

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 13 March, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

### OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to table the Annual Report of the Franco-Manitoban Cultural Centre for the year ending March 1984 and the Annual Report for the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation for the year ending March 31st, 1984, and I also have a Ministerial Statement.

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

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

I am very pleased to announce that the Government of Manitoba, through the Manitoba Film Classification Board, is introducing new initiatives to make mandatory the classification of home-use videotapes.

In October 1984, the board began to classify publicly exhibited videotapes in order to provide the consumer with the same information available to them with respect to films. At that time, we planned a phased approach to make possible the classification of home-use video materials at a later date. We are now in a position to do so.

The classification of home-use video materials is in response to concerns raised by members of the public, as well as the video industry itself. Representatives of the Home and School Parent/Teacher Federation, the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, and the Catholic Women's League, in particular, have expressed to us their desire to monitor the distribution of videos within the province. Manitobans have told us they want to be aware of the nature of the videotapes they are purchasing or renting to take into their homes. They want to know, and we believe they have a right to know, if the videos contain scenes of themes which are not suitable for family viewing. This government is committed to make Manitoba a safe and healthy place to live.

Furthermore, the industry has voiced concerns about the distribution of unclassified videos which requires them to make subjective judgments on suitability. They have asked for guidance and direction to help them ascertain the relationship between individual video products and community standards as a guide for members of the industry and the consumer.

The Manitoba Film Classification Board will be taking all the necessary steps to ensure that the public and the industry are well aware and informed.

The law prohibiting the display and distribution of obscene materials is governed by the Criminal Code,

which is federal legislation. Our government will continue to support initiatives to strengthen this aspect of the Criminal Code, particularly with respect to sexual violence and the exploitation of children for obscene purposes. The Attorney-General has announced, and his department is implementing, the reinforced prosecution policy aimed particularly at sexual violence and the exploitation of children for obscene purposes. This policy complements the Home-Use Video Classification Program being announced today.

We also will be undertaking educational initiatives and producing materials to inform the public of new classification categories and what they mean, and also to raise awareness of their rights as consumers and the steps they may take, should they wish to raise objections or concerns about the content of video materials.

Minor changes will also be made to the current classification categories for film including the category currently called "Adult Parental Guidance." The current category requires that those under the age of 18 be accompanied by a parent or adult guardian. In recognition of the different levels of emotional and physical maturity between the ages of 15 and 18 years, the "Adult Parental Guidance" category will be replaced by the new category of "Parental Accompaniment." This new classification will require that those under the age of 15 be accompanied by a parent or adult guardian. In effect, this reduces the current adult parental guidance age limit from 18 to 15 years of age and creates a new category of films suitable for viewing by those of age 15 to 18.

It does not, however, alter the "Restricted" category that will continue to identify those films that are not suitable for viewing by those under 18 years of age.

The classification categories would then include:

General: suitable viewing for all;

Mature: suitable viewing for all, parental discretion advised;

Parental Accompaniment: not suitable for viewing for those under the age of 15 unless accompanied by a parent or adult guardian; and

Restricted 18: not suitable for viewing for those under the age of 18.

Consumers, distributors, video retailers and the Manitoba Film Classification Board will all require time to prepare for and adjust to the new environment. Furthermore, there's a substantial backlog of material which will require time to classify, and the industry will need time to respond to new requirements.

We will begin to implement this initiative by July 1, 1985, but work will start now, as this government believes it's important to act immediately.

This new initiative, I'm pleased to say, can be implemented at minimal cost to the consumer and to the retailer, although all distributors will have to be licensed as film exchanges, the cost to them, and subsequently the cost passed on to the consumer, will be a small price to pay for this essential service. It will enable us to put in place measures required to effect

the mandatory classification of home-use video materials.

I am pleased to be able to provide this service to Manitobans so that they can make educated choices about the videotapes they bring into their homes.

Thank you.

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

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

We on this side of the House wish to thank the Minister for this announcement. My colleagues and I raised this matter during the Estimates, during the last Session of the Legislature. We're pleased to see that the government is now embarked upon some positive action with regard to this matter. We're pleased to see that the Minister is taking some steps in this area to ensure that children of Manitoba are not exposed to obscene videotapes and movies, Mr. Speaker, and we thank the Minister for taking action in this area at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I have several reports, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'm tabling in accordance with the rules, a copy of each regulation filed under The Regulations Act, being Regulation Numbers 61/84 to 279/84 inclusive; and numbers 1/85 to 51/85 inclusive.

I also beg leave, Sir, to file from the Law Reform Commission, its report of An Examination of 'The Dower Act', both in its full report and a summary of that report for the benefit of members who have a lot to read.

I'd also like leave to file the Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Uniform Law Conference of Canada held in Quebec in August of 1983. Sir, the Annual Report, 1983-84 from The Manitoba Public Trustee; and two reports under The Contraverted Elections Act, one from the Court of Appeal, in accordance with the act and its regulations; and one from the Court of Queen's Bench, again in accordance with the act and the regulations.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 60 students of Grade 5 standing from the Lakewood School under the direction of Mr. Maharaj. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia; and there are 10 students from the Niverville Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Brown. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier. It follows upon what appeared to have been some contradictory statements made yesterday with respect to the status of life insurance in Manitoba.

Early in the question period, the Minister responsible for MPIC indicated his department had received a two-year study and were considering whether or not the province should be entering the life insurance and pension management industry. Later in the question period, the Premier said that the province had no plans to enter the life insurance industry in Manitoba. Later he appeared to have corrected that by saying there were some conditions applied to that particular statement, so I wonder if the Premier could clarify just what the intentions of the government are with respect to this particular issue?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I attached no conditions to my statement yesterday.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, then could I ask the Premier if his statement to the media after the question period was correct that the government had withdrawn its plans to enter the life insurance industry because they were satisfied that the insurance industry was investing sufficient monies in Manitoba now?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** What I indicated, that I would have thought would have been obvious to the Leader of the Opposition, is that the government has no plans to enter into the life insurance industry in the Province of Manitoba, that there are discussions presently under way with the life insurance industry as to ways and means by which we can maximize capital return right here within the Province of Manitoba for useful public, social purposes; and secondly, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the industry had been responsive, that those discussions were taking place in good faith between the province and the industry. I specified no conditions, Mr. Speaker. I don't know where the idea would originate in the Leader of the Opposition's mind that I was attaching some sort of conditions. I expressed positive expectancy that these discussions, in fact, would be positive.

In fact, I might report to the Leader of the Opposition that this very morning we received a call from the Canadian health and life insurance industry, most anxious to further and to advance those discussions; most anxious to explore different ways by which we can co-operate more together in order to ensure greater participation in the development of the Province of Manitoba.

I should also mention to the Leader of the Opposition that I expressed interest, in fact, as has the life insurance

industry indicated their interest in discussing with us the very successful experience in the Province of Quebec involving the Caisse de Depot.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a representative of the life insurance industry yesterday was quoted as saying that the industry already has invested \$2.5 billion in Manitoba - which is twice as much as they take in in Manitoba - what level of investment are they asking the industry to achieve?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, that is the very nature of the discussions we are conducting with the industry, that we're carrying on with the industry. Needless to say, we want greater investment in the Province of Manitoba by the life insurance industry. I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition would share that same common desire as we enjoy on this side of the House.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the original proposal of the government was two-pronged, one to enter life insurance and another to enter the pension management field. Has the government given up its plans to enter the pension management field at the present time?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, we are examining ways and means, as I indicated, by which we can consolidate pension management so that we can maximize, as Quebec has done very successfully, pension management in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of that fact that the Premier is considering ways and means of maximizing that investment in Manitoba, I wonder if he would then enter into discussions with the Civil Service Superannuation Board, because according to their 1982 and 1983 annual reports, in 1982 they invested 8 percent of their \$365 million assets in Government of Manitoba securities, a further 3 percent in hospitals and municipal corporations, and the rest in various other investments such as petroleum, natural gas, real estate equity mortgages. The next year, 1983, those figures only amounted to 10 percent of their investment. Would he approach the Civil Service Superannuation Board and ask them to maximize their investment in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I remind honourable members that the purpose of question period is to obtain information and not to give it to the House.  
The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for demonstrating clearly in this House that we must indeed encourage and do more co-operatively to ensure a greater participation in the economic life of the Province of Manitoba regardless of the source of the pension funds.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, what will the Premier's criteria be for the investment of funds? Will it be to

ensure the greatest return for those who have contributed pension funds into a plan, or will it be simply to divert the funds into capital that will lose money such as the \$40 million that this government has lost in Crown corporations during the past year and other investments that this government chooses as a priority?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I ask of you, leave to respond to the wide-ranging nature of the question from the Leader of the Opposition because when the Leader of the Opposition refers to Crown corporations, I would like to mention to him the success of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation that in fact reduced its rates by 2 percent in respect to this year. I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition the success of Manitoba Hydro that is now getting on its feet after a number of years of losing reserves in the Province of Manitoba under this administration. I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition the success of the Manitoba Telephone System, and probably most important, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition the fact that McKenzie Seeds is turning around, after a number of years of losses under this administration . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . despite the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition chose, in the City of Calgary, to indicate that he was seriously considering selling off McKenzie Seeds if, indeed, Manitoba should have the ill fortune of his becoming Premier of the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the balance of the Leader of the Opposition's question, the very fact that there are discussions under way, discussions in good faith, demonstrates the commitment, I believe, by both parties at this stage, to work in the interests of Manitoba. I am prepared to accept the life insurance industry in good faith; I would hope the Leader of the Opposition would be prepared to do so. I am prepared to accept, Mr. Speaker, advice received this very morning from the life insurance industry that they want to know what they can do for the Province of Manitoba, they want fuller and more meaningful discussions as to how they can increase their input in the Province of Manitoba. I am encouraged, Mr. Speaker, as I would think the Leader of the Opposition ought to be encouraged by that expression of good intention on the part of the industry.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I am always encouraged when the government decides not to get into private business.

Mr. Speaker, my question for the Premier is, he's talked about the successes of the monopoly situations in Manitoba, with the exception of McKenzie Seeds. Is he satisfied with the other two corporations to which I referred, Flyer Industries and Manfor, having lost \$39 million collectively last year? Is he satisfied with that performance?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question asked seeks an opinion. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question to seek information.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question asked for an opinion. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier is satisfied with certain performances, what does he intend to do to insure that the Crown corporations, Flyer Industries and Manfor, don't continue to lose \$39 million a year for the Province of Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the first thing that we did upon assuming government was to reduce the inventory from 17 million board feet at Manfor down to 1 billion (sic) board feet, which it should have been — (Interjection) — 1 million. When we assumed government in the Province of Manitoba, they had an inventory of 17 to 1. 17 to 1 supply as against demand, because of mismanagement under the government in which the Leader of the Opposition sat as a member of the Treasury Board.

We have proceeded, as the Leader of the Opposition fully knows, to reduce that inventory to modernize Manfor to proceed with various means by which Manfor can, indeed, be turned around. I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition also, Manfor was in fact, I believe, born out of a previous Conservative administration in this province, Churchill Forest Industries, if I recall correctly. That plum that the present Senator Duff Roblin, who was then the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, welcomed to the Province of Manitoba, and I believe, signed by another former Premier of this province, Sterling Lyon, while he was Attorney General of the Province of Manitoba. Let the Leader of the Opposition remember that.

Mr. Speaker, there are as well serious problems involving Flyer Industries. We've acknowledged those problems; and those serious problems have been around for many many years. But at least this administration is doing all it can, unlike the previous administration in the Province of Manitoba, to deal successfully with the problems involving Flyer Industries.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in the first year after they took office, they reduced the inventory. Why is it that in the second year they then lost \$23 million at Manfor?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would like the Leader of the Opposition to tell me one pulp and paper company anywhere in Canada that did not lose handsomely in 1982. The Leader of the Opposition need only answer his own question by telling us where the pulp and paper industry anywhere in Canada, anywhere in Canada, enjoyed a profit in 1982.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know then if that's where he plans to put the pension funds of the people of Manitoba - into that sort of investment that's losing?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Leader of the Opposition - unlike the Leader of the Opposition and those that surround him, we have confidence in the future of this province. We have confidence . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . in the investment in the Province of Manitoba, in the resources of Manitoba to maximize the return to Manitobans. Unfortunately, it appears, to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, that there are those in this House that lack confidence in the development of the Province of Manitoba, and unfortunately that appears to include, maybe not all members across the way, but most members across the way.

### Deer Lodge Hospital - pharmaceutical supplies

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. On December 7, 1984, the Minister of Health announced plans whereby the supplying of pharmaceuticals to the personal care homes in Winnipeg would be taken over by a government-run operation at Deer Lodge Hospital. My question to the Minister of Health is, what consultations did the Minister have with the providers of that service and the recipients of that service in the personal care homes of Manitoba prior to making his December 7th announcement?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions between the industry and the commission for a number of years. I also met with the industry following the announcement — (Interjection) — just a moment, if you want the information - and there is a committee that is studying the situation now. I made it quite clear that what we were after is better service and economy, and if they can do it - fine, there is no ideology hangup there. But we will have to get this economy and better service.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, in answer to my question, the Minister left the impression that discussions had taken place with both the providers of the current service in Winnipeg and the recipients. Could the Minister affirm for me and for the House whether his discussions involved the proposed takeover of that service by the government?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it quite clear that there had been discussions prior to the announcement between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the providers of the service on a number of occasions. There are certain things they were asked to rectify that was never done; then I made the announcement and following that - and I admit, it was following that - I was approached and they wanted to see if they could, for instance, have

block purchasing, and there's no reason why that couldn't be done. There was a committee on which they were well represented that will make recommendations to me any time now - next week or fairly soon.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister made specific reference to the Manitoba Health organization in his answer.

Following his December 7th press release and announcement, I quote from a December 17th letter from MHO to the Minister, in which, in the second paragraph they say, firstly:

"We wish to lodge a protest against the method by which the new program was announced, namely, without any consultation with us nor those more directly affected, such as, the governing boards of personal care homes."

Would the Minister care to re-answer the question?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes. Exactly the way I answered it, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The question is clearly argumentative. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, it's not argumentative when yesterday in the Throne Speech we had the Minister say, "I never say anything but the truth."

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Health.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate to the House how many meetings with the providers of the service and with those recipients of the service have taken place and what is the nature of the future of those meetings? How many more meetings does he plan to have?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many meetings they've had. The committee was formed and I know they had started meeting. I have other things to do than start counting meetings that are going around.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate to the House whether a commitment has been made by his government for the installation of a computer at Deer Lodge Hospital which will be used in the supplying of pharmaceuticals to the personal care homes in Winnipeg under the program he announced on December 7th?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, at a meeting that I had with the industry, and I repeat that I made it quite clear that I was after two things, better service, security and savings, and you're going to hear me say that all

through this Session, you can rest assured of that; and if they had recommendations that they can fulfill that, I'd have no problem leaving it the way it is. If not, yes, we will centralize the drugs at the personal care homes where we, the government, are paying for all those drugs and if we can have savings, I think it would be wrong not to do it.

### Investment in Manitoba

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

**MR. P. EYLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Leader of the Opposition spent a great deal of his brief speech decrying the lack of investment in Manitoba, saying the government lived in fantasy land, when we said there were indicators that there was increased investment in all sectors of the economy.

My question is, can the Minister of Finance give us any recent statistics which would shed a little bit more light on the claims of the Leader of the Opposition?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I had hoped that the Leader of the Opposition would have stood up and corrected some of those incorrect numbers that he gave the House the other day, but in 1984 - and this is according to Statistics Canada reports - Manitoba experienced an investment growth rate of 11.3 percent as opposed to the Canadian increase overall in investment of 2.1 percent. That's No. 1. No. 2, Statistics Canada's inventory of investment intentions for 1985 indicates that Manitoba will again lead the nation, will be No. 1, with 11.4 percent of an increase in total investment, which certainly is something that the Leader of the Opposition would have implied was not the case when he was dealing with investment.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but we have to be entirely fair to the opposition. They make a big distinction between total investment and private investment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. P. EYLER:** My question to the Minister of Finance is, does he have figures for private investment and can he tell us how the private investment in Manitoba compares with private investment in the other Western Canadian provinces?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** The numbers I had previously given were overall investment, public and private. When we're dealing with private investment, people out there in the community who the Leader of the Opposition the other day were saying are not investing in Manitoba, our investment rate increased by 9.8 percent in Manitoba in 1984. That's approximately three times the national rate of 3.3 percent. — (Interjection) — The Leader of the Opposition says over three years. Well, I just happen to have that here for him. 1985, in fact,

marks the third year of post-recession strength in investment in Manitoba. Capital investment increased in 1983 by 11.7 percent; 11.3 percent in 1984 and again, 11.4 percent in 1985.

In Canada, it declined by 4.2 percent in 1983, Mr. Speaker, rose by 2.5 in 1984 and again, it's projected to increase by only 6.7 percent in 1985, indicating we're doing very well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If there is detailed information that a Minister wishes to give to the House, it might be better to do so in the form of a written document that could be passed to all members.

### **Deer Lodge Hospital - Pharmacare computer**

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health.

Can the Minister of Health indicate whether the province and his department have committed to the purchase of a computer for the installation in Deer Lodge Hospital for the provision of the Pharmacare Service in the personal care homes? Has that commitment to purchase the computer been made?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of. I'll have to find out from the commission if that has been done.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Can the Minister assure the House and the providers and the recipients of Pharmacare Service in the Province of Manitoba that no final decision will be made by the government on the implementation of his December 7th proposal until after we have discussed this issue fully in the Health Estimates?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, Mr. Speaker.

### **Chicken farming regulations**

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

Could the member indicate to this House, or confirm, that he and his government have signed a regulation prohibiting Manitoba farmers from producing or raising more than 100 chickens on their farm if they have not had more than that previous to the passing of the regulations?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I wasn't quite clear. Did the Minister indicate that they have not passed such a regulation?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I'll take the question as notice and check.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that Manitoba agriculture and the farm community are undergoing extreme pressure due to financial difficulty, will the First Minister give the assurance to the farm community and the family farmers of this province that he will not restrict them from producing more than 100 laying hens on their farms, so that they have the right to a livelihood and try and work their way out of some of the tough times that have been created during his time as Premier Mr. Speaker.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I found out from experience to always investigate carefully the premises of some of the questions that are raised by the Member for Arthur. I think it's safer to do that than to accept the honourable member's premises in respect to what he's posed today. We're prepared to compare our record, which has been much more favourable, Mr. Speaker, insofar as support for the family farm than the record of the former Member for Arthur when he was the Minister of Agriculture in the previous administration.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, if he has, in fact, passed such a regulation, will he rescind it so that the farm families of this province can produce extra income through that kind of a production method?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question is hypothetical.

### **Flood Assistance Program**

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

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to direct a question to the Premier and ask the Premier if he can indicate to the House today if the designated Flood Assistance Program in the Bellsite-Birch River area will be expanded to include those farmers who petitioned the Premier on a recent visit to that area. Could the Minister advise the House if the decision has been made on that?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** That is under review at the present time.

### **Provincial parks - tenders for maintenance of**

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

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

My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. In a move that seems to be totally contrary to the government policy, they are tendering the maintenance and operation of provincial parks to the private sector,

can the Minister indicate how many provincial parks are going to be tendered for the maintenance and operation to the private sector in the province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question. This process has been under way for a period of time and I don't know how far back. There are a number of parks in Manitoba which are not viable enterprises as a public operation, but may make sense to be operated by adjacent private operators and that's the kind of situation in which we are prepared to give consideration to privatizing some of our park areas. It's a matter of continuing a service to the public while maintaining control on the cost to the people of Manitoba.

So, it is indeed a co-operative effort, Mr. Speaker, and where it makes sense to do that, I think we should look at those opportunities in order that we can maintain and enhance the service to the people of Manitoba.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Could the Minister indicate what is the criteria for this tendering process? Is it based on a profit and loss situation of parks? If that is the case, can we have a rundown of all the provincial parks so that we know which ones are going to be available for tender?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I think the member really needs a great deal of information, if I understand his question, one which can more properly be given to him during the Estimates review. But if he wishes, we will attempt to compile a list of parks that have been privatized over the years and a potential list that may be - I have no problem with that.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into the debate aspect of it and I suppose we'll have that opportunity, but can the Minister of Natural Resources indicate what is the attitude of the Manitoba Government Employees Association with regard to what is happening and what is happening to the employees that will be displaced by the various parks that are being tendered for the private sector right now?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't answer for the MGEA. I believe the member must have a communication link with that organization. I can tell the member though, that we have to have policies that will work in the public interest. It does not make sense to apply a wide-brush rule to that question.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister. If profit and loss is the criteria that is being used in the park aspect, is that the kind of policy that this government is going to be using from now on in the future in all their endeavours?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of areas that have to be considered in order to determine the viability of a particular park in the Province of Manitoba. Part of that is user fees and the other part is whether or not it is within the realm of

the future to make them viable if they are not now. If we have seen that a park facility is not going to be self-sustaining — (Interjection) — no, no - and where there is an entrepreneur nearby who is willing to add that component, that service, to his operations, then, Mr. Speaker, it does make sense to take that into consideration and, in that sense, if we do that, we maintain continued service to the public and, at the same enhance the viability of private business in Manitoba.

### Potash mine, Russell

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, since the First Minister is in such a good frame of mind today and the Minister of Finance is talking about all the investment capital that's been flowing into this province, can the First Minister tell me and the people in Western Manitoba when this potash mine is going to develop west of Russell?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the people in the constituency of Roblin-Russell, we are working hard at bringing into existence what is a first class potential potash mine in the Province of Manitoba. I believe we can enjoy some sense of appreciation as to the importance of the development of our resources. As it when it will be brought into operation, Mr. Speaker, that will depend upon the viability of bringing the mine into operation. The honourable member can rest assured that it will be done not a day too soon or a day too late, insofar as ensuring that the mine is brought into operation in a viable way.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to the Minister's \$100,000 trip to China with the former Minister Messer, the Cabinet Minister from Saskatchewan; Mr. Dombowsky from Potash, Saskatchewan, and other officials from Canamax, there's a lot of concern out there as to how this new corporation is going to sell the potash to Red China, while on the other hand your government, using another Canadian multinational corporation, Alcan, refused to let them set up their plant at Balmoral. Are the same terms of reference going to apply west of Russell as they did at Balmoral?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, first, this government did not refuse to permit Alcan to establish itself in Balmoral. The honourable member should, in fact, ensure that his facts are correct before advancing this information in this Chamber out of respect for the members of the Chamber itself.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology. The Minister of Energy and Mines makes no apology for our efforts to encourage investment and trade with China, with India. I'm sure Premier Devine and his Ministers make no apology for their efforts on a repeated basis to ensure potash sales to the Province of Saskatchewan. We again

— (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, maybe some members if they want to have separate meetings might wish to use the members' lounge so we could answer the questions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier for that kind of a half-answer - or whatever you'd call it - to my question. I have no concern and the people of my constituency have no concern about selling potash to China or India at all. We're just wondering if you're going to handle this development the same as you handled the Alcan one.

Can I ask the Minister now, Mr. Speaker, if he's prepared to come into Russell or the constituency and sit down, or set up a committee of businessmen, businesswomen, private entrepreneurs, contractors, investors, labourers, et cetera, et cetera, from that general area, the same as you're setting up for the Limestone project, so that we can hasten the development of this project at Russell at the earliest possible date?

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Wally, you're not looking for a job, are you?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, maybe the member for Roblin-Russell might wish to undertake an important sales promotion and organizational effort under the stewardship of this government and they might indeed be of some assistance to us, if we are to believe him this afternoon in respect to his eagerness to encourage participation and development in the Province of Manitoba in the Russell area.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy and Mines would like to deal with the specifics of the honourable member's question pertaining to involvement, insofar as Russell itself is concerned, on the part of his department.

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I in fact had the pleasure of meeting with a gentleman from Russell, who represents the various municipal groups there. We talked about the possible development of a mine at Russell and I informed him of the progress to date. We agreed that it would be premature to do what the Conservative Government had done prior to 1981, where, without having anything signed, sealed and delivered, they had launched a massive advertising campaign and induced a number of people into speculative purchases around the St. Pierre area, around the Balmoral area. Those people were hurt by the premature activities of the Conservative Government.

Mr. Speaker, what we have done is move in a very reasonable way to inform the people of Russell what

the possibilities might be and to inform them that if developments take place that warrant the establishment of a group to do the types of things that the member talked about, that we would both proceed co-operatively to do so, but not prematurely.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** One final supplementary question. Can I ask the Premier, what's the deadline date that you're looking at for this development?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it would be very silly of me to answer that question.

### Pratt and Whitney - costs

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry. Last night he refused to disclose the financial cost the government was prepared to commit to the Pratt and Whitney development in Manitoba, and keeping in mind that they are prepared to introduce a freedom of information act, is the Minister prepared to table in this House within the next few days, all documents, correspondence, reports, relating to his attempt to locate Pratt and Whitney in the Province of Manitoba?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly welcome the first question in this House by the newest member, the Member for Fort Garry. I think that kind of information would be best asked through the means of an Order for Return.

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

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, and the amendment thereto proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Rhineland has 27 minutes remaining.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last night when we adjourned I was talking about the situation that the sugar industry is facing in Canada and I was relating that the International Sugar Agreement, to which the Canadian Government was the signatory, envisaged that world raw cane sugar prices between 13 and 25 cents U.S. per pound and today that market is 4 cents U.S. per pound and that, of course, is why the industry is in the particular predicament that they are in.

Now I also said that all developed countries have a policy which protects the sugar industries against the vagaries of the world market. In Canada we do not



have a policy and that is another reason that the producers are concerned about what is really happening in Canada and with the industry.

I would just like to give some statistics as to - these are the factory statistics of Manitoba Sugar Company - on just exactly how Manitoba is affected by the closure or the soon-to-be closure of this factory. The amount of money that was paid to the beet growers in the 1983 crop was \$13,228,000; company payroll and benefits, \$4,095,000; paid for railway and truck hauling, \$2,792,000; paid for natural gas, oil and electricity, \$2,492,000; property taxes, \$439,000.00. There are also other areas that pay out and this amounted to a total of \$25,686,000.00. They employed 225 employees at Manitoba Sugar. They have 28,000 acres of sugar beets contracted in Manitoba and 450 growers. Refined sugar is produced at 40,000 tons per year; beet pulp, 25,000 tons; molasses, 18,000 tons.

The Alberta industry is somewhat larger than the Manitoba industry, but this gives you an idea of how important this factory really is and how much money is injected into the local economy.

Mr. Speaker, if we lose this industry, all of us will suffer and we'll feel the effects of the closure. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested in equipment, 28,000 acres of sugar beets are grown in Manitoba and the 1984 cost of production of an acre of sugar beets is \$608 per acre. Now you can see there's a tremendous amount of cash involved in the production of sugar.

Now if you take \$608 times 28,000, you come up with a figure of \$17,024,000 and this is directly injected into the local economy of the areas that produce beets. Now much of this is labour. It is estimated that at least \$4,095,000 is paid for direct labour. Mr. Speaker, this injunction of \$17,024,000 with its spin-off has a tremendous effect on the economy of this province.

Many Canadians are under the impression that importing sugar doubles as foreign aid to underdeveloped countries. This impression is not correct. Forty-two percent of imported sugar comes from Australia, 22 percent from Cuba, 14 percent from South Africa, 9 percent from the Commonwealth African nations, 2 percent from Belize and 11 percent from other countries. You can see that very little sugar from underdeveloped countries finds its way into our system; but whenever a crisis arises anywhere in the world, the price of sugar is the first to be affected.

During the Cuban crisis in 1974, and the Suez crisis in 1979, sugar became a scarce commodity and prices soared. After the Cuban crisis, the United States determined that never again, would they be totally dependent on imports and they now produce approximately 65 percent of their requirements. You may think that because we only produce 10 percent of the sugar requirements in Canada, that we could not affect the price of sugar. In 1974, when cane sugar rose to \$72.95 for 100 lbs. of sugar, we sold beet sugar in Manitoba at \$66.90. Sometimes the spread was as much as \$7.05 per hundredweight that beet sugar was lower than cane sugar.

In the short term, there is no doubt that the consumer has the advantage of low sugar prices. But the sugar beet industry cannot survive at this low price. In the long term, there was no doubt in my mind, that the consumer will benefit from a sugar policy that would

maintain the sugar beet industry and I would like to read from the Debates in the House of Commons, from Hansard, a statement which was made by Mr. Blaine A. Thacker, who is the member for Lethbridge Foothills:

"Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform Parliament about the current world sugar situation and about 1,500 Canadian sugar beet producers in Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta are being affected. The world cost of producing cane and beet sugar is about 15 cents per pound, 85 percent of world sugar trades at the guaranteed domestic prices which range from 22 cents in the USA to over 40 cents a pound in Cuba. The EEC subsidy alone is 15 cents a pound. This price is guaranteed by quotas, tariffs and subsidies.

"In Canada, we face a situation where some 15 percent of the world surplus determines our price which is .04 cents per pound U.S., and as such, we will surely lose our producers. Canadians consume about one million tons of sugar, of which 90 percent is imported. The amount of money leaving Canada for that sugar this year is about \$80 million U.S. However, in 1980, when the price of sugar was 43 cents per pound the cost was \$800 million.

"Therefore, a healthy domestic sugar industry is good for consumers as protection against unstable world prices, for our foreign exchange account, for our manufacturers of machinery and for our producers.

"I strongly urge the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Wise, and the cabinet to make short-term investment in this industry to ensure its survival, followed by the development of a long-term national sugar policy to put us in step with the rest of the world."

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we are asking for. If we are called upon this Legislature to give short-term assistance to this industry, I hope that all of you will join with me to keep this industry alive. I am very pleased that the Honourable Charlie Mayer, member of parliament for Portage, has been placed in charge of this problem. I am certain that the producers and the company will receive his co-operation.

My hope is that the provincial Minister of Agriculture will also acquaint himself with the situation regarding sugar beets and lend his support and the support of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, it's a serious situation. A lot of money that is now being circulated in the community is not going to be there, if we lose this industry. So I urge all members to support that industry.

Thank you.

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

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

I'd like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by thanking you for your attempts over the past Session to keep us in order and wish you condolences in your attempts in this current Session, I will do my best to not add to your problems.

I'd like to congratulate the Member for The Pas on his appointment to the Cabinet. I'm delighted to be working with him. I'd like to congratulate the Member for Ste. Rose on his partial retirement, although I understand that he's actually basically working more than full time just working on the regular constituency files. But I do hope he finds a little more time for himself

and his family. We all in this House hope that the chair beside mine will be filled again by Mary Beth Dolin. She contributed a great deal to this Legislature and to this province and we certainly all hope that she'll be back soon.

I join my colleagues in welcoming the new Member for Fort Garry. He and I got to know each other about 12 years ago when I was an articling law student in the Attorney-General's Department. He was a very good employee, a very good advisor in terms of giving advice to the people who were there as students, and I wish him well and hope that he manages to maintain his seat on that side of the House for some time to come.

While I'm in a congratulatory mood, I should maybe throw in something for the Member for Sturgeon Creek. I thought his speech last night was probably the best I'd ever heard him make. I think he made some points that during the debates over this Session, we will enjoy debating. I'm sure that might give him apoplexy and so I made sure that I was very careful about the timing of my statement on that.

The Member for Rhineland just finished talking about the sugar beet industry — (Interjection) — the Member for Flin Flon has some nasty comments, but I want him to know that I grew up on a sugar beet farm and there's a great deal of nostalgia here for the days when we used to weed those sugar beets all summer and do the harvesting in fall and so on, and one recalls, I recall very vividly the fall of 1959, John Diefenbaker was the Prime Minister of Canada, and the sugar beets, I believe it was '59, the sugar beets froze in the ground for a great number of farmers and the federal government came forward with a payment which was sufficient approximately to meet the expenses of the farmers who would have had a very, very severe time had he not done it, and those were the kinds of things that particular Federal Government did. Certainly, we will be doing what we can to encourage the current Federal Government to similarly protect that industry, not only here, but of course in other parts of the country as well. We recognize it's an important industry.

I'd like to talk just a little bit about the consultations that I've been involved with over the last several weeks with Manitobans and after that, to spend a little bit of time, if time allows, just a little bit of time discussing some of the statistics quoted on a variety of occasions by the Leader of the Opposition, maybe touch a little on the householder mailing, that big smile of your leader, the Leader of the Opposition and his signature. — (Interjection) — No, I didn't see Frank smile; it must have been very quick.

In the last few weeks, Mr. Speaker, I've been out in numerous Manitoba communities discussing the issues of government financing with Manitobans, discussing the issue of government expenditures, discussing the issue of taxation, discussing the issue of what should be a priority for the province; and the consensus - very very clear, very strong - is that the No. 1 priority of this government should be job creation. There's real concern out there with respect to that issue.

I pointed out that job creation is not just producing some job in the cities and towns of this province; it is also looking at ways of strengthening the agricultural community. We discussed over the last few weeks the many programs that have been instituted by the current administration in order to protect agriculture. Many

farmers, over 1,000 farmers, were helped by the Interest Rate Relief Program. We had somewhere in the vicinity of 700 farmers who were assisted by the Interest Rate Reduction Program where we allowed people who had entered into fixed rate mortgages with MACC to open them up and rewrite them down. That was a cost of about \$18 million to the province.

We brought in the Hog Stabilization Program and we now have, I understand, about 75 percent of the hog population in the province under that program. The last number I saw, we'd put in at least \$8 million. We'd put in \$25 million to \$30 million on the Beef Stabilization Program which has about 75 percent, again, of the cow herd under that program.

There were other programs introduced and, of course, programs continue. MACC loans to farmers, with a special emphasis on younger farmers; but all of those programs, adding them up together and things like doing away with that compulsory check-off, we got a fair number of farmers telling us they really appreciated that. People were happy about that, those kinds of irritants removed. I just thought I'd throw that in so the Member for Emerson would be happier, because he's been so quiet.

All of those things are done, not only for farmers; they're done for people in the small towns and in the cities as well because when the farm community is better able to survive, those communities are able to provide sales and service; they're able to provide some manufacturing for farm use and, of course, were able to at least stand a chance of keeping what is left of the meat packing industry in the province by stabilizing that particular industry and I think we've done a very good job of that. Generally, Manitobans appear to agree and, of course, the recently announced change by the Minister of Agriculture will again have helped many Manitoba farmers.

Certainly a number of people brought that issue forward when I was out there listening to people in Manitoba; but that clearly is an initiative that we must work on.

We talked about protecting the social services in the province and generally we heard from hospital boards that they really don't have any extra; there's no fat there. We heard that from school boards.

Of course, those two components are 50 percent of our expenditures right there. We get the money; we pass it along to them. We don't spend that 50 percent here, pass it along to them. They're telling us that they're hard pressed and people generally, with the odd exception, are saying, we don't want cuts in those areas, we don't want cuts in the area of social services. We want job creation to be high on your list; we want protection of agriculture. We don't expect tax decreases - we would like them. We would prefer that you not raise taxes any more than necessary. They would like us to not have larger deficits and that's basically, I think, where most Manitobans stand with respect to what they would like to see us doing for next year. That is something that, of course, we are working on at this very minute.

The Budget Address will be - I can give you the date for it now - March 21st at 8:00 o'clock in the evening, next Thursday evening, so we've got about a week left to put it together; so I must say that consultation process has been useful over the last several years, something

that we intend to continue on for next year and into our next term.

There were a number of things that I did want to talk about this afternoon, possibly starting out with the investment outlook which was released by Statistics Canada today, beginning with the overall outlook.

"Investment intentions for 1985 show Manitoba with the strongest overall increase among the provinces. Total new capital investment spending is expected to rise 11.4 percent to \$2.7 billion. In contrast to that 11.4 percent increase, Canada-wide investment is expected to rise by only 6.7 percent; and two provinces, British Columbia and New Brunswick are expected to have year-to-year declines in capital investment spending."

It might not be a bad idea to do some overall comparisons between this administration and the previous administration. From 1978-1981, under the previous administration, total capital investment in this province increased at an average annual rate of 4.1 percent, '78-81 - 4.1 percent investment increase in this province.

From 1982-1985, investment is projected to increase at an average annual rate of 11.5 percent or close to three times the rate from '78-81 and, of course, inflation rates were at an historic high during their three years and have been coming down during ours.

How about a comparison with Canada? Where were they and where are we? 1985 marks the third year of post-recession strength in investment in Manitoba. Capital investment increased 11.7 percent in 1983; 11.3 percent in 1984 and is projected to increase by a further 11.4 percent in 1985. In contrast, investment in Canada declined 4.2 percent in 1983, rose only 2.5 percent in 1984 and again, as I said previously, is expected to rise by 6.7 percent in 1985. The average annual growth in investment in Manitoba, some eight times the growth for Canada as a whole, eight times as strong as in Canada as a whole, and from 1978-81, Manitoba's growth rate was only one-quarter of the national average. That's what we got under those people who said that they knew how to increase the pie as the Member for Lakeside was suggesting. Some pie! He shrivelled it up.

Private sector investment in Manitoba made a strong comeback in 1983 with the highest growth rate in the country, except for Prince Edward Island. The Member for Sturgeon Creek has been mumbling what about 1981, what about 1981. Okay, and that's fair. What I was doing was talking from the depth of the recession and he was saying how about that other year. Well, okay, in Manitoba, private investment is projected at 7.2 percent above 1981, and for Canada, it's 3.4 percent below 1981. So, for us 7.2 percent up in the private sphere for Canada as a whole, 3.4 percent below. They were at one-quarter of the national average when they were in office and they dare to suggest that they would do a better job. They had the chance and they blew it. — (Interjection) — Maybe the member can't add but 7.2 percent is above 1981; 3.4 percent, the Canadian, is below 1981.

As I was saying, we do have to put them out verbally. Well, I have a number of other statistics we could go over looking at the bad old times and the good new times.

Retail sales - that's one item where people are always interested. From 1978-81, the average annual increase

was 1.1 percent below the Canadian average. When we took office or from 1981, not 1982, but 1981-84, we improved that to seven-tenths of 1 percent above the national average. They were below. We were above. Not a great deal - I accept that. We're not a great deal above, but we are above. They were below.

Labour income - again, the same thing, 12.4 percent in Manitoba as compared to 13.8 in Canada as a whole. Here we're at 7.6 compared to 6.2 in Canada as a whole. Again, stronger labour income growth since we were in office, stronger than in Canada, but was weaker when they were in office.

Population - October of 1978, was 1,029,300 Manitobans. Now, what did those people under their "Sterling" leadership do by 1981 in October? They were down to 1,027,800 people in Manitoba; they were down. Under the NDP in the Seventies, under the Schreyer regime, an average annual increase of 6,000, but we remember the gobbledegook they were giving Manitobans in '77 about population. So, they actually dropped in population from October '78 to October of '81.

You might ask, where are we now? Have we done as well as they have done? Well, I'm glad to tell you we have done better. As of October of 1984, we have 1,060,500 Manitobans. While the population dropped under their administration by 1,500 people, it has grown by 32,700 under our administration.

Well, let's talk about employment. From 1978-81; I'm glad the Member for Emerson reminded me of employment about jobs. How did you do from '77-81? Well, unfortunately, you were just under one-half the national rate of increase. They were going at less than one-half the rate of national increase. From 1981-84, we have a drop in Canada of one-tenth of 1 percent; in Manitoba, we're up by eight-tenths of 1 percent. Not good enough, of course not, but compared to what that bunch who suggest that they can increase the pie did, we are doing a tremendous job.

Again, over their period, growth in employment was half the national rate. In our time, it's considerably better. I don't know how you do it when Canada has a negative and we have a positive, but we're doing better.

Total investment from 1978-81, 4.1 to 16.5. That is, on average, we had a 1 percent growth for every 4 percent growth in investment in Manitoba from '78-81. The Member for St. Norbert was saying, well we've got a lower base. One of the reasons we have a lower base was that we weren't getting that 16.5 percent growth in the days of high inflation, we were getting 4.1 percent. In the last three years again, 3.1 percent to 1.8 down for Canada on average. There's a tremendous difference between what we have been doing and what they have been doing. We would be the first to acknowledge that we have not done enough; we want to do better; we want to make sure that all those people who are not working can get a job, but let's not suggest that that bunch could do a better job.

Now, you see this one signed by Gary Filmon. Mr. Speaker, oh yes, he signed it with one arm, so maybe there's a signal in there. Anyway, the opposition claims industrial building permits fell in the first nine months of 1984. You know, if this was Proctor and Gamble instead of P.C. - the soap companies are very honest compared to that document; the soap companies would

be in court under a consumer protection legislation if they tried to put something like that out — (Interjection) — that your leader signed.

Did they say that industrial permits were 3.7 percent of the total permits issued in the province? You know, the 96.3 percent of permits that aren't in that category, they didn't want to talk about. Did they want to talk about commercial permits, commercial building permits? They were talking about \$121 million worth of investment, instead of the 18.4 there. Did they talk about that? You know, the value of commercial building permits in the first 11 months was up 108 percent — up to \$121 million. They're focusing on a slight drop in an \$18.4 million category. Were they talking about residential building? You know a person who read that, the average Manitoban who doesn't want to get into a bunch of detail, looks at that kind of distortion — looks at that distortion and says, "Oh my goodness, things are heading downhill here. We're not doing as well in construction."

Did they look at residential building permits? Residential building permits in the first 11 months were nearly twice as great, two times as great as under the good old days under the Tories — \$304 million in residential building permits — but they were focusing on the \$18 million item, where we slightly down. Is that not deception? Is that not deception? I think it is.

So those are the kinds of things that they put into their documents. It is distortion. You couldn't find one person out of 100 you meet on the street who would say, after they read what you said, that you've given them a realistic picture of what is happening in this province. Nobody, nobody would say that, not once they had all of the facts. — (Interjection) — Well, we're becoming less and less worried, Mr. Speaker.

Industrial growth and economic development in the private sector where the real long-term jobs are created was almost non-existent in Manitoba this past year. That's what they would have Manitobans believe. Private sector employment in 1984 increased by 9,000 jobs. That's not bad, 2.5 percent, 9,000 jobs. They say it's almost non-existent. It's almost non-existent.

When we deal with private sector employment, we're 1.4 percent or 5,000 jobs above 1981, while private employment in Canada as a whole, again eight-tenths of 1 percent, 72,000 lower than in 1981.

And again, we've gone through the private sector investment and I'm sure that we'll have to draw a few pictures for the opposition before they understand it fully, but I think one way they could understand — one way the Member for Emerson could understand — is something like this: NDP — good; Tory — bad. You see, under the NDP, people come to Manitoba; they stay in Manitoba; they prepare to make their lifetime decisions here. Under the Tories, they voted with their feet; they left. I think that's the simplest way of looking at it. Practically the whole City of Brandon — you could take it in those terms — practically the whole City of Brandon, moving out of the province, during their period in office. That's about the equivalent of what happened. That's the kind of thing, certainly the adult population of that city, completely, that's the amount of Manitobans who voted with their feet under that "Sterling" administration.

And they say employment growth is not as good as in other provinces. Employment growth is not as good

as in other provinces. What they're saying is less employment growth is better, that's what they're saying, because our employment growth is better than in many other provinces. It is better in average in Canada as a whole, as we've shown. But what they're saying is it's not as good as other provinces so more employment, from the Tory definition, is bad. That's why they will not be in government for many years to come. They have it figured out wrong.

You know it seems to me they have the attitude of a comedian I heard last year who was saying that Ed Broadbent had been in Newfoundland and he was saying, if you elect me I'm going to give you jobs, jobs, jobs, and this fellow in Newfoundland listened to this fellow Broadbent — and he said, "Jobs? My uncle had a job once, it darn near killed him." Well, it seems to me that the Tories in Manitoba are saying having more jobs is bad, having less jobs is good. It seems to me that they're very similar to that individual. — (Interjection) — That's right. The Manitoba Newfoundlanders.

In 1984 there were actually only four provinces where unemployment decreased in this country of Canada. That's regrettable, and even in those four it didn't decrease enough, but in Manitoba it did decline. The number of people who couldn't get jobs declined by 10 percent, from 48,000 to 43,000, and that's about three times the rate of decline of unemployment in the country as a whole. That's at the same time, Mr. Speaker, as we're having an increase in population as compared to the decrease under the Tories.

We were one of the four provinces. Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia also experienced a decline in the number of people not working, but there were six provinces — at the same time we had that drop of 10 percent of people — who couldn't find employment. There were six provinces who had an increase and of course our unemployment rate itself came down considerably from 9.4 to 8.3, 1.1 percent down in Manitoba, as compared to the overall decrease of six-tenths of 1 percent. So again, we're now looking at double that particular number when you just look at employment rates. It would be triple if it wasn't for all these people coming back. I'm reminding the Member for St. Norbert that there are more than 30,000 more people here today than when they left office.

I guess there's another way of looking at that. You could look at the proportion of the national unemployment rate that we have now as compared to 1981. I think that that's not unreasonable. In 1981, we were at 77.6 percent of the national rate. It's better than the national average. Now we've improved that; we're down to 73.5 of the national rate of unemployment here in Manitoba and of course when we took office we were either third or fourth in terms of unemployment. There were two or three provinces in better shape — that's turned around. Did they say anything about that? Did they say anything about that in their report to my constituents? No. It was signed by this smiling face — I think the Member for St. Boniface had it down pretty well when he referred to him as somewhat shallow — and I think it's important that we concentrate in that area of employment. That's where I started out, it took us a while to get it.

They started out saying that the response in Manitoba, from Manitobans, from teachers, from

trustees, from hospital administrators, from nurses, from all the different people out there, the farmers and so on, is that jobs should still be No. 1 in terms of our priority. I think everyone in this Legislature agrees that we have to focus in that area. Of course, that's why we brought the Jobs Fund in, in order to focus on long-term, permanent development of our economy and generation of employment opportunities.

At this point, Jobs Fund initiatives are directed toward a dozen sectors of our economy, and I've mentioned agriculture. There's food processing, forestry, energy and hydro, small business, technology, development agreements. I just want to pause there for a minute. The Member for Sturgeon Creek referred to our development agreements and some differences last night and he made some points that I think are interesting. I don't think there's any doubt that my preference would be - and I think the preference of anybody on this side, maybe even on that side - that we not get into a bidding war, in terms of buying jobs.

I don't think that's something any government wants to do and I admit that I would be less critical today of the particular project we had on our table when we came into office than I was then; I would admit that. I believe that the former Minister worked hard in good faith with that corporation in order to have them remain here and would just ask that, on the other hand, he understand the difficulties a new government has coming into office with something like that. I believe that the letter was indeed dated on the election day but wasn't received by the company until several days after. I think if that happened to them there'd be a little bit of suspicion, especially if it hadn't gone through Cabinet. The member indicated that it had, but we didn't have a record of that. There were some discussions, and it was a difficult thing. It wasn't something that we did with any glee.

I would point out as well that the development agreements that we have entered into, and I'm not saying there's a substantive difference, I'm not saying that. What I'm saying though, is that we had developed a specific fund from which we could get the money. It was there and, in that sense, there was a difference; maybe not a big difference, maybe not a difference in principle. I just say that.

While we're on that, the member referred to - I'm trying to remember the name of the program. It was a program under which businesses could expand and get a grant from the Federal Government - Enterprise Manitoba. What I objected to was that it basically didn't matter what you were doing, in terms of qualifying or not qualifying. There was no judgment to be made; there was no way of knowing whether you were really encouraging more investment or whether people just came along and took it. Now there might be a difference of opinion on that, but I've seen some of the items - you know, a freezer for a store in Treherne or some place - hardly the kind of thing that is going to do anything other than put that individual in a better competitive position against his neighbour. Anyway, I just mention that.

The other areas, of course, in the Jobs Fund, that were the other of the 12, are Co-operative Development, Transportation, Housing, Urban Development, Youth Wage Assistance, Provincial Capital Assets, Community Assets and they've basically been, we believe, rather

successful overall. There are always going to be some areas of dispute in them. I think that we can all agree that job creation has to be No. 1. I would like to hear sometime during the debates in the next little while, because the opposition has been saying they're going to eliminate the health and education levy, where they're going to come up with the extra money.

I think I've demonstrated clearly this afternoon that they're not going to enlarge the pie if they do what they did the last time they were in office, so that's not an option. They're going to have to tell Manitobans where they're going to come up with \$110 million of tax. We have these people who are going to cut taxes telling people that they're going to reopen land titles offices that will cost the taxpayers \$200,000.00. We're having them telling people we're going to add on to private school funding in a way beyond what the NDP would. We're having people telling people out there all kinds of things about your added expenditure plans and we would like sometime to hear those people . . . The South Winnipeg Vocational School were supposed to come up with \$2 million and so on, so we hear all your stuff about where you're coming up with lower taxes and more money.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that either they would be the "party" party that they have been developing into being in the last year, just fun and frolic and give everything to everybody and cut everybody's taxes and lower the deficit with no research, day-old newspapers and anonymous phone calls as their research department, using those funds for good times and parties. That's what that party is about; it's a "party" party group right now under the present leadership and at some time they are going to have to stand and say where they stand on the issue.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** Order please.  
The Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to begin by congratulating the Speaker and wishing him well in his position once again, a difficult task of maintaining order in the House, but one that he has very capably filled and I think has shown his true abilities under great pressure, great duress and great difficulty in the past few years.

I'd also like to begin by congratulating the Member for The Pas who has been elevated to Northern Affairs, Happy Harry. I think one of the nicest, one of the finest individuals to ever be elected to the House.

I'd also like to congratulate the MLA for Fort Garry on moving from City Council to the Legislature. I want to tell him that he has some big shoes to fill. I think Bud Sherman was a very effective member of this House and I, for one, will miss his wit and his participation in debate.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I don't know if there's anything else that I have to say that's nice. I want to begin by looking very briefly at the Throne Speech and then making some comments to both of the major parties in the Manitoba Legislature.

I want to say that the Throne Speech, I think, was a disappointment. The only major thing that I could see in the Throne Speech is something we're all fully aware of. It's the major economic question as far as

I'm concerned, and I know as far as the government is concerned, and that is the construction of Limestone. I don't want to get into that issue right now because I intend to speak on it a number of times. I simply say to the government that they have not made the case to proceed or accelerate the construction of Limestone. That's the least that can be said. At worst, I think we can say that they are prepared to gamble \$3.2 billion of taxpayers' money on a reckless scheme to re-elect the government. There'll be more on that later, of course, from all of us and what we need on that issue, I think, is a full scale debate and the Premier indicated just prior to the Session, that he was prepared to have that debate, and I think that both sides should remain open to the question of whether or not that project should proceed at this time. But I say the government has not made that case and I think they will have to not only make it to us, but to the people of Manitoba.

It isn't good enough, Mr. Speaker, for them to go up North with a travelling circus and tell the people in the member for Thompson's riding and in the Churchill riding, and in Flin Flon and The Pas, that this is the "gravity" train and everybody jump on board, and to tell the contractors of Manitoba that. They have to address their comments to everybody in Manitoba who is a taxpayer, who is a Hydro user, and they cannot just sell it on the basis of jobs for a few people and the "gravity" train for some and bills and possibly debts and possibly disaster for the rest of the province for a whole series of decades, maybe for 50 or 60 years, depending on how you want to look at the project.

Mr. Speaker, there was very little mention of Urban Affairs. The government doesn't seem to have a policy in that regard, hardly any mention, if any, on municipal governments, very little, if anything, for Winnipeg.

On Education, again, very little financial support for the public school system. A lot of talk, a lot of moving of the hands and shaking of the head by the Minister, but if you look at it, the people in the school divisions asked for a loaf of bread, and they were given a stone.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two small things, I think, in the Throne Speech that are of some value. I'm very interested in The Freedom of Information Act because this government has proven to be very reluctant to produce and provide information to the opposition, Mr. Speaker.

I say, as an illustration only, I submitted an Address for Papers to the House Leader 14 months ago, he still hasn't produced it. Doesn't want to produce it, may never produce it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I, like everybody else I think, welcome the classification of home video tapes. I asked for that a number of months ago, because I find, as a parent, that this is a problem that people are encountering trying to determine what they are going to get when they rent a video cassette, take it home, and put it on their VCR for their young children. Heaven only knows what kind of foul language or what sort of pornographic type of material might come out and you cannot guess and the people who provide them and who sell them and rent them, they don't know either. So we're into a kind of peculiar period, where we have our movies classified and we are now going to finally have these video cassettes classified. So I think the government is taking a step in the right direction there.

I mentioned that to the Minister six months ago. He wrote me a couple of days ago and said we're going

to do something about it, a little slow on the draw, a little tardy in answering his mail, but at least the legislation has come forward.

But Mr. Speaker, there's one small thing that is coming forward which I think is going to elicit a major debate in this chamber and that is the government's attempts at dealing with what they would describe as hate literature. Mr. Speaker, that is a crucial question. It's very easy indeed to say that we have to stamp out a certain type of offensive material. But in so doing, there's a danger that freedom itself and the freedom of expression, and the free exchange of ideas, may suffer in consequence. So I say to the government, if they are bringing that forward, if the Attorney-General, the least likely person to do so, brings it forward, I think we'll have to take a hard look at it. And although superficially, it'll be the government in their role as good guys, fighting the bigots and racists, that will be the superficial level of the debate, but the real level of debate, will be on the question of free expression and the freedom to speak, and debate questions openly without fear of being thrown into jail, etc., etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that the government, if they're not careful, they may be cutting their own throat, because if they give power to an administration to clamp down on that, it is usually the people on the left side of the equation who have the ideas that are not common, who have the ideas that are different, who have ideas that sometimes are in advance of popular opinion, they may be cutting their own throat and they may be paying a price and they may not wish to, but they may silence free expression and free debate and free discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I note in passing only, that there is no reference to the French language question. This was one of the accomplishments of the government. They were going to rectify this 90-year-old problem, solve something that had been around, but they're distancing themselves. That's right, not a word, not a peep. And the Free Press in their observation on this last Friday, said that the Throne Speech "was a blissful detachment from the political realities of Manitoba in 1985." Well, that's pretty devastating observation. And it mentions several times, that they had no mention of the French language service question "no direction or purpose for dealing with French language services and the validity of the laws. Its account of the government's policy on Hydro revenues is incompletely honest," in other words, not honest, or in other words, dishonest.

So Mr. Speaker, those are a few observations on the Throne Speech. I wanted to direct a few comments to the members of the official opposition and say to them, as an observer who has been on both sides of the House and one who has been in this chamber now almost 19 years, that I think they're playing it too safe. I think the Progressive Conservative party's policy of low profile or no profile, may backfire, and I have to tell them that they have allowed the government to take the ball in the last six or eight months and run down the field, or if they haven't been running down the field, moving down the field.

Mr. Speaker, we know that they couldn't have gone any lower than they did a year ago. They were at rock bottom, so we know that there could only be improvement.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I recall to them my favorite story of all the nursery rhymes and fairy

tales and so on, is the hare and the tortoise, and you have here the NDP tortoise inching towards the finish line. And the Conservative hare or rabbit, standing there leaning against the tree, saying I can take those guys anytime I want. And there's a danger, Mr. Speaker, in this, and that is that they may move too late. They may allow the NDP tortoise too much time to move forward. So Mr. Speaker, I'm simply striking a cautionary note there, and I want to say as well, I'm warning both sides that are other animals in the forest hiding in the jungle.

There are the Liberals, for example, might be regarded as an old elephant, or hippopotamus, the Liberal Party, with a new leader and they're going to try to take one or two seats. Now they're gamblers, they're going after River Heights. That's a big gamble and I don't know where else they're trying. I think Mr. Kaufman is going to go after Fort Rouge. Now, someone's going to win Fort Rouge, other than the Attorney-General for sure, whether it's Mr. Kaufman or not, we don't know, but we know that seat is up for grabs.

There's another animal in the forest, Mr. Speaker, and that's the Progressive Party. Now some may laugh and they may say well they're no threat, but I have to remind you that their leader is always a threat. He would be an asset to this Legislature at any time. At any time. No matter how far we go back or how far we go ahead, whether you like him or hate him, you have to admit that he is a political animal and a capable person and one who could keep any government, no matter which stripe, on its toes for the benefit of the Province of Manitoba.

Then, there's a man-eating party in the jungle, the Core Party. They have to be given consideration as well, because if they played their cards right and picked the right candidates and fought hard, they could pick up three or four or five seats in the next provincial election. — (Interjection) — Well, I'm saving that for the last. The independents, intelligent, lovable, popular - to name but a few of our good points. We too could expand. Certain ridings, certain candidates, depending — (Interjection) — the Member for Ellice? The Member for Ellice. Well, he's so unhappy he's not even here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying that with the two old-line parties, if they don't address the needs and rise to the occasion and provide people with solid alternatives, there are going to be new political forces moving forward in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Leader of the Official Opposition that he has to take a stand on the major issues of our time. He has to make his position on the language question crystal clear for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, and also in relation to the Core Party and the Independents and other people who will make their position very clear. I say that the Leader of the Official Opposition has an albatross around his neck, and that is his Federal Leader, Brian Mulroney. The Prime Minister is a serious problem for the Provincial Progressive Conservative Party. Because on the language question, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is no different from his predecessor. The Prime Minister has 60 MPs from Quebec that he has to worry about breathing down his neck. I say that a distinction must be made, if there is a distinction, between the Provincial Conservative Party and the federal party on the language questions.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on Limestone. The Conservatives have not fully rounded out their position on that issue. I suspect they will. We will have that debate, but they have to indicate exactly what their stand is on that major question.

Mr. Speaker, third, I want to warn the Conservatives of one issue that could be potentially dangerous to them and injurious to their health. That is the question of aid to private and parochial schools. The Honourable Member for Morris gave an interview not too long ago in which he intimated that he and his party was going to do something about aid to private and parochial schools. Front page of the Winnipeg Free Press. I think this is something that is going to become an election issue if the Conservatives put that in their platform. Mr. Speaker, if the NDP was smart - I don't know if they're this smart - if they were smart, they would oppose that policy and defend the public school system. The easy position is to cave in to tie the Tories. I'm concerned about what the Conservatives may do in this regard and concerned about the reaction of the government as opposed to their historic position of not being in favour. The Conservatives brought in aid to private and parochial schools in the sense of direct grants and the NDP made an enrichment a couple of years ago without caucus support, without party support, without public support. Mr. Speaker, we don't want back door, we don't want subterfuge here. We want up-front discussion and up-front debate on a crucial historical question.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say, in that regard, that the Leader of the Opposition is going to have to define his positions, and he's going to have to take a stand, and he's going to have to differentiate himself. The people of Manitoba don't want a choice between a weak Premier and a weak Leader of the Official Opposition. They want a choice, a real choice. I think that the Conservative Leader has 6-12 months to demonstrate that he has the right stuff. That will be a judgment of the public as to whether or not the Leader of the Official Opposition is a good alternative, a positive alternative, a real alternative to the Premier.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Norbert says when is the election. I think the election will be in one year, but that doesn't rule out the possibility of a snap election or a fall election. I don't think the government's ready. They're not ready. It's cold outside, Mr. Speaker. It's warm inside, it's friendly. There's your staff and your office and the chesterfield. I don't have those things, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the amenities of office. All I have, Mr. Speaker, is the old broom closet on the main floor. Every now and then somebody from the cleaning staff comes in and throws a mop in by accident and says I'm sorry, I beg your pardon, sir, but it's hard to break an old habit.

Mr. Speaker, the people who are in the Cabinet, they don't want to go outside. They don't want to take a chance in the big, bad cruel world.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the election could be a year away, this could be the last Session. This could be it. So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take advantage of the opportunity and say goodbye to some on the members on the opposite side who won't be here after the next election. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I think if we look at the opposite side - I think we'd better start at the bottom, the Member for

Wolseley. There's a riding guaranteed out. That's riding's gone, No. 1. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Wolseley looks good on paper. I read her credentials here in the Throne Speech Debate. They look very good on paper. Unfortunately, her performance leaves a lot to be desired. I say that we will never see her again. That's typical of Wolseley as well. That's a swing riding. A lot of people in that riding have only been there for one term.

Mr. Speaker, there's going to be some real fights in some of the north-end ridings, but I am not sure. I just want to say I think two of the nicest people in the Legislature, the MLAs for Burrows and St. Johns, they're going to have a fight in what is really a safe riding. They will have a fight to retain their seats nevertheless.

Now the Member for Ste. Rose, he isn't going to run, but I don't think there's going to be a New Democrat coming back from Ste. Rose. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia, he has a safe seat but he too could have a fight. It all depends on whether Alf Skowron runs against him or me, so we'll see.

**A MEMBER:** And for what party?

**MR. R. DOERN:** And for what party and how many other Independents come out of the woodwork.

Now the Member for Riel, Mr. Speaker, is a very fine person, one that I like, but I think her seat is in jeopardy. She is in jeopardy and if she doesn't come back, it will be unfortunate, but that could occur.

Mr. Speaker, moving right along, the Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Highways, I think he will not be here again. He will not be here again. A nice guy, a good-looking man, he always reminds me of Clark Gable, but I don't think he's going to be back.

The Member for Radisson, he won't be back. The Member for Osborne, she may not be back. That's going to be an interesting fight. Deputy Premier or not, she's going to be in a real fight.

Now the Member for St. James, Mr. Speaker, gone with the wind, gone with the wind. He was in for one term before; he is now in for a term, but I don't think he can win re-election. It's a tough seat; I don't think he can do it.

The Member for Gimli, another Minister, I think that's gone, that seat's gone.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General for sure is gone. That's the Cy Gonick syndrome. — (Interjection) — Who's Cy Gonick? Soon as they find out, never again, the same thing there.

**A MEMBER:** If you can't fire him, he's going to quit.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Well, I don't know if we're going to see him on the bench, but let me tell you, I want to say if he has a chance to go on the bench, take it.

The Member for Fort Rouge has given us a legacy of two things. He's given us the French language question and he's given us something else: the Penner poll. I think that's a classic. It's like the Potemkin (phonetic) Village. If he gives you a poll you know it's a fabrication; you know it's been made up; you know he won't produce it; and you know he can't produce it, Mr. Speaker. But that seat is up for grabs. That's going to be an interesting fight between the

Conservatives and the Liberals, maybe Independents, and so on, that's going to be one of the seats to watch.

Mr. Speaker, Rossmere I think is in trouble, in big trouble. The Minister of Finance himself, a man who was once considered leadership material, once considered to be the next leader of the New Democratic Party, a man who acts like a Finance Minister when he's making a statement and then acts like a gutter fighter when he isn't, but a man who is seen as a comer in the party and now I think has been written off completely.

Mr. Speaker, the kind of announcements he's making are pathetic. I mean here's one, "Schroeder Commends McKenzie Turnaround", February 15th. He was pleased to announce and he commended the employees, the management and the board of A. E. McKenzie for their financial turnaround. Throw in ten million bucks and declare \$135,000 a year profit. You got to be kidding, Mr. Speaker. That's a turnaround? That's a turnoff; that's a phony bit of sleight of hand that will not sell, Mr. Speaker, in this province.

Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Well, I'm sorry I did. I did forget the Member for Ellice, who I think is going to have to be very careful and the Member for Thompson, who I think is in jeopardy. Now he's a nice guy too. I think he's got a lot of promise. He's a good heckler; he's a good speaker; he has two young children to support, but he is in jeopardy. He is in jeopardy. I think maybe he should either stand aside as an Independent or a Conservative. I think he'd be wise in disassociating himself. You're known by the company you keep, so I think that might be worth keeping in mind, but he's going to have a stiff fight.

Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Well, I'll go to him last, but the Member for Transcona is probably safe, the Minister of Mines, he's probably safe, but he's gone down too, Mr. Speaker. He was also the man who was to be the replacement of Ed Schreyer, the Schreyer-like member, the man who had the potential to be leader and premier. Now, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this man who has a lot of ability, a Rhodes Scholar no less, has simply become a pale imitation of his own leader. He has somehow or other allowed himself to be drawn in with the style of leadership and the style of performance that the Premier has, and so he's given us the Limestone affair. I think that's going to be a sordid tale when it comes out. Then he's given us Willy's war where he's threatening the people of New Brunswick - not New Brunswick - the people of North Dakota with a war. If they don't smarten up in regard to MANDAN, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Order please. The member should refer to other members by the office they hold or by their constituency and not use personal names or epithets, no matter how affectionately they might be considered.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say that the two Ministers - just to conclude that comment - the Minister made the statement which I thought was one of his worst, in which he threatens a shopper's boycott to the people of Grand Forks and to the people of Fargo-Moorhead.



He intimated that if they didn't play ball that our people might stop going over the border, but you know, Mr. Speaker, that certainly isn't a good-neighbour policy and that works both ways. We go down there and they come up here and they go to our race track; they go to our resorts; they shop; they're welcome, and our people are vital to the North Dakota economy. The Member for Arthur says correctly, they are even now buying our machinery — (Interjection) — well I don't know the agriculture scene, but we know that there is trade and beneficial trade on both sides of the border.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield, the House Leader - gone - not a chance, no way. I mean any guy - he's the only person in the history of this Legislature that had to walk around with a bodyguard. He had the Minister of Health running cover for him and a couple of other bodyguards because his own people were trying to get him. The people of Springfield were trying to get him. — (Interjection) — Yes, remember the toe in the door. Imagine, a fair maiden sticking her toe in the NDP caucus door and the Minister is on the other side threatening to bust her foot. I was going to say "Big Larry", Mr. Speaker, but I won't. The Minister of Health, the big Minister of Health, leaning on the door. It's enough to give you the gout.

Mr. Speaker, some other Ministers, the Member for River East, deader than a doornail, deader than a doornail. Mr. Speaker, like a breeze through the forest - once and that's it. People in his riding have never even heard of him, and I'm afraid that his mark on this Legislature has been nil; his contribution to date has been insignificant.

Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion, the Minister of Cultural Affairs, the man who sees himself as Santa Claus, the man who goes around dispensing \$50,000 cheques to new ethnic organizations, the man who's attempting to sway and influence and lead the ethnic community - not alone - he has lots of support; he has the enthusiastic support of the Minister of Education, the Member for Ellice and the First Minister, to name but a few. But that's the old ethnic game, but in the end, through these policies, he comes across as Manitoba's answer to Serge Joyal, someone who's trying to influence and fragment and bolster the ethnic people of Manitoba, people who for many years in Manitoba never looked to the government for money, never had to, never wanted to, didn't think about it. Now, the game is should we or should we not go to the government? Why should we be suckers while everybody else is going with their hands out and getting all kinds of grants? Let's get in on this gravy train.

Now he's going into phase two, propping up companies. Can you imagine a labour spokesman, a labour leader running around propping up companies?

Mr. Speaker, just briefly, in regard to the Premier. The Premier is the man who said, we're on a roll. Mr. Speaker, isn't that what the man inside the washing machine or the dryer said? We're on a roll. That doesn't sound like the Premier. I don't know who's writing his lines for him now. Somebody's giving him new lines and he's feeding them into the debate.

The First Minister, instead of making hard decisions, instead of doing the tough decision making and providing good government, he's gone for the quick fix and the PR stuff and the big spending. Mr. Speaker, in the old days, I used to be shocked at practices that

went on in some parts of this country at election time, people trying to bribe voters with dollar bills or ten dollar bills, with giving them drinks. In the days of the Union Nationale Government in Quebec, they would buy a fridge for a family; they'd buy a pair of shoes; they would buy clothing for the kids and so on. I thought that was shocking in a way, but now we have a government that's prepared to spend billions, if necessary, to gamble billions, if necessary, to get re-elected. And I say, in the process, the government's popularity is plummeting as they become more desperate. The Premier's image is going down the tube. Mr. Speaker, if you want to know what some people think of the Premier at present, go and see Section 23, the Musical Comedy, and you will see what they think.

Mr. Speaker, I simply conclude and say that I'm concerned about the future of the New Democratic Party, 50 years of blood, sweat, toil and tears and now the possibility of the party going down the tubes because of poor leadership and weak leadership. I'm also worried about the future of certain individuals and I guess, just like in the old high school and university year books, what will happen to them, what was their ambition and what was their probably fate? I think this is the probable fate. The Minister of Finance - a clerk in the Land Titles Office in Beausejour; the Minister of Energy - a meter reader for Manitoba Hydro; the Minister of Industry - a bouncer in a pub on Main Street and the Minister of Education, relegated to doing commercials for Clairol. Finally, probably the saddest fate of all, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader - a cabin boy on the Paddlewheel Queen.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, it's nice to have a lighthearted interlude as the debate proceeds in the House and it's always interesting to listen to the way that the Member for Elmwood delivers his speech. It's kind of interesting, even though there isn't that much substance in what he says, it's always nice to listen to him.

Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly pleased to enter the debate and, unlike the speeches we've been listening to from members opposite, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, who delivered a tirade of negativism as perhaps such as we haven't heard for some time. I listened very carefully and I didn't hear one word of constructive criticism, not one suggestion of constructive alternative - what the Conservatives would do if they were in power. It was negative all the way.

I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that when the Leader of the Opposition visits another province, Toronto, Calgary, I would suspect that everybody he meets, whether it's the Chamber of Commerce or the bankers or what, he would be telling them, please don't come to Manitoba, things are bad; don't come. I suspect that is his theme when he goes out to visit other areas and to listen to him in this House and listen to other members, that is the message that's coming forward.

We've heard some of the comments made by the Minister of Finance and he outlined that in the brochure that the Conservatives are distributing throughout the province; so I'm saying that I think it was one of weakest

speeches that I've ever heard the Leader of the Opposition deliver, and it's too bad. His response to the Speech from the Throne after Her Honour had completed reading the speech, sounded childish to me, and I hate to use the word "childish" because I don't like to insult children. I don't like to compare them with adults who are not adult in their comments.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech, in my view, indicates a clear direction of confidence in the future of Manitoba, confidence in the co-operative spirit of the people of Manitoba, confidence in the resourcefulness of our citizens, confidence in the thrusts and policies of this government, confidence in social democracy, a government that is not timid and a government that is prepared to be progressive and innovative and a government willing to undertake new initiatives - and to name one, the Jobs Fund which is a fairly high-profile example.

Therefore, I am pleased to congratulate the Member for Wolseley on moving the Throne Speech. I congratulate the Member for Riel for seconding the Speech from the Throne. Both speeches were well delivered, appropriate and factual comments, Mr. Speaker, outlining good policies for the next few years and for the 1980s. I would particularly like to thank the Member for Riel for the kind words that she directed towards me, and a number of my colleagues, and some of the members opposite who have extended kind words to myself on my retirement. I appreciate that.

I would extend my congratulations to you, Sir, on continuing as Speaker of the House. It's not an easy task. I don't envy you your position and it's difficult, I know, at times.

I suppose congratulations are in order for the Member for The Pas. Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas has a wide knowledge of the northern part of our province and the problems that are faced by Northerners. I'm sure it a fitting post for him and I'm sure that he will do well in that area.

May I congratulate also the Member - to get the congratulations out of the way - the Member for Fort Garry on coming to this nice Assembly. I would agree with the member who spoke before me that he will have some big shoes to follow. We'll certainly miss the former Member for Fort Garry. He was certainly a fine gentleman.

I would also congratulate the Assistant Clerk and I wish her well in her new position.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I announced that I would not be a candidate in the next provincial election. I would also comment, Mr. Speaker, that you and I, Sir, were elected on the same day, April 5, back in 1971. It's been my privilege to represent the constituency of Ste. Rose. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the citizens of the Ste. Rose constituency for the support, the confidence, and the co-operation that they have extended to me during my four terms in office. We have achieved, we have made much progress and, with their support, we have made Manitoba a better place for people to live.

Mr. Speaker, there has been progress in Manitoba and the Minister of Finance documented some of the statistics and people are coming back to Manitoba. I think he mentioned that there were 32,700 in the last three years. This is quite a record. Mr. Speaker, you can go in any small town - you may not notice so much

in Winnipeg, but when you go down say the street of Ste. Rose or some other smaller community and you see three or four automobiles parked on the street with Alberta licences or other licences, you start to question what province you're in. We know that they are coming back, and we welcome them here.

Let us review some of these accomplishments, and I don't want to take that much time, but, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has outlined some of the statistics. Our private investment is strong as the Minister of Finance indicated, and the job creation is one of the best in Canada. We have much to be proud of. Employment rise; 469,000 Manitobans are now employed. There were 13,000 more people working in '84 than in 1983.

Our unemployment has dropped. We have been consistently the lowest, or the second lowest, in all of Canada, Mr. Speaker. Even the statistics that were being quoted by the Member for Sturgeon Creek last night about the Conference Board of Canada says that Manitoba will have the second highest economic growth rate of any province in 1984. We've had a population boom that I've just indicated, Mr. Speaker.

Even oil production is on the increase. The best in the West, Mr. Speaker. Building homes, homes are being built, an increase in 1983 of 194.8 percent in total starts.

Retail sales is a good forecaster. The Minister of Finance has mentioned some. Manitoba's retail trade in 1984 will see the best improvement and did see the best improvement in all of Western Canada. There is much to be proud of. It's a sad commentary when you listen, when you suspect that your Leader of the Opposition, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, would go out to Toronto or somewhere else and say things are bad, don't come to Manitoba, wait till we get elected. That is really deplorable, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** False information.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. A. ADAM:** We've only touched on a few things, Mr. Speaker. You know you can go throughout Manitoba and see the changes that have taken place, the progress that has taken place, whether it be in nursing homes, whether it be in day care, and not to mention the Main Street Program - I'll let somebody else do the bragging there, I don't have to do it, Mr. Speaker. It was one of the most popular programs that was ever introduced in the province.

Mr. Speaker, there are problems; there are always problems on the horizon. One of the problems that faces Manitoba and Western Canada in particular is in agriculture. There is a dark cloud on the horizon, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with the agriculture sector and it's a national issue. The members opposite know that as well as I do.

We have here an industry that's perhaps on the verge of collapse and what is happening is brutal and callous - what is happening in that industry. It is unfortunate because it is the backbone of the country. It's one of our most important sectors and it's unfortunate to see what's happening there and the inability of farmers to

deal with it effectively, to deal with the problems that face them.

As a province, in the limited ability of a province, we have done more in the three and a half years that we have been in office than any other provincial government in the history of this province, but the problems are so great that it's beyond the capability of a province the size of Manitoba with a population of perhaps more than a million, but as a province with limited resources available, we have introduced a very substantial number of programs to assist the family farm. A very substantial amount of funding has been provided and been allocated to the farm economy. The Minister of Finance outlined some of that funding when he spoke earlier - in the millions of dollars. Still the problem remains. It defies a solution under the present structure and we are trying to do something about it to the limit of the ability of a province.

For instance, the latest announcement by the Minister of Agriculture when he introduced the interest rate reduction to 8 percent. We are attempting to address at least the problems that some of our farmers face in the Province of Manitoba. If other provinces are not to follow suit, that is their problem, Mr. Speaker.

For the last decade or more, we on this side, New Democrats everywhere, have been drawing to the attention of farmers and Manitobans the changes taking place which would be detrimental to the farm economy. We now know the results of the changes to the Crow Rate, how that's going to affect our farming economy. Certainly we did the best we could. We spoke about it; we even tried to co-opt the opposition with us. They waffled on it for two or three years. I suspect that the former Minister of Highways when the Tories were on this side of the House, when he met with Mr. Pepin, I think they saw eye to eye; I believe they saw eye to eye on what was going to happen to the Crow Rate. I think they saw eye to eye on variable rates, Mr. Speaker. The variable rate now is rearing its ugly head.

We've warned Manitobans and we've warned Manitoba farmers on the implications of this happening. Variable rates will destroy a good part of rural Manitobans and, true to our predictions, the railways are already asking for it and the grain companies are asking for it. Even in today's paper, Saskatoon, where they're dealing with this and there was an article on it, where the lawyer for the Wheat Board, I guess it was, indicated that the CNR hadn't made a good case for their requests and that the commission should not accept their arguments. But it will be a sad day for Manitoba if that comes to pass and that is only the tip of the iceberg.

We hope that farmers in Manitoba will listen and pay heed to what is happening around them. I know it's difficult because they are in such difficulty; they're working so hard to make things meet, make ends meet. They are so preoccupied with their daily problems of survival that they haven't got time for these other issues.

It is certainly not the farmers who are responsible for inflation and high input costs. Mr. Speaker, farmers have increased their production. I would say, a few years ago a farmer would produce enough food for about seven people; today he can probably feed 60 to 70 people. So the farmer has increased his efficiency but it's been gobbled up as fast as he has increased that capacity to produce. It's been gobbled up by the other sectors in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we sounded the same alarm as we did on the Crow Rate and on the variable rates. We sounded the same alarm on high interest rates. We sounded the same warning on high energy costs when we had a Conservative Government sitting on this side of the House and their Leader saying that energy prices had to go to the world prices the sooner the better or as soon as possible. That is the kind of situation that we were warning against. We have the Member for Turtle Mountain sitting here today, who, when he was on this side said that there was nothing else that could be done, what else could you do but let the interest rates . . . Otherwise, your dollar would tumble down. I can't paraphrase you exactly, sir.

Mr. Speaker, now you have inflation down to 4 percent or 4.5 percent and what has happened? It hasn't remedied anything, has it? We have warned about this and I say to the farmers of Manitoba, they had better start counting who their friends are or finding out who their friends are. They had better find out who their friends are. Where are the Federal Conservatives on the farm issue today? Where are they, Mr. Speaker? Where is the Minister of Finance, Mr. John Wilson, the Honourable John Wilson? Is he a friend? — (Interjection) — Whatever his first name is, maybe it's Mike. Mr. Speaker, well the other day he was referred to by the Member for Arthur as a bureaucrat. You know the Minister of Finance was referred to as a bureaucrat. Don't pay no attention to those bureaucrats in Ottawa. It's not bureaucrats. It's high profile ministers that are saying - it's high profile ministers that are downgrading the situation of the farms and the farmers in this province.

**A MEMBER:** No, no, no. You blew it Pete. I was with you up until that time.

**A MEMBER:** We were with you up until you didn't know his name.

**MR. A. ADAM:** All right. We have an article here, February 13th, who say that we would have to throw \$3 billion at the agricultural problem and it still wouldn't solve the problem. So we're just not going to do it. We're not going to do it. Why do it? Mr. Speaker, they admit that there's 39,000 farmers who are in severe to moderate financial difficulty, but why help them? Let the thing shake out. This is what — (Interjection) — Well this is John Wise.

**A MEMBER:** Oh.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Minister John Wise said yesterday that we could throw in billions and that doesn't guarantee that they'll survive. Isn't that an admission that there's something structurally wrong with the system?

**A MEMBER:** Let's get the system like they have in Russia.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, should we be looking at other ways? What did they do, Mr. Speaker? They made an election promise that they would remove some of the gas tax on farm fuels and we had no objection. We had a resolution in this House, sending down there

to Ottawa for them to do so, last year, Mr. Speaker. You know what they did the next day or the day after, they removed 2.8 cents per litre or thereabouts, and they turned around and raised the fuel prices at the wellhead 2 cents a litre. The big deal you know, the big trade-off. And what else did they do - the friends of the farmers - the friends in Ottawa of the farmers? What they did here is try to increase their cost recovery on services. At beef grading, Mr. Speaker, they've increased that; hog grading; sheep grading, exporting potatoes; vegetables; pedigreed seed growers - and there's a good one. Let's just stop for a moment and look at that one. Seed purity germination and germination, 50 cents to \$1.50; 500 percent increase in cost to the farmer, to the pedigreed seed grower. These are friends of farmers, a cost of \$2,205,000, to 1,470 growers. Seed grain packing, grading and sealing, from 1.5 cents for 25 kilograms to 22 cents for 25 kilograms, an increase of 1,500 percent. Mr. Speaker, they've increased to pedigreed seed growers 10 cents on average, which is the price now, to \$1.10. That's 1,100 percent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we can just go right down the list anyway. The friends of the farmers in Ottawa, the Conservative Tories, have increased their cost recoveries roughly of \$3,430,325.00. So, Mr. Speaker, even though the problems are great, and I've outlined some of them here and what's happening in Manitoba, they are small by comparison to the problems that are faced by the American farmer. Mr. Speaker, you have to take a trip down there to get a feel of it and talk to somebody. Mr. Speaker, the other day . . .

**A MEMBER:** Did you do that?

**MR. A. ADAM:** Yes, I was down there two weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, just recently there was a march in Washington and they went to the Memorial Convention Centre there, I'm not familiar with Washington, but it was just down the street somewhere from the White House. There were thousands of farmers and they carried with them 250 white crosses which they planted and that was symbolic to represent that 250 farmers are going bankrupt every day in the United States and we deplore when there's even one farmer that goes bankrupt in Manitoba or in Canada. We don't want that to happen. And over there, Mr. Speaker, there's 250 a day going under - tens of thousands are going out. In one area alone, within a radius of maybe 10, 15 miles, three of them committed suicide. That is what's happening in the United States and they introduced a Farm Support Bill.

**A MEMBER:** They think it's funny.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Oh yes, I know they do.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress introduced the Senate and they passed these bills, the Farm Support Bill, and they were warned by the President that he would veto it and he did at the time that I was reading some of the commentary and the reports.

**A MEMBER:** What paper is that Pete?

**MR. A. ADAM:** Well this one has to be quite a way down south, but never mind where it comes from, the

article was from Washington. "Delmar Kies (phonetic) and about 1,000 farmers gathered Monday in the cold drizzle to ask the government for more farm credit and higher commodity prices. They listened to speeches from farm State congressmen at the Jefferson Memorial and they planted 250 white crosses. The crosses symbolize, the farmers said, the number of farm foreclosures each day. During what Kies calls the "Other Depression" in the 1930s.

His grandfather committed suicide in the '30s, because of the farm economy. It took most of the lifetime of Kies' father to buy back the land that his grandfather had committed suicide over. The father, two years ago, died leaving the 240-acre tract to the 61-year old Kies and his wife, Clarice. You want me to tell you the sad part Kies said, his eyes downcast, the sad part is, I've already lost half of it. I can't pay my interest, my taxes, and three weeks ago, my bank turned me down, so I don't know what I'm going to do. We don't want the government to give us anything, we just want a fair price.

One farmer said, I'm fed up, we're fed up with the free market system. You must remember that I'm talking about, generally, very conservative individuals from the United States. They are saying we're fed up with the free market system, because we have our neighbours committing suicide or thinking about it and going down the drain by the tens of thousands, Mr. Speaker.

I'm certainly not, and I said that, I'm not belittling any of the problems that are occurring in Canada. But what happens over there will eventually get here and perhaps the Wheat Board is one of the reasons why maybe it's not as bad here. I'm sure that there wouldn't be any tears shed, on that side of House, if the Wheat Board was to go.

Well, I see the Member for Arthur turn around in disgust, but I say to him that, in my opinion, there wouldn't be many tears shed on that side of the House if the Wheat Board was to go.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I've only got five minutes left, that farmers are beginning to know who their friends are, and who their enemies are. They're beginning to realize that there's something structurally wrong with the farm economy, not only in this country, but in the United States. I'm not saying that we have the answers.

I indicated in my comments previously that it defies the solution. It seems as though the more grain, the higher amount of exports, the more grain that's produced, the more farm bankruptcies that you have; the more exports, the production, the more sales, the more bankruptcies. Let's talk about what is wrong with the structure. Let us try and discuss it.

You know, our Minister tried to get the different governments to meet on a farm crisis. They wouldn't even come down to talk, Mr. Speaker. In other words, if a farmer loses money on one bushel of grain that he sells, it follows that the more he sells, the larger his loss. That is what's happened.

There's a dilemma of commodity prices being too low - that's what's happening in the States and is happening here - and high input cost. The input cost that I spoke of a while ago . . .

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

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

**MR. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I said a while ago that the farmer increased his efficiency tenfold. It is not the farmer's fault that there's inflation. I said that. The little Caesar from Pembina wasn't listening. I said that. So if we can't resolve it, and I said it defies solution, let's look at some alternative. Let's see whether we should have a two-price system maybe. I'm not saying it'll work. Let's talk about, let's look at it. Maybe we should have so many bushels or let's say a guaranteed income. Let's look at some solutions before the whole thing is gone. That's all I say.

It may well be if we had parity prices for so many bushels, and then beyond that, let it go on the dumping ground.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would begin by extending my best wishes to you on carrying out your responsibilities of this Session of the Legislature. I would only hope that the members of the government would not see fit to bend and stretch the Rules the way they did earlier in this week. If they do not, of course, that will make your job very much easier, Mr. Speaker.

I congratulate the Member for The Pas on his elevation to Cabinet as short-lived as that may be.

I would congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the new Member for Fort Garry on his election to represent that constituency. He, of course, carries on in a tradition begun at least as far back as 1957 to 1969 by the present Member for Charleswood, and then from 1969 to 1984 by Mr. Sherman, so that constituency has been well served, certainly for those number of years, and I'm sure will continue to be served well by him as a new member.

Mr. Speaker, in the few short minutes left until 5:30, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the comments made by the Minister of Finance earlier today who talked about his pre-Budget consultations and how the No. 1 priority had to be job creation and how good a job the government had done in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, of course, that at the present time there are 48,000 unemployed persons in Manitoba, 20,000 more than when the New Democratic Party took office. I would also like to look back, Mr. Speaker, at the effectiveness of the New Democratic Party's Job Fund Program which they allege to be the "crowning jewel" in their achievements, Mr. Speaker.

In the Labour Bulletin published by the government for February 1985, on page 13, Mr. Speaker, this is a page that deals with Manitoba labour market variables annual averages 1970 to 1984. These statistics clearly show, Mr. Speaker, that from 1977 to 1981, during the four years of Progressive Conservative Party Government, the labour force in Manitoba grew from 455,000 to 490,000 for an increase of 35,000 in the labour market, in the labour force. That's despite, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance's comments about decreases in population, which he says occurred during that period of time. The labour force grew by 35,000

people. During that same period of time, the number of employed persons grew from 428,000 to 461,000, an increase of 33,000 jobs. So, for an increase of 35,000 in the labour force, there was an increase of 33,000 employed persons in Manitoba. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, these are the annual averages in the government's Labour Market Bulletin which come from Statistics Canada.

During the New Democratic years in office, Mr. Speaker, the labour force has grown since 1981, from 490,000 to 515,000, for an increase of 25,000 people in the labour force. Certainly, although there may have been increases in the population - and I don't dispute those figures, in fact, I don't make an issue of them either way - but there's only been an increase of 25,000 in the labour force.

During that same period of time, Mr. Speaker, from 1981 to 1984, the number of employed persons has only increased from 461,000 to 472,000, an increase of 11,000 jobs. I think it's clear, in terms of comparison between those years of office that under the New Democratic Party only one-third of the jobs created under Progressive Conservative Government have been created in Manitoba. In no way has the number of jobs created kept up to the increase in the labour force of 25,000.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that the Minister of Finance glossed over this whole area in his remarks when we commented, asked him for specifics on employment growth. He just glossed over those figures. It's interesting to note also, Mr. Speaker, that while we have had the benefit of this great Jobs Fund during the last year, the unemployment rate in Manitoba, from January of '84 to January of '85 has actually increased, while unemployment across Canada has decreased. It's gone down to 12.2 from 12.4 across Canada during that year, while unemployment in Manitoba has gone up, Mr. Speaker. The number of unemployed persons in Manitoba has gone up during the last 12-month period. This is while we have had, again, Mr. Speaker, this allegedly great Jobs Fund acting to protect Manitobans from unemployment.

It's interesting to note also, Mr. Speaker - this is in the Labour Market Bulletin again - Manitoba had the eighth fastest rate of employment growth between January '84 and January '85 - the eighth. Now, that's gone up a little bit from December. The Labour Market Bulletin for January '85 pointed out that Manitoba had the lowest rate of employment growth between December '83 and December '84, the lowest rate of employment growth.

Now, what's also interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that for the month of December, the Manitoba rate of unemployment was increasing while the rate across Canada was decreasing. Similarly, in January, Mr. Speaker, the rate of unemployment was increasing in Manitoba while it was decreasing across Canada. In February, Mr. Speaker, the latest statistics - again, the rate across Canada - was decreasing by .4 percentage points while we remained the same in Manitoba.

There's a trend here, Mr. Speaker, that does not bode well for Manitoba at all. That, combined with the Conference Board statistics, the latest quarterly forecast of February '85 of the Conference Board of Canada about employment growth, puts Manitoba last. They predict .8 percent increase in employment. The last of all provinces, Mr. Speaker.

These are statistics that the Minister of Finance in no way referred to. These are factual statistics, other than the Conference Board, contained in the Provincial Government's Labour Market Bulletins. Mr. Speaker, they do not bode well for Manitoba. They run contrary to the themes of the Throne Speech that we're discussing now. We're told that the Jobs Fund is going to continue to be the saviour of Manitoba workers, and it's not, Mr. Speaker. It's not. It hasn't worked. Our unemployment rate is going up, while Canada is going down. Our rate of employment growth is last in December, was eighth lowest in January, and it's predicted to be by the Conference Board of Canada, the worst in the country for 1985. — (Interjection) — That's correct, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Turtle Mountain points out - that assumes a start on Limestone.

That explains, Mr. Speaker, the rationale for the whole Limestone project. The government is looking for a quick fix, Mr. Speaker. Why else would they be attempting to bring forward a project that is, at the very least, two years premature in its construction? Some of them may have understood what is happening in Manitoba, what is happening in the area of job creation. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's worthwhile to point out that in comparing the Manitoba statistics with other provincial government statistics on unemployment, as the Premier points out, other provinces supposedly don't have a Jobs Fund, a fund for make-work projects. Yet, their statistics, their unemployment rates are going down, while Manitoba's are going up.

Mr. Speaker, I think that deals in some significant way with the statistics submitted by the Minister of Finance and have to be a cause for concern amongst members of this Legislature and amongst members of the public. The Manitoba economy, obviously, is very stagnant. We're not having the growth in job creation that is taking place in other provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak on this Throne Speech, because this obviously is the last Session of this Legislature. It's an appropriate time to speak about the record of the New Democratic Party as this party prepares for an election with the public relations firms that they've hired recently and with the pollsters from Washington, D.C. that they've hired.

Mr. Speaker, this is a government, in my view, that is using at the present time taxpayers' money in an unconscionable way to finance a massive increase in political staff and huge partisan government advertising programs, at the same time that they are reducing services to the public. It demonstrates, and the public are cynical enough, I think, to understand this. It demonstrates a government whose main interest is in getting elected, not in serving the public; a government that hires, Mr. Speaker, an Assistant Deputy Minister to head up Communications and Public Relations at a salary at over \$50,000; a government that has had a 250 percent increase in advertising costs over its term of government; a government that has increased by over 100 percent the persons that they have hired in the highest echelons of the senior service, at the Levels 5 and 6; a government who, we've become aware, as soon as the National Energy Board - assuming they approve the Limestone project - are going to launch another advocacy advertising program on the benefits of Limestone.

This is a government that during the past number of years has refused to listen to the public of Manitoba, that had to be forced by this opposition to listen to the public and that I suggest, as we said in the Rules Committee the other day, is a government that cannot be trusted to be responsible for the Constitution of the people of this province and this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a government that are prepared to use the taxpayers' money to pay their election expenses in the next election. Approximately \$1.5 million of the taxpayers' money is going to be used by this government to pay their election expenses. We repeat once again, if we are elected to office, they will not see one penny of that money so they better tell their fund raising committees to raise enough money to cover all their expenses. Otherwise you're going to be looking after it yourself.

This is a government that is prepared to use its position for political purposes in almost every situation and take advantage of its position. Why would Ministers in this government ask members of the multicultural committee for mailing lists at this particular time? Mailing lists, Mr. Speaker. It's so that this government again is using its power and its influence to get mailing lists from members of the multicultural committee to mail out government propaganda to them, and at taxpayers' expense. I suggest that this is undue use of the power of any government.

This is a government, Mr. Speaker, that has earned the wrath of the Provincial Auditor for their misleading financial statements. The Auditor said he does not agree with the fairness of the presentation of the Minister of Finance in presenting the financial statements as the Minister of Finance has tried to hide the amount of the deficit. This is a government that has betrayed the public from the time they got into office and it's coming further home to roost.

This is a government who promised to ease the municipal tax burden. You know the comparison; my leader said it the other day and I'll repeat it again, Mr. Speaker. In three years under this government, the increase in municipal taxes is four times the total increase under the Progressive Conservative Government over four years. That's not taking into account this year, Mr. Speaker. We've seen some of the increases. I know within my own constituency where two school divisions are involved, the increase in the Seine River School Division is 13 percent; the increase in the Fort Garry School Division that is being considered tonight, I believe, at their meeting, for finalization, is 25 percent - 9.75 mills increase.

My school division in Fort Garry is not going to get the consideration the Winnipeg School Division got with a special grant at the last moment. They never have, Mr. Speaker, so there's going to be an even greater burden placed on the municipal taxpayer from a government that promised to ease the municipal tax burden, that promised to go to 90 percent financing, promised to keep grants in line with inflation and inflation has dropped; and the grants are not even keeping up with the rate of inflation, as they presently are.

Mr. Speaker, this is a government that has run up deficits that simply cannot be afforded by the taxpayers of this province; and as we consider their record, what would happen if they were to be given another four

years of office? What would the deficits be over another four years? Can the people of Manitoba afford four more years of deficits of the like this government has had over another four years?

What will happen to the sales tax? They increased it to 6 percent. The Minister of Finance has apparently reported to have said, speaking to another group, that a possibility is the sales tax will be increased even more. What about the payroll tax? Will that be increased more? There's every possibility, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact, I note the other day that the Retail Council of Canada commented on the payroll tax, pointing out that Manitoba and Quebec are Canada's only provinces with a payroll tax which the spokesman said is one of the greatest disincentives to investment in the labour-intensive retail sector; and he noted that the service sector, with retailing as its main component, is Manitoba's chief source for creating new jobs and their council covers about 70 percent of Manitoba's total retail sales. But this government, what will they do in another four years? Raise it another 1.5 percent like Quebec; go to 3 percent?

What's going to happen to the credit rating if they're given another four years? Something may happen even before this term expires. It's already gone down; it's costing Manitobans more to borrow money. In all likelihood, with this government in power, the credit rating will be dropped even lower.

What's going to happen with labour legislation? We've seen this government act as a pawn in the hands of the leaders of organized labour in Manitoba. They are attempting to defer some areas of labour legislation, but what are they going to do if they get another four years? They've already upset the previous balance between labour and management. Are they going to tell Manitobans what they are going to do specifically in the area of labour legislation for the next four years? Mr. Speaker, the union leaders won't let them. They may not have told them yet, but they will if they get another four years and that will be disastrous for Manitoba.

What about the quality of education? Will that deteriorate even further if this government is given another four years? They've done nothing to deal with improving the quality of education in this province, in elementary or high schools or university. Mr. Speaker, I suggest, given another four years, those standards will drop even further under this government.

What about manufacturing, Mr. Speaker? Manufacturing has dropped off tremendously, and the Conference Board points out that many of the province's largest manufacturing industries have not participated in the general manufacturing resurgence that's taken place across Canada.

Why not, Mr. Speaker? It's because of the payroll tax, Mr. Speaker, the sales tax, the labour legislation and everything else. Everything this government does is anti-employment in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

What will happen to hydro rates if the people of Manitoba give them another four years? Mr. Speaker, they took off the freeze that we imposed. They've increased them over 22 percent since they took off the freeze. Mr. Speaker, that spiral will keep on and on and on, if they're given another four years in government.

What will happen to Workers' Compensation Board assessments, Mr. Speaker? The record is clear, Mr. Speaker. We're now in a situation where they've increased the assessments over almost 60 percent in three years. They've imposed an increase this year which is some 70 percent short of what is required by the legislation, whereby the expenditures should be consistent with the revenues. What will happen, Mr. Speaker, if these people are given another four years in government? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, all of these areas are areas that will be increased significantly, the burden on the taxpayers, on the employers, will be further increased and what this will do is affect jobs.

It all comes back to what I started talking about in the first place, Mr. Speaker, the low rate of employment growth in this province is occurring as a result of all of these things that the government has done in the past three-and-one-half years. Deficit sales tax, payroll tax, credit rating, labour legislation, hydro rates, Workers' Compensation Board assessments are all contributing to this province being unable to compete, Mr. Speaker, and this is resulting in a low rate of employment growth, which is set out in the statistics, the lowest rate of employment growth in Canada predicted for 1985, confirmed during the past two months, and it's the result of the policies of this government.

If the people of Manitoba want this to continue and get worse, they're going to shortly have that opportunity, but hopefully for the sake of the workers and the young people of this province who need jobs, Mr. Speaker, this government will call an election shortly and a new government will be elected to set some of these things right.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time being 5:30, when this matter is next before the House, the honourable member will have 14 minutes remaining.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).