been recently announced that hold great promise for the North and for the province as a whole. That is the power sale agreement that will bring revenues to the province in the order of \$3.2 billion over a number of years. It has a significant impact on the potential resumption of hydro construction in Manitoba. It will mean tens of thousands of jobs in both direct and indirect employment throughout the province, and it will benefit the entire economy through new investment opportunities that arise and flow from it. It is obvious that this major firm power agreement holds considerable potential for our economy that will soon be realized.

Now, I'm not going to say that we would not have this project if the Conservatives were still the government, because unlike with the Churchill situation I don't know that to be a fact. While their initial response to our announcement has been implicitly skeptical, and some of their past Ministers who had responsibility in this area had gone beyond that in their skepticism and derision, they as a group in this Legislature have not displayed the outright opposition that they did to the Churchill project. As a matter of fact at times I would like to think that they have even been cautiously optimistic about the potential for future development that this agreement represents. Now, I can't say that's a fact but I do want to be kind and I do think that some of them on that side may believe that to be the case.

But there is a fact that does remain. They never did negotiate any such agreement when they had the opportunity to do so during their four years of government. So we must learn from that lesson that either they were incapable of negotiating such an agreement, or they didn't believe such an agreement

was of benefit to the province, or they didn't want to be involved in negotiations such as that for fear of failure. We've seen them to respond to all sorts of situations with that sort of mentality in the past, so it would not surprise me if any one or all three of those were in fact circumstances as they existed at that day.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we have negotiated such an agreement as the New Democratic Government. We are proud of that accomplishment; we are proud of the long-term benefits it promises for all Manitobans. These two major economic initiatives are only part of the vision that is presented as the Throne Speech. Unfortunately there is not enough time today to speak of all of them in such detail. I have been informed that there are other members who want to speak on the Throne Speech Debate, and I won't take my full 40 minutes for that reason. But I did want to address these two specifics today because of their impact on my own constituency and their significance to the province as a whole.

I also want to speak, as Minister responsible for Co-operative Development, to the concept of co-operatives that is identified in the Speech from the Throne. I'm encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by the progress that has been made in that area over the past few years. While it is true that co-ops, credit unions and caisse populaires, like all financial and business organizations, have felt the impact of the recession with its resultant impact on their operations. All in all I believe it is fair to say that they have weathered the storm.

Just yesterday there was an article in the paper entitled, "Credit Unions, Caisse Populaires Rebound on Finances." The fact is that those organizations are gaining strength as they prepare for that recovery which I spoke to earlier. The majority of the 103 credit unions and the 26 caisse populaires in our province play a vital role in our fiscal future, in our key to our ongoing financial health. The improvement that they have shown over the past year in performance is welcome news and I believe holds well for future activities.

At the same time new co-operatives are being developed on an ongoing basis and hold great investment potential for hundreds of thousands of Manitobans who are now a part of the co-operative movement. — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Morris has indicated some concern with that statement and is shaking his head "no." He tells me he's not shaking his head "no."

MR. C. MANNES: I'm just reading a book.

HON. J. COWAN: He tells me now he was just reading a book. Well, I'm pleased to hear that, Mr. Speaker, because I would have been concerned if his pessimism about the port extended to pessimism about the co-operative sector in the province. I'm now assured that it does not. Can he indicate if it does perhaps? I've been a member of co-ops and credit unions. — (Interjection) — Well, the member indicates now that he's been a president of a co-op for many years and I congratulate him on his service to his community and to the co-operative movement. Now, I would ask him if the pessimism that he has for the Port of Churchill extends to the co-operative movement? He won't answer that question. Well, time will tell in fact if that pessimism is abounding in his very spirit.

MR. G. MERCIER: Tell us all about the Workers Compensation Board.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, the Member for St. Norbert talks about the Workers Compensation Board. I'll tell him that the improvements in that Workers Compensation Board are benefiting workers and employers alike in this province through a more rational approach to the longstanding problems that his government turned their back on for four continuous and constant years. He will see that as a result of the work that this government undertook - and I take no credit onto myself for it - that there is going to be safer and healthier workplaces in this province, that there is going to be a more equitable system of workers compensation to benefit both employers and employees, and that if he had the courage to have taken any action when he had the opportunity we would be far better today than we are, but, no, he did not and the record is clear on that.

Yesterday the Member for St. Norbert, or the other day, asked or suggested that we had done nothing, that I had done nothing in my tenure as Minister of Workplace Safety and Health and Environment. I did not do as much — (Interjection) — Oh, he says he did not say that. He should read the record more carefully or he should choose his words more carefully because I think if he reads the record he will have a better understanding of exactly what the implications were in his statement.

But let me tell you, without attempting to be defensive about the issue, we now have workplace safety and health legislation in place that provides for more committees, more worker representatives, more training, a strength and right to refuse, a strength and right to participate that was long overdue that was suggested to his government from the very day they took office and they refused to do it. Because of that he will see that there are fewer accidents in this province over a long period of time because workers are exercising their right to refuse, their right to participate and their right to be knowledgeable about workplace accidents. Employers, because we worked with them in the development of this legislation, are participating fully in that process as well in a true co-operative fashion. Even his own members in his caucus did not vote against that legislation when it was brought forward to this House.

I'm damn proud of what I did as Minister with the help of my colleagues and the help of industry and workers in this province, and I'll stand by the record any day. — (Interjection) — Well, he says I will have to. I will compare the record of what was done in two years to the record of what they did in four years just a number of years ago, or what they did in the many years previous when they had the opportunity to provide benefits to this province through a better workplace safety and health system.

HON. G. LECUYER: We'll be proud of it.

HON. J. COWAN: The Member for Radisson says we'll be proud of it; we certainly are proud of it. I would hope, because members opposite voted for it, that they would take some pride in it as well, but that shall remain to be seen.

The value of the co-operative sector - to go back to my speech and I apologize for being distracted - should not be underestimated, Mr. Speaker. It employs approximately 10,000 employees and represents a \$1.5 billion investment in the future of this province. I'm certain the Member for Morris recognizes that value to the province as a whole and supports a co-operative sector in that way. He's indicating he does, so at least we have one member over there who sees the value.

Co-operatives also provide a mechanism for the membership of the co-operative to play an instrumental role in our economic and social development. As Minister I am optimistic and excited about the new opportunities for that development that are being considered from the co-operative perspective. We will have an opportunity to discuss those in detail throughout the course of this Session on an ongoing basis in other environments. I am looking forward to being able to inform members opposite, co-operators and other Manitobans throughout the province as to the number of new initiatives that are presently being discussed and reviewed by the government.

As I indicated earlier, there was much to talk about in the Speech from the Throne. I also said that out of courtesy to other members who wish to speak I would keep my remarks short. So unfortunately there is not enough time today to cover all the areas that I would like to.

I look forward to the other times that we will have, so that we can discuss them in similar detail and we can discuss the fact that we have the lowest unemployment rate in the country right now. We can discuss the fact that we have a mineral agreement. We can discuss the fact, as the Member for St. Norbert whispered from his seat a while ago, that we have had to make tough decisions as a government in respect to the way we undertake our operations, but that we have made those decisions from the perspective of providing a fiscally responsible government and a humane government that works to protect the essential basic services of the province, such as health, such as day care, and have done so in a humane and understanding fashion to those employees who may be affected. I look forward to that because I am not afraid of that discussion.

I wish we did not have to do those things that we had to do but the fact is the times demanded it and this government had not only the courage to do what was necessary, but had the forthrightness to do it in a humane fashion. I don't think the same can be said for every government across this land today and I'd be prepared to put our record and our process alongside the record and the process of any other government in this country or previous governments in this province, because I believe that in fact we have done what was necessary in a fiscally responsive but a humane fashion.

So I look forward to all those and others. There will be many more things to discuss during this Session. I look forward to those opportunities, but in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend this document to you, to the people of this province through you. It is a blueprint for our vision.

A MEMBER: How about the Northern Air Ambulance?

HON. J. COWAN: To the member who is now questioning about the Northern Air Ambulance, I look forward to the discussions on that as well because he has provided, unlike many of his colleagues, some constructive support, criticisms, ideas and suggestions on that particular issue which I know is important to him. It is important to me. It is important to the northern people in this province and, while I can't at this point in time suggest that everything has been done that should be done, I can tell him quite clearly and I hope he would agree that we are working on that particular issue in a systematic and a comprehensive way and that there will be a day in the not too distant future when we will be able to discuss the changes that have come about as a part of our government's plan to improve the quality of health care for all Manitobans in respect to northern transportation. I know that to be a fact. We will be able to reflect upon the major improvements together that this government will make in that area.

But to get back to the Throne Speech and the blueprint of our vision, it is a vision that promises a great future. — (Interjection) — Well, the member asked me if they're trying to make me stick to a text. Well, if they are they're certainly failing in that regard. However, I can assure him that they're not trying to make me stick to a text, but I am trying to be short in my remarks so that others can have the opportunity to speak, and in saying that, Sir, I commend that vision to you. It promises a great future for those who are willing to look to that future and to work to make it a reality. The members on this side, I can assure you, have that goal in mind. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel it kind of a privilege to follow — (Interjection) — Yes. I haven't heard yours yet. I admire the capabilities of the Minister and the Member for Churchill in his loquaciousness and the fact that he is a very colourful speaker and I can appreciate that. I think that in his own right he's very sincere about what he is saying.

But getting to the Throne Speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity and support my leader in his motion of non-confidence in the government of this province. This present government has failed in its attempt to govern this province in the past two-and-a-half years. As the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Tuxedo stated in his speech to the Throne - I just want to follow-up on what he said here and make sure that I get it right - he said, "Normally the Throne Speech sets out guide posts for action, creates optimism in the future, but this one does none of that. It is nothing more than a rehashing of previous inadequate responses to the problems and concerns of Manitobans today. A very lavish and lengthy attempt to cover up with verbiage and the abject failure of this government in its responsibilities to Manitobans." So regrettably, Mr. Speaker, he moved the motion of censorship.

He went on to say that the government has failed in its efforts to deal with the economic and fiscal affairs of this province. This government has failed to attract

private sector investment into this province and has failed to establish meaningful long-term jobs in Manitoba and as a result of these failures has lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Throne Speech deals with the Jobs Fund and job creation at some length and takes credit for having created a total of 21,000 jobs. But according to Statistics Canada only 9,000 full-time jobs and 4,000 part-time jobs were reported and a federal employment official said that the majority of these jobs had been created through the private sector and not the Jobs Fund. This government has flouted in the face of the public for the past year-and-a-half, claiming credit for creating jobs that had not been their right to claim, when in reality the \$200 million Jobs Fund had been funds shifted from departmental Estimates and used for projects that would normally have been carried out by individual departments. Many of these jobs would have existed without the Jobs Fund.

So what the government has done is to manipulate and juggle the figures and the numbers to suit their own purposes and that is to confuse the public. Mr. Speaker, this government has failed to give credit to other levels of government and the private sector where the most significant contribution is made by these other levels within the community - the impact on any economic recovery that the province might have enjoyed - so, Mr. Speaker, in effect the Jobs Fund was the smallest contributor to any economic recovery that did appear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side take note of the shift in attitude of the government. In the Throne Speech, the government at last acknowledges the role that the private sector plays in the economy of Manitoba. How many times this government has been told that the role of government should be to create the climate for industrial development and the industrialists will come and the economy will flourish, but under the socialist government that we have here today there has been a certain reluctance on the part of the private sector to get involved. The government should not be more interested in competing than supporting, so create the climate and the private sector will be there creating the jobs and the employment and the payroll that will enable every Manitoban the opportunity to live in comfort and enjoy life.

One of the better incentives that this government could do to encourage and create the climate for private sector to locate in the fair Province of Manitoba would be to repeal that grievous and detrimental 1.5 percent payroll tax. Why should any businessman deliberately go into business in Manitoba where he has to pay the 1.5 percent tax on wages that he pays his employees? This tax, along with the 1 percent corporate tax, the additional taxes on fuel, certainly make anyone wanting to locate in Manitoba think twice about locating here.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a few years back the Manitoba Economic Council warned us that we must at a faster pace create new jobs. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must also provide new opportunities, where skilled people provide job retraining, improve the character of urban living and prepare ourselves for the 21st Century. These are mighty objectives and of great intrinsic value to this province, but whether or not they are accomplished will depend entirely on the atmosphere and the environment created by the

Provincial Government. To accomplish the necessary goals, government will have to be imaginative and creative. If, as I've said before, the right climate and degree of co-operation exist between government and the business community, then the business community will respond and rise to the challenge with vigour and imagination and a new high in economic success will be achieved and everyone will benefit.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm urging this government to create that atmosphere, an atmosphere of freedom and encouragement. Let the private sector be innovative. Less government bureaucracy, discriminatory taxation and this province must have industrial growth, everything else flows from that. Without it, there is no profit, there is no salary, no wealth and as a result no public service.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am urging again this government to show some leadership, some imagination and some creativity. Make room for the private sector, create the climate and let it happen. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Throne Speech the Premier didn't provide any details on the proposed new investment program that would encourage industrial development. Why the secrecy? It is hoped that the investors out there don't know or aren't approached and if they aren't made aware of what the incentives of the province are, then where are we at? The Premier has to go out and sell his ideas and I wish him sincere good luck.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Throne Speech dealt briefly with a number of issues, but it was really a resume of the government's first years in office. The speech never really came to grips with what the government was going to do. The issues of housing, labour legislation, child and family service legislation were skipped over and no details provided. No indication of what was going to happen with the Municipal Assessment Reform report, when any action would be taken or if any would be taken. After all, the report has been under study since November of 1981, surely a decision should be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, one issue that was glossed over was the controversial proposal made in the previous Throne Speech with respect to government involvement in the life insurance and pension plan field. I gathered from the Minister, as of yesterday, there is a report. The first stage has been reported on, but it hasn't gotten beyond the Minister's desk yet, so we look forward to having that report in the very near future. But, as I've said, nothing much has been heard up to this point. I certainly look forward to hearing something from the Minister.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the priorities that the Throne Speech dealt with was the preservation of health care services. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think anyone on this side will argue with the need and the growing demand for health care. I will certainly agree with our leader when he states that we on this side are most anxious to participate with the government side to ensure that the highest standards of care are maintained. We also recognize that this government is accepting the recommendations of the Maternal and Child Health Care Task Force which was created during the term of the Member for Fort Garry.

It's interesting that the Throne Speech makes mention of co-operative housing. Mr. Speaker, I'll be interested to hear more about that and about the proposal as well as what other initiatives the government might have.

Again, I'm looking forward from the Minister of Housing as to what is happening. I do know and state here that the federal initiatives were largely responsible for the new starts in Manitoba in the past year. The \$3,000 federal grant was estimated to create approximately 500 new starts in Manitoba as well as the Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan which allowed the purchaser to deduct from his taxable income the difference between the maximum \$10,000 RHOSP limit and the amount the holder had actually contributed. The effect of these changes is to continue the incentives to first-time home buyers following the termination of the \$3,000 trend. Mr. Speaker, the conclusion arrived at was that the strong performance of the housing industry in single family housing starts confirms that a backlog of demand existed from previous years and that the enhanced affordability of home purchases created by the federal \$3,000 grant and lower mortgage interest rates have allowed a wide segment of the population into the new home market.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are several members from our side and no doubt members from the other side and their time is wasting. We only have another hour before we adjourn, so I will conclude my speech and just say that I want to reassert my stance that I made at the beginning of this, that I will be supporting the motion of my leader in which he moved non-confidence in the government for its failure in its efforts to deal with the economic, the fiscal affairs of the province.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a pleasure to participate in this debate and I have a few brief comments to make. We have heard a boring Throne Speech from a boring government, but then again what's wrong with government being boring? I didn't come here expecting Michael Jackson or Star Wars and I would rather have boring government than stupid government.

A good speech writer would have shortened the speech which would have made it less boring but wouldn't have given it any more sex appeal. It would take more than a good speech writer to make the government less boring and the Lord only knows what it would take to give this government more sex appeal. Mr. Speaker, part of my job is to listen to boring speeches and to give them.

A MEMBER: You're hearing one now.

MR. H. CARROLL: Perhaps I'm hearing one now, but the honourable member across should wait and hear the rest of what I have to say in that line. But on the whole I'm not supporting the opposition in their criticism, or at least totally. On the whole this isn't a bad Throne Speech. It's unimaginative and I'm saying thank goodness for that. It's dull and I'm saying thank goodness for that.

At this time I don't want any plights of fancy coming from the government. I want to see them digest what's already on their plate. I'm not going to get into a criticism of the Jobs Fund. I've heard so many statistics

from so many different sources that I don't know where the truth lies. Perhaps the Jobs Fund is doing a reasonable job and I'm prepared to give it the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Speaker, on a scale of 1 to 10, I'd have to rate the Throne Speech at a solid 5 which is in most cases a passing mark, and I think that's probably the only pass mark it's got from this side of the House since the debate began.

There are no new initiatives; I don't want new initiatives from this government at this time. There are no new concepts and no new visions. Everytime I hear a new concept or a new vision it means it costs me money and it means somebody is going on half cocked. So for this I praise the government that it's not trying to do things that it's not capable of doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go over the Throne Speech. Everyone has their own little pet area and they've got them all marked in yellow and made all sorts of comments, so I'm not going to get into that. I'd like to go on to mention a concern that I have is that the Throne Speeches and the general policy things don't usually cover the areas of the greatest contention. The debate on the Throne Speech will be over tonight and the biggest area of concern this Session could possibly have nothing to do with the Throne Speech.

I am hopeful that there can be a resolution to the bell-ringing situation, but if there is no resolution and this government goes ahead with its earliest intentions to solve that particular problem the Throne Speech will be a matter of history and this Session will be marred, and again, just as last Session was marred, because the government doesn't learn anything. I am concerned that the government hasn't learned. I am not convinced of any great need to change the rules this Session. I would suggest that there needs to be a change in the rules but the timing of the changes is as important as the changes themselves. I would think next year the next Session would be the time to make such changes.

A MEMBER: Let them fool around one more year.

MR. H. CARROLL: One of my friends opposite says let them fool around one more year. Speaking as an individual, I would doubt that we're going to see bell ringing. Mr. Speaker, I was with the opposition on the bell ringing because I felt that the matter was of such significance to the province that I could support it. But, Mr. Speaker, on an ordinary matter, on questions on the Budget, on questions before the House, I would not participate in a walkout and I don't think my friends on the right would participate in a walkout on ordinary matters, but on constitutional matters that's a different thing.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I was concerned that the government was going to try to bring in rule changes. Let's hope that our Speaker has enough wisdom and can prevail upon all members of this House to come up with either a compromise or the House Leader can be convinced that it should not be brought forward this Session.

I would like to suggest one last comment before I finish. In terms of the Hydro project I am an optimist; I am going to give the Minister again the benefit of the doubt. On the surface of it it appears good. I am hoping

the Minister has learned from the Newfoundland fiasco. I am hoping that there have been good people backing him up and that the contract will be a good one for Manitoba and living in that hope I will praise the government for that.

In conclusion, I am saying let's have continued boredom from this government. We don't get into trouble with them when they're boring.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you. Well, Mr. Speaker, in that case I'll try to be boring. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to enter into the debate on the Throne Speech. I will try to resist what I've done in the past and that is that I have condemned the opposition for their negativism as they go about attempting to tear apart the proposals and programs that our government has put in place.

I would also attempt to stay away from focusing on their previous speeches over the last number of years as well as their record in government, when they continuously went about their business with the "what-can-we-do attitude" towards the problems that face Manitoba. These people left the province in record numbers, Mr. Speaker, and of course they thrust with those lack of constructive policies to deal with the problems facing Manitoba, thrusting Manitoba into a recession ahead of the rest of the country, here in Manitoba. A dubious distinction that they could take credit for, Mr. Speaker.

The effect of those negative policies, and I won't focus on them as I said in any great length, and the fact that they did not keep their promises that they made in 1977 to the people of Manitoba, carry out the kinds of programs that they indicated they would, thrust Manitoba, as I said, into a recession and was the one that continued somewhat as we came into government, one that we had to grab hold of and stop, reverse the process and turn things around in this province. It did take some time and they even showed it on their graphs that they sent out in their publication to the people of Manitoba in the constituencies that they represent.

Our Throne Speech, as was outlined here just a week ago, showed how we took those measures, how we took those steps to reverse the negative effects of the lack of good government over the previous four years, and that was a very difficult thing. We faced a lot of difficult problems in this province as a result of those policies, and as a result as well of a national and international recession that affected all governments and all provincial governments and national governments in the Western World. But we have had the best record, Mr. Speaker, clearly, in reversing the disastrous effects of that recession and turning things around in a positive way here in Manitoba.

We have an excellent record in that regard, Mr. Speaker, and now with the Throne Speech we have put in place the kind of economic strategy that we will employ to continue on that road to recovery with some changes of course as we move forward to longer-term economic development planning in this province. We're going to do it positively, co-operatively and in unison with the people of Manitoba as we have over the last two years, Mr. Speaker.

I want to mention how the speech goes positively into the Royal Visit, and that's one thing that we in Dauphin are very pleased about, that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth will be coming to Manitoba, will be spending some time in Dauphin on July 25th. That is a very important occasion for the people of the Parkland region of Manitoba, the fact that they will have a visit from Her Majesty, and at the same time she will be participating in an historic occasion there and that is the opening of the Selo Ukraina, the new Ukrainian village site on the slopes of Riding Mountain.

That site that has been under development for the last couple of years is a beautiful place. It will provide a permanent facility for the celebration development of the Ukrainian culture in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it will make Dauphin and the Parklands region a centre for the Ukrainian culture in North America, and in addition to doing that it will provide a facility that can be used by people from all over Manitoba for various functions and conventions and so on. It will bring people in. It is a tourism facility; it is to be used by all people of Manitoba. It doesn't matter whether they are Ukrainian or any other ethnic background or what kind of background they have, Mr. Speaker, they will be able to utilize those facilities. It is a permanent facility that will provide, as I said, a tourism attraction for our area, and we're very encouraged with that facility.

The province has been the major investor in that \$3.5 million development there; the first phase is \$3.5 million. The province has been the major investor because we have recognized the importance of the multicultural make-up of our province, and in recognizing that we are encouraging the development and the practice of the culture in our province's various minority groups and cultures, and assisting in the development of the cultural mosaic that makes our province and our country so unique.

That is one of the major things that have taken place, but it is consistent with the excellent efforts that our government has made in a number of other areas to provide employment in our area. I, as the MLA for the area, speak with a great deal of pride at the many accomplishments that we have that we can point to that demonstrate the sincere efforts that our government has put in providing not only employment but in lasting facilities, employment in the short term and employment in the long term, for the people of that region as well as for all parts of Manitoba.

The Selo Ukraina is now employing 163 people on the site and in other sites and support activities. These people would have otherwise been unemployed. They would have been either in many instances collecting Unemployment Insurance or they may have been on Social Assistance. They are there working, productive citizens. They are happy, their families are happy. The people of that area are encouraged by this development, encouraged by the fact that they have now been able to find meaningful employment. It is projected that there will be approximately 50 or 60 permanent jobs created as a result of that development there for many of the people in that area who will be indeed bilingual in Ukrainian and English in order to work in that facility. So there's a lot of hope in this province, Mr. Speaker, for the many other linguistic groups, and this is but one example of that right in my own constituency.

I want to therefore add my deep feelings toward the visit of Her Majesty on July 25th. I have just had the

opportunity to announce a co-ordinating committee chaired by the mayor of Dauphin, Mr. Lawrence Milner, who will be chairing the co-ordinating committee. We also have a number of other prominent people from the community who are ensuring that Her Majesty's visit will be planned down to the smallest detail and will be a memorable occasion with many people having the opportunity to participate in the planning activities and in putting on various displays and participating in entertainment for Her Majesty when she is in Dauphin.

That is only one example of the kind of undertakings that we have taken by our government, Mr. Speaker. We have as well had a record of success in the area of the Municipal Assets Program which has done a great deal for communities in my area. Bridges for the Rural Municipality of Ethelbert - badly needed bridges that took into their consideration their desire to put forward their priorities and then to put in place the structures with the assistance of the Provincial Government's programs as well as their ingenuity in putting together the most cost effective kinds of structures. They have worked closely with the Provincial Government, with the people in their area and it is another example of the fact that co-operation, working in co-operation with local governments, working in co-operation with local non-profit organizations, working in co-operation with local businesses and working in co-operation with the Federal Government, we are able to deliver on programs that we otherwise would not be able to do. That has been a hallmark of our government throughout.

We have demonstrated that in the Main Street Manitoba Program as well, which brings communities together, working towards a common goal. We have demonstrated that in our Careerstart Program, working with business and non-profit organizations and local governments. We have demonstrated that in our Employment Action Program and our Northern Employment Program, the NEED Program, in agriculture with the Beef Program that was in place, the Interest Rate Relief that was there during a time of crisis and hopefully one that will not continue over a long length of time. So we have focused on economic development, meaningful projects, working together with other levels of government and local people in the communities. And not the least of our successes would be the sub-agreements that we have signed and they have been referred to at great length by some of my colleagues.

Certainly, the Member for Churchill, the Minister for Co-Operative Development, has outlined clearly the kinds of accomplishments that were involved in the Churchill sub-agreement and some that he certainly takes a great deal of pride and should take a great deal of credit for because of the efforts that he has put into ensuring that agreement would take place.

He indicated very clearly that the difference between our government and the opposition over there, if they were in government, and he quite rightly said, I believe that agreement would never have taken place had that government been in office at this time. There are a number of reasons why that wouldn't have taken place. It wouldn't have taken place because they were incessantly fighting with the Federal Government during their time in office. They were not looking to co-operate and to get things done, they were more concerned with who they could blame, and that led to a lot of failures at the federal level.

As well, they did not have the positive commitment to the Port of Churchill. They said it was some kind of dream that couldn't come true. But we have made a practice on this side of the House over the last two-and-a-half years of making those kind of difficult things come true, Mr. Speaker, and we have a record of success in that regard. We are not afraid to go out, even though things may be difficult, and to make them happen and not to be concerned with whether we get all of the credit for it. I found it so ironic when the Member for Assiniboia says that we failed to give credit to the private sector and others, a few moments ago in his speech. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We have taken the position right from the beginning that it doesn't matter whether we get the credit for it. We want it to happen, so we are giving credit to the private sector. We've said that over and over again. They are participating and they have confidence in this province, much more - if they ever listened to the opposition there would be absolutely no confidence in this province. They have indicated that in opposition but the private sector has the confidence, but they need something to rally around. When the opposition was in government, they said, well we'll sit back here and let the private sector do it and we saw what happened. There was no leadership, nothing happened. Now, by working as a team together with the private sector, we are making it happen. So it's not a change in attitude that you see in the Throne Speech this year, it's an attitude that we've had and that we've continuously put forward as a constructive way to get things moving in this province, and we're doing that, Mr. Speaker, not only as I said with the private sector, but with other levels of government.

It was demonstrated, I guess by getting results, the former Minister of Agriculture said today that we're dancing cheek to cheek with the Federal Minister, but what he didn't say is that we've got results. We haven't got ourselves hung up as to whether we're giving credit to someone else. That is precisely what that opposition worries about continuously. They're not concerned about getting results, they're more concerned about blaming other people.

I want to indicate to you that the transportation sub-agreements that we signed, the Churchill sub-agreement and transportation development have a great deal of potential for this province.

Let's talk about roads a little bit. The members of the opposition will see the road program very shortly, but before we get into that, what I have attempted to do in this sub-agreement is to get recognition by the Federal Government that they should be responsible for interprovincial trade routes in this province. I think that most people who drive down the Trans-Canada Highway expect that the Federal Government is paying for it. It says Trans-Canada, they just assume that federal dollars are flowing into the interprovincial trade routes, but that's not the case and we think that is wrong. We have attempted in our discussions to get some accommodation by the Federal Government in that regard and we've had some difficulties and that's acknowledged, but that didn't stop us from proceeding in those areas we could get common agreement. We will continue to press in that area.

In addition to that, we believe the Federal Government has a responsibility to recognize there is a cost

transference as a result of rail line abandonment. This has taken place throughout the province over the last number of years. It has cost the Government of Manitoba a great deal of money in having to upgrade roads that would not otherwise have to be upgraded to a certain standard so that they can take the increased traffic, the truck traffic and so on that is so damaging to the roads. We have not got a commitment from the Federal Government to actually participate in those costs.

We have indicated that we believe they are in the neighbourhood of \$52 million, however what we have got in the sub-agreement is a recognition that there is indeed a cost transference and they are prepared to enter into a federal and provincial study to indicate exactly what those costs are and then we are of the belief that once that has been determined, we will have some commitment from the Federal Government to participate in those extra costs in financing that.

So, that is a step in the right direction. It's not what we wanted, we would have liked to have seen dollars in that regard, but we're the ones that have determined the costs right now and what we want is now that the Federal Government would participate and therefore they would arrive at costs that they are part of and that they have to, therefore, recognize and acknowledge. I think that we will be moving in the right direction through that agreement. So that is a step in the right direction.

Now, I want to mention a few of the major developments at the Port of Churchill because we believe that the port is very important to the furtherance of economic development in this province. The highway to Churchill will cost in the neighbourhood of about \$100 million and if the members opposite think that at this time is a wise investment when we already have a rail bed there that we're not utilizing to the degree that we should, well then they should go ahead and indicate that they want to spend that \$100 million on a new highway to Churchill, if they think that is wise money at this time.

Mr. Speaker, what is so important is that we utilize the facilities that are there and we find ways of stabilizing that line that is there already. Mr. Speaker, there have been great strides made over the last number of years by CN and there are tests that have been carried out with cryo-anchors on the Thicket and Herchmer subdivisions of the Churchill line. There have been strides made there and they have been experimenting with ways of stabilizing that line and they've had some successes. We believe that has potential as well. But in addition to that, if we can't stop all of the heaving that goes on on that line because of permafrost and stabilize that line, we can move towards the low centre of gravity light-weight rail car that could be used on the Churchill line. That has enormous potential for that line and that is exactly where we would like to see our investment go with regard to rail cars, not in the development and rehabilitation of boxcars, but in the new lightweight, low centre of gravity rail car that the C.N. feels that they can have ready for testing, a prototype, by next year. That car will of course ensure the life, the future of Churchill, the line of Churchill. Even if they are not able to stabilize the line to 100 tonne status, it will ensure that line with the 60 tonne low centre of gravity cars and they will be used, as has

been indicated by my colleague earlier, on branch lines throughout Manitoba.

The members of the opposition would be familiar with the fact that there are many miles of branch lines that are not at the 100 tonne capacity and they are not able to accommodate these larger heavier cars. What we are going to ensure by having a lightweight car not only for Manitoba but also for Saskatchewan, which has a lot of branch lines as well, is that these branch lines can be maintained and kept open without the tremendous expense of upgrading them to 100 tonne hopper car standard. That is a very important development that has major implications for rural areas of Manitoba and that is one of the greatest accomplishments I feel is contained within that sub-agreement. I don't think they're aware that is an important development. — (Interjection) — That's right, that is a very important development and we can't really overemphasize the importance of that to rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we have a commitment from the Federal Government, the coast guard, to improve the support and the shipping route. There's a great deal that has to be done with regard to extending the shipping season and that really is the key to the future of Churchill. The development of other transportation, other commodities through Churchill is very important, but what is more important is the fact that shipping season be made longer, so that it will ensure the economic viability of that port. We cannot have all of the prognosis at this time, all of the estimates, for the viability of the Port of Churchill is based on the short shipping season as it exists now. What is important is to use the technology that is available in the Scandinavian countries to employ that same kind of technology in the straits, in the area of Churchill, to ensure a longer shipping season. We have the confidence to do that and we intend to go ahead and move in that direction. It's not a dream; it's not something that can't happen. The Member for Morris talks about something away off in the future. We will make it happen very very soon, once we have established the confidence in that port, that we are able to keep that season open, then of course the customers are going to start dealing through that port, Mr. Speaker. We're not going to wait with that, we're going to move full ahead with that. We intend to move forward.

Now, the Canadian Wheat Board is a problem. Certainly the Canadian Wheat Board is not able at this time to give the kind of commitments that we would like to see in that port. We would like to see commitments of a million tonnes annually. We are not able to get that at this particular time. Now, there are problems with publicly stating a certain commitment through the port because the customers would be aware of that, and of course it would drive the prices down because they knew that the government was committed to hauling a certain amount of grain through that port. That is a problem.

But on the other hand, once the shipping season has been expanded and we can demonstrate that we can do that, more and more customers are going to start utilizing that port because it does have economic advantages to them and that can be offered. It is cheaper to haul out of Churchill and that's been demonstrated. So we are able to do that.

I think the new tug at the Port of Churchill is a very important development in this agreement. A new tug

that will be constructed right here in Manitoba and used at the Port of Churchill - 2,600 horsepower tug.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken — (Interjection) — 2,600, two thousand, six hundred horsepower tug. What we have done, Mr. Speaker, is taken the attitude of why not, when we're dealing with the Port of Churchill, rather than asking why all the time. Why should we do that? And that is why things are happening there because we have taken a positive attitude and said, look it, why not? Why can't we do it? - and it is happening and that's the result that you get.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into all of the other details. I'm confident that the shipping season can be expanded. There are other problems there. They're not all solved but with a positive and constructive attitude by everyone working together they will happen, and the Hudson Bay Route Association was pleased to hear of that announcement in Saskatoon just the other day, when the Federal Minister of Transport and myself were there.

But the Minister from Saskatchewan said something - well, it wasn't the Minister that was supposed to be there - they sent the Minister of Urban Affairs to represent him. In his speech, which was the Minister of Agriculture's speech, constantly referred to the challenge that you have. Your challenge, he said to the Hudson Bay Route Association; and therein lies the difference between this government, a New Democratic Government, and a Conservative Government. That's not their challenge, it is our challenge and if we don't accept some of those responsibilities and work together constructively we won't get results. So it was a very good speech and it recognized all of the problems facing the Hudson Bay Route Association in developing the Port of Churchill, but it did not acknowledge that those problems were not their problems, they were our problems and that we together have to find the solutions to them as we are doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to turn it over to the opposition now to continue. I had a lot of other material that I wanted to talk about - the Transportation Institute at the University of Manitoba, but I don't want to — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Health says I should, but I know that the opposition members are getting kind of itchy and the Member for Fort Garry is anxious to speak as well, and I have courtesy in allowing him, of course, to speak even though my time isn't up.

I'd just like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, that we have focused on kind of a co-operative attitude right from the beginning in our government, working with other levels of government to make it happen. It is working; let's recognize that in a positive way. Our strategy is turning things around in his province. We are working with the private sector; we are working with the local governments, working with senior levels of governments and we hope that that will continue. We have reversed that long slide downward that this province was in during those dark days of Conservative Government. We have reversed that and now we are climbing back up hill again and we will continue to climb upwards.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to acknowledge the generosity of the Honourable

Minister of Highways for relinquishing the floor to provide the opportunity for me and one or two others perhaps to add our contributions to the Throne Speech Debate at this juncture.

My opening words would be congratulatory words to you, Mr. Speaker, a distinguished officer of this Chamber who for many years now has served this Chamber and all who sit in it and the Province of Manitoba with great distinction in my view. No more honour and distinction descended upon you than was the case in the last convulsive Session of this Legislature, Sir, and I wish to note for the record my respect and admiration for the way that you handled this Legislature during one of the most tumultuous periods in the history of this province, and certainly one of the most convulsive with which I and many of us in this Chamber have been associated in the past several years.

I'd also like to offer my words of congratulations to the Mover and Seconder of the address and reply to the Speech from the Throne and commend them for their contribution to the new Session now under way. I would especially like, Sir, to extend my congratulations on the record to my new leader, the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, who assumed leadership of the party before the initiation of this Session of the Legislature, of course, but who came into this new Session of the Legislature as Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, for the first time at the outset of a legislative session. So that was a significant event last Thursday, when the Session got under way, and the future Premier of the Province, the leader of my party assumed his position in his official leadership role, and I want to offer my congratulations and my recognition of that historical fact for the record.

Finally, Sir, let me say we are all excited about the fact that this is a particularly historic year for Manitoba from the perspective of important royal and religious visitors. We all look forward with great excitement and interest, I'm sure, to the forthcoming visit of Her Majesty and His Royal Highness and, subsequent to that, the papal visit, the visit of His Holiness Pope John Paul, in September.

So, 1984 is shaping up as a particularly historic and spectacular year in terms of public events for this province. I join with all members of this Chamber in looking forward to those two specific events, in particular, and perhaps Sir, to a third one, perhaps a third historic event. Perhaps a provincial election that will see the election to office of the Progressive Conservative Party of my Leader as Premier and a new era for the province. We can all join, I'm sure, in looking forward with hope to that eventuality. If it doesn't occur in 1984 it certainly will occur within the next two or two-and-a-half years. If we're fortunate it might occur this year, Sir.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Why are you leaving?

MR. L. SHERMAN: My friend, the Honourable Government House Leader, asks me why am I leaving. I haven't noticed that up to this juncture that I've left, Sir. I'm here, I'm participating in this debate, I intend to participate in this Session, I intend to give the Government House Leader and his colleagues as much

trouble and as much difficulty as I can, as much in the future as in the past, and I take life a day at a time and a sitting at a time, and I assure the Government House Leader I'm here and I want to join with him in building a better province and in ushering in a new era for this province. To that end I'll be working very hard to bring down the government of which my honourable friend is a member.

Mr. Speaker, this of course is the Throne Speech Debate, but I do want to say, Sir, and I do want to note, that in preliminaries to tonight's budget a spokesman for the government, and most notably the First Minister himself, have taken pains to stress that budgetary savings, if there are to be any this year, and reductions in the deficit, if there are to be any this year, will not be achieved at the expense of social programs. That point has been made in the course of the Throne Speech Debate, both in informal debate in the Chamber, and outside the Chamber in comments and commentary by spokesmen for the government, including the First Minister, and I want to note that at this juncture because, in my view, one of the omissions of a significant nature in the Throne Speech was any substantial or meaningful reference to some social programs.

One, in particular, a social program to fight child abuse, that I think is of extreme and growing importance in our society, and should have been included in the Government's address to its program for the coming year. I don't note in the Throne Speech any reference except a passing and oblique one to the subject of child abuse and it's discussed in connection with a short paragraph in the Throne Speech on the subject of violent pornography. Other than that there is no reference to the subject itself, and yet we have recently appearing in our midst a report by the Ombudsman dealing with an investigation into the handling, or the mishandling, of a particularly unsavory and infamous child abuse case that occurred in this province, or that came to light in this province last year, that occurred under the aegis of the Children's Aid Society of Eastern Manitoba and that pointed up for all of us in this Chamber and outside what a serious social blight child abuse has become.

Perhaps, Sir, it has always been there in significant dimensions but, in any case, it has become a known social blight of considerably broader, considerably more dimensions, in recent years than was the case in the past. I think that that particular case to which refer, that came under the aegis of CAS Eastern Manitoba and that was the subject of the Ombudsman's review points up some very critical lessons for us in terms of what we need in our child welfare system, our child protection system in this province. Therefore, I say that when spokesmen for the government, including the First Minister, point out that whatever they're going to do this year they're going to do without impeding or in any way detracting from social programs, I say to them that there's some social programs which they are not properly addressing at the present time in any event. It is certainly to be hoped that no budgetary savings will be achieved by even tighter penny pinching where social programs are concerned. There is more that needs to be done in the area of social programming. There is much more that needs to be done in the area of protection of children against child abuse and I would

hope, and we will know when the Budget is introduced, but I would hope that there are genuinely and sincerely no savings going to be achieved at the expense of social programs.

Further to that I would hope that there are genuine and sincere efforts made to develop new and stronger social programs in this province, and to pay for them out of the available revenues, and to stimulate the economy in such a way as to provide the necessary revenues to give us the programs that we need. There are those important, burdensome, painful social blights, such as the one I mentioned, which is coming more and more to light through improved reporting procedures, through perhaps a greater and more developed sense of courage on the part of victimized children, and we've got to be in a position to respond in a healthy and a positive and a constructive way. In fact, we've got to be in a position to intervene where necessary and prevent and protect before those incidents occur.

That is an area of social programming that I think, Sir, has not been given the proper kind of attention, certainly not the kind of attention that I would have expected in the Throne Speech Debate. In fairness, I must note that, in response to questions that I asked her in the House last week, the Minister for Community Services indicated that she has taken some steps in concert with her colleague the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education to develop new guidelines for the war on child abuse, to develop new approaches and techniques for protecting children at risk, and for training social workers, case workers and supervisors in the child welfare field in such a way as to be able respond much better to this problem. That, Sir, is a subject that remains in the abstract, an initiative that remains in the abstract at the moment. We will have to see how effectively the Minister of Community Services intends to move in that area. Certainly the Throne Speech made no specific reference to it or mention of it. So the jury is out on that initiative. I'll give the Minister of Community Services the benefit of the doubt for the moment but I will be watching, as will my colleagues, with great interest to see just how strongly, keenly and sincerely she really feels and believes that those kinds of initiatives are required and that she is undertaking them.

In the process of undertaking them, Sir, I would hope that she will look at a total review of the mechanics in place in her department, in government and in the child welfare system throughout the agencies in place out there right now - the Children's Aid Societies and the other child protection agencies - to determine that the right, modern, contemporary and sufficiently powerful mechanisms are in place to hold that social blight to a minimum and to give children at risk all the protection beforehand, that we can possibly summon for them. So, Sir, that's one area that has attracted my attention because of the repeated references by spokesmen for the government, as I say, to the fact that whatever savings they occur this year will not be attempted at the expense of social programs.

The other is the important complement and counterpart of social programming and that is programming in the health field, that is the health system, the health service in our province. I want to spend a few minutes this afternoon making some

reference to what I think are some very important challenges facing the current Health Minister, where our Manitoba Health System is concerned.

I believe, Sir, that Manitobans are very worried about their health care system today. In fact, I would say that I have heard more expressions of concern, fear and worry by Manitobans about their health care system today than I have at any time in the past 15 years. I know that there has been an increase in acuity, acute care cases, an increase in illnesses of the elderly, an increase in the population of the elderly themselves, increased pressures on our system because of shortages of certain specialities because of developing technology and obsolescence of existing technology and all the costs that are attendant thereon, and the very difficult challenge that we always face in this country, in this province, of maintaining our universally insured health care system, because it depends on dollars and dollars are short.

I know all those things are there. They're real and they're behind this problem today, but I want to emphasize that that is no excuse for inaction or no excuse for apathy, that the problems are there and they're greater than they ever have been. If they're not any one particular person or any one particular office's fault - and no one is looking for scapegoats in this situation - they are the challenge and the problem for all of us and it's the responsibility of the government and the Minister of Health, the Health Ministry, to take the necessary lead and do what's necessary to reinforce the system and restore people's confidence in it.

So I think that it's important to take a few moments at this stage before the Throne Speech Debate ends, as we had into the more practical aspects of the current Session to emphasize for the record, for the Minister of Health, for my own colleagues and members opposite, my concerns as health critic for the opposition about the atmosphere and climate existing in our population today where the health care system is concerned. Again and again, in letter after letter - and I intend to refer to some of them - in phone call after phone call, in visitation after visitation, I have people, Manitobans in all walks of life, laying on me today their deep anxiety and distress over what they feel is a deteriorating health care system, what they feel as inferior health care to what was available here in this province a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech of 12 days ago made frequent and repeated references to health care and the fact that a top priority this year for that government over there will be the reinforcement and strengthening the maintenance of our Manitoba health care system. Well, that's good news to tens of thousands of Manitobans, Sir. That's good news, but it also points up the fact that the Minister of Health has his work cut out for him. It's going to be extremely difficult for him to maintain, let alone reinforce and strengthen our health care system, unless the economy of this province generates the revenues that he needs to do the job that needs to be done in health care and unless he is given the opportunity and the support from his colleagues to shift the system into the 1980's and the 1990's into a modern setting, to get away from those locked-in empires - not only of concrete but of attitude - locked-in empires of attitude in health care in which we've been trapped for so long. Further to that, he's

going to have a very difficult time unless he gets support from his colleagues and counterparts across this country to change the health care legislation in this country in such a way as to reward initiative and creativity.

That's one of the things that disturbs me most about The Canada Health Act, Mr. Speaker. I have made reference to my disappointment in The Canada Health Act before this and I make it again today. There have been some spokespersons including no less a distinguished commentator and expert in health care than Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, who feel that The Canada Health Act just passed by Parliament is on balance, positive, effective and very useful. I would say that even my own Federal colleagues in Ottawa feel very substantially that way and I think that the Minister of Health, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, sitting opposite me in this Chamber feels that way.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't share their view at all. I don't think The Canada Health Act achieves one scintilla of what we need to achieve to reinforce and strengthen our health care system in this country. It gets at those twin ogres that I've referred to before, extra billing and user fees, which seem to preoccupy the current national Minister of Health. I do not deny that extra billing and user fees are highly undesirable. I agree that they're highly undesirable. I don't want them any more than my federal colleagues want them or than the Minister of Health for Manitoba wants them. But they're not the problems that are assailing the health care system in this country today, Mr. Speaker, and they're certainly not the problems that are assailing the health care system in Manitoba.

The big problem, I suppose you could say the bottom line is money, although I've argued and I would argue again that pouring more funding into the system isn't going to help it. All that does is tend to crystallize the attitude of people, all of us, myself included, who've always said the government will bail us out. That's no answer, no solution to health care problems. I hate to be the one who would repudiate or reject an offer on the part of Ottawa to put more money into the system, but since they haven't offered to put more money into the system, I can say, Mr. Speaker, that at this juncture I don't want it anyway. I don't think it would be good for the system and I think that the Minister of Health and I agree to a certain extent on that point, although none of us would turn additional dollars down.

But one of the great evils, the great problems that has plagued our system in the last few years is the fact that it began with the universally insured nature of it which built up the kind of psychology, the kind of mind set which led us all to believe over decades in this country that there was no tomorrow. The money was here; it was there to fund the health care system, it would always be there and we wouldn't have to worry about running out of money, we wouldn't have to worry about tomorrow. Well, we've learned better in the international, national, provincial and local economic riggers of the past 10 years.

We've learned that the money isn't always there and now it's very difficult to fund and finance that highly expensive and costly system, but the mind set remains, the mind set that says well, the government will pick up the bills, so if we pour more money into the system all it does is perpetuate that mind set and that's why I say, Sir, that that isn't the answer.

The answer is in creativity, in innovation and imagination that modernizes the system and that can be encouraged by governments through amendments to and improvements in existing health care legislation in this country. That is what the Canada Health Act does not do. That's where it fails; that's where it lets us down; that's why I'm so disappointed in it.

I think there was a golden opportunity for the legislators of this country to take The Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act of 1958, Universal Hospitalization and The Medical Care Act of 1968, Universal Medicare, the two lynch pins, the two foundation stones of Federal Health Care programming and financing in this country and reform them. I think there was a golden opportunity to modernize them.

I think there was a golden opportunity to look at them and say okay, those are great foundation stones. We put them in place in 1958, that's 26 years ago, and 1968, that's 16 years ago, we haven't changed them since and yet the world has changed. Society has changed; demographics have changed; professional balances have changed; health requirements have changed; technology has changed; money supply has changed; everything has changed except our health care legislation, which still is geared to funding a system which is based on the conventional bricks and mortar hospital of 1,000, 1,200, 1,300 beds all filled; which still is based on the repair system of medicine, the curative system of medicine; which still is based on a Medicare fee schedule which recognizes nothing but volume, rewards no quality, no talent but volume; which still is based on a system which says that this health care programming spectrum of ours is geared to attendance upon a patient by a doctor, by a medical practitioner in a hospital setting; that care and attention should be carried out in hospital settings; that still is based on a system which underutilizes much of our manpower and womanpower in the health care professional field and which maintains a professional status quo, maintains professional empires and maintains competition between those empires and which continues to be based on a system that is rooted and founded in all those creeds that are now somewhat outmoded and outworn. So that's the problem, Sir.

That legislation, 1958 and 1968 positively and in an exciting way, provided us with the wherewithal legislatively and fiscally to fund and finance an institution, the Universally Insured Canadian Health Care System that was going to be one of the wonders of the world, perhaps the eighth wonder of the world, certainly one of the envies of the world and that was a marvelous thing. But in the ensuing quarter century, while all those factors and aspects of life and health and health care and money supply have changed, that conventional edifice has remained the same. So now we have, in effect, what is a dinosaur in our health care system and the legislation of 1958 and 1968 is still geared to building that kind of hospital, maintaining that kind of professional set of empires and maintaining that kind of general health care attitude and general health care mind set.

What we needed when legislators sat down to look at The Canada Health Act and look at what might be done in terms of health care legislation and provision of legislation to reinforce and rebuild and strengthen our system, was amendments to that legislation or new

legislation that was going to reward new kinds of health care programming; that was going to reward the transference of the health care system from the institutionalized setting into the community; that was going to reward a system that was geared to prevention, to keeping people well rather than simply to repairing those who were ill; that was going, for example, to reward the concept of the Day Hospital, that keeps people on their feet and in their homes and in their communities rather than in a conventional institution where they are bedridden for long periods of time.

That sort of thing could be achieved through legislation that rewarded those changes but The Canada Health Act contains none of that, Mr. Speaker. So this is where I say that opportunity for me represents a golden opportunity missed, and I do not share the enthusiasm of some people for it. I think the enthusiasm in large part stems from the fact that it got through without too much acrimonious debate, so politicians of all stripes are inclined to take a rather relieved view of it but that's small consolation for a golden opportunity missed. I think it would have been better to have had whatever was necessary in the way of head-to-head debate and to have produced a formula and a blueprint that would enable us to modernize the system, to get into the 1990's and beyond. So, Mr. Speaker, that's one of the facts of life and realities of life that the Minister of Health of this province and other provinces have to live with in the immediate future.

I repeat, that the Minister of Health for Manitoba is going to have to work very hard, very hard to live up to the promises of the Throne Speech about reinforcing and maintaining our health care system. In fact, Sir, I think that there was an overemphasis in the Throne Speech on the strengthening of our health care system. It indicated to me that the government is very conscious of the fact that they have stood witness to, whether they overtly permitted it or not, they have stood witness to a very serious decline and deterioration in the past two years of the health care system in this province, so that again and again repeatedly in the Throne Speech they mentioned how much importance they were going to place on health care. How much emphasis on health care?

Well, as Shakespeare said, or to paraphrase Shakespeare, Mr. Speaker, methinks the Throne Speech doth protest too much, there was too much emphasis on it. It seemed to indicate that they were saying we've let this province down; we've let the health care system slide; it's deteriorated. We've got to take the initiative and try to convince people that we're health care system conscious, and that's what we're going to be concentrating on.

Well, I give the Minister credit for wanting to concentrate on it, but I say that he's got his work cut out for him because without the kinds of things that should have been achieved through the new Canada Health Act and without the healthy economy that can give him the fiscal resources he needs to do the things in health care that should be done, he's going to have a very very difficult time, Mr. Speaker. But Manitobans will be grateful for his pledge, grateful for the Throne Speech references and we'll be watching with keen interest to see whether the government can deliver and is sincerely interested in attempting to deliver on that promise, Sir.

There are some other specific situations in the health care field generally that I would like to mention while I have the opportunity. I'd like to remind the Minister of the problems that he faces and we all face in maintaining the quality and level of care and standards of efficiency for which the Health Sciences Centre has long been noted. All of those ingredients are under relative siege at the Health Sciences Centre at the present time. There is great difficulty being experienced at that major tertiary care referral centre and teaching centre right now, Sir, in maintaining the kinds of administrative personnel required to keep that hospital at a high quality level. There are difficulties at St. Boniface General, as the Minister knows, Mr. Speaker, and I've had questions asked of me very recently about the full operation of the new CT scanner there. That was a cancer fighting component that has been long awaited and much anticipated at St. Boniface and I'm not sure yet, Sir - perhaps the Minister and I can deal with this later on during the discussion of his Estimates - but I'm not sure yet whether that very important piece of technical equipment is fully in place and fully operative at St. Boniface, but it was something that was committed by our government in fiscal 1981-82, committed in our capital program of 1981. I was reassured by the current Minister that it would be in place at St. Boniface and the question remains as to whether at this moment it is in place. The Minister indicates to me that it's opening on Friday. Well, that's welcome news after a long wait.

The Minister is familiar, Sir, with some of the latest incident reports that have been produced by the Manitoba Organization of Nurses Associations, dealing with complaints that have been lodged over the past year by nurses in Manitoba health care facilities which point up a continuing, ongoing, critical problem in terms of patient care, levels of patient safety, Mr. Speaker. I know the Minister has appointed a committee under Mr. Justice O'Sullivan to look into the nursing situation but again, that appears to be a long overdue reaction to a situation which was brought to the Minister's attention some considerable time ago.

The latest reports from the Manitoba Organization of Nurses Associations indicate that the incidents of patient difficulty in terms of delivering patient care, the incidents in hospitals reported by nurses of inadequate patient care and safety exceed those reported in the previous year by more than 100, Mr. Speaker, and those reported in the previous year were at a serious level, a serious total that was the subject of some debate between me and the Minister one year ago in this House and that situation is continuing to worsen and deteriorate.

The Licenced Practical Nurses, the LPNs of this province, Mr. Speaker, have raised again and again their serious concern and worry about their future, their future role and status in the Health Care System in this province, how they fit into the system and what the future is for them. At a recent conference of the Manitoba Health Organizations, Sir, there was a major seminar of LPNs dealing with what they called the politics affecting the utilization of the LPN and attention was paid at that point in time to the attitudes of the current government or whatever government, the attitudes of the Government of the Day, where the role of individual nursing categories is concerned. I said to

that seminar that I had received many complaints from Brandon, from western Manitoba, southwestern Manitoba last year, from LPNs who had been given every indication in the hospitals and health facilities in which they worked that they were going to be phased out, that their category was going to be phased out. Whether that came down to them through the administrations of their health facilities as a signal from the Government of the Day, I don't know, Sir, I have no way of knowing that, Mr. Speaker, but the fact is that a serious morale problem was created in the LPN category. That is another challenge which the Minister must deal with.

I have had complaints in recent weeks, continuing complaints, from veterans who normally would have received beds, care and attention at Deer Lodge Hospital but who still, Sir, one year after the takeover by the province of Deer Lodge Hospital are still unable to get beds, whose doctors are unable to have them admitted to community hospitals in line with the assurance that was given when Deer Lodge was taken over. At the time of that takeover there was supposed to be a guarantee of a certain number of beds in community hospitals for veterans, Mr. Speaker. They're having extreme difficulty getting into them and what has happened is that where they could rely on the service and the treatment that they always got at Deer Lodge, they now can't rely on any assured treatment at all. That's a continuing sore point in the system.

The other day I had a letter that I'm quite prepared to table from the concerned people of the Interlake, Mr. Speaker, Ashern, Manitoba, addressed to me but pointing up the fact that hospitals and care homes were in deteriorating condition and shape in the Interlake. Sir, the letter addressed to me, dated March 1984 from Ashern, Manitoba and areas and which, I say, I am prepared to table reads as follows:

"This government is so insensitive, arrogant, remote, unreachable and wildly extravagant in areas that have no concern of the people's well-being. We are talking about hospitals and care homes. The government's cutback on expenditure in these very important areas is not human. You must do something about it now before the health of these human beings are more neglected, do something about the welfare of the people. Certainly the health of the people is more important than this ridiculous language debate. Don't just look. You must listen to what the staff say and ideas how to improve this serious situation that exists."

"Thank you. Concerned peoples of the Interlake."

I have other letters from Dauphin, the home constituency of the Minister of Highways - who was just a few moments ago bragging, Sir, about jobs that he was creating - letters complaining about the hospital in Dauphin and about the fact there are no jobs available for young people in that community; a letter from the Deloraine medical group, all striking the same difficult worried concerned note of a deteriorated system, of a system of health care that once was great and is now running down, so those are the challenges, Mr. Speaker. That's what's out there when the government talks so repeatedly and incessantly in the Throne Speech about maintaining the health care system. It has a great deal to maintain. It has a great deal to rebuild and reinforce and strengthen. It has a great urgent challenge facing it in that field, Mr. Speaker,

and we will be looking, as we go into the working part of this Session and into the Estimates, to the Minister of Health and his colleagues for some positive evidence, some positive proof that they really intend to do that.

They should begin where all governments should begin in order to maintain good health care systems and social systems and that is, to create a healthy economy that can produce the revenues necessary. Mr. Speaker, that's step No. 1, generate those revenues through a healthy economy and encouragement of the private sector, then modernize the system, use those fiscal resources to modernize the health care system to meet the needs of the 1990s, to meet the needs of the present day rather than the needs of 40 years ago. If they don't do that, continuous streams of letters and litanies of complaints of this kind will come in, Mr. Speaker. They came in last year; they're continuing to come in this year.

The indicators are that there's been no improvement, in the past 12 months, in the deteriorating conditions in the health care field, despite the warnings that the Minister had last year. So we're calling upon him now, Sir, to live up to those pledges and promises in the Throne Speech to do something now, to take action now, to put the system back on its feet. A million Manitobans are looking for that and 23 members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will insist on that as we proceed through this Session, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The question before the House is the proposed amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, as printed. Do you require it read? Since it is being asked for I will read the amendment.

THAT the motion be amended by adding to it the following words: That this House regrets:

- (a) that the government's failure to provide a rational long-term view in dealing with the economic and fiscal affairs of the province;
- (b) the government's continuing failure to demonstrate any commitment to deal with the serious problems which exist in the agricultural sector in Manitoba today;
- (c) the continuing failure of the government to attract private sector investment for the establishment and meaningful long-term jobs in Manitoba;
- (d) the government's contravention of the statutory provisions of The Financial Administration Act and,
- (e) that by virtue of its failure in every field of endeavour charged to its responsibility, this government has lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

QUESTION put on the amendment, MOTION defeated.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed amendment by the Leader of the Opposition which has been read.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Banman, Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman.

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas 20; Nays 32.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly lost.

Are you ready for the question on the main motion? It is as follows:

Moved by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, for an address to the Honourable Administrator in answer to his speech at the opening of the Session.

Those in favour please say, aye? Those opposed please say, nay?

In my opinion the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Member for Riel.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MRS. D. DODICK: Some committee changes please. On Public Accounts we have the Member for Thompson substituting for the Member for River East; and in Public Utilities and Natural Resources we have the Member for Gimli for the Member for The Pas, and the Member for Riel for the Member for Transcona.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30 p.m.?

The time being 5:30 p.m. I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.