



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXI No. 2 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 13 APRIL, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**Thirty-Second Legislature****Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 13 April, 1984.

Time — 10:00 a.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 Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 60th Annual Report of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement. I would like to table, for the information of members, copies of the new Federal/Provincial Economic Development Agreement which have been signed earlier this morning. It is particularly pleasing to be able to do this this morning - and Mr. Axworthy will be joining us in a few moments, is a former member of the House - in respect to joining with us in regard to the agreement pertaining to two major new transportation agreements under the Canada/Manitoba Economic Regional Development Agreement.

The signing of this agreement is an important day for Northern Manitoba and is an important day for the entire province. The two agreements represent a total federal and provincial fund commitment of at least \$230 million over the next five years.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Don't stop us now; we're No. 1.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Of this total, I'm pleased to say that \$93 million has been allocated to developing the Port of Churchill to ensure its long-term viability.

The Transportation Development Agreement commits a further \$137.7 million to major transportation investments in Winnipeg and in other areas of Manitoba.

The Churchill Agreement includes several key items:

- \$39 million dollars will be provided for improving railway rolling stock to carry increased grain shipments to Churchill.
- Between 1984 and 1986, up to 1,000 boxcars will be rehabilitated at the Transcona Shops.
- And CP/CN will be carrying out design and prototype development for a new lightweight grain car here in the City of Winnipeg.

It is hoped that the prototype development will lead to full-scale manufacturing of the new cars in Manitoba.

By 1987 Manitoba Hydro will be constructing a \$36 million transmission line to Churchill as part of Manitoba's contribution to the agreement. The Federal

Government will contribute \$12 million toward the cost of the project under a special rate structure. The Churchill agreement also calls for substantial port upgrading, including the grain elevator work, dredging, and airport improvements.

In addition, Ports Canada will commission the construction of a new 2,600 horse power tugboat here in Manitoba for use at the port.

Another important element in the agreement is a major review of additional options for development of the port.

This agreement clearly demonstrates our government's commitment to the future of the Port of Churchill - to the future of Northern Manitoba. And it confirms the Federal Government's commitment as well.

The second agreement we have signed today - the Transportation Development Agreement - has several important program components. The largest component is about \$102 million in airport construction and renewal here in Manitoba to be undertaken by the Federal Government.

A key aspect of this agreement is the establishment of a new transportation research institute at the University of Manitoba - an institute which will be housed in the New Administrative Studies Building.

Clearly, the transportation research institute will play a large part in fulfilling one of the major objectives of these new agreements - to place Manitoba in the forefront of transportation research and development.

I should add as well that the agreement calls for design and manufacture of a rail bus, which will be developed in Winnipeg and tested in Northern Manitoba, in the Thompson area, indeed, later this year.

Our government's top priority is to develop long-term economic initiatives and these agreements are just two more examples of that plan. These two agreements are consistent with that priority. They will create jobs; they will create lasting assets in Manitoba for Manitobans. It is these kinds of investments - investments in our future - that will be the main focus of a restructured Manitoba Jobs Fund. As was indicated yesterday, the Manitoba Jobs Fund will be the principle source of financing for the province's share of costs of these federal-provincial agreements.

Co-operation is the cornerstone of the government's economic strategy - co-operation between various levels of government, including the provincial and federal governments, between the private and the public sector, between Manitobans - working together to develop and to achieve Manitoba's present and future economic strength.

Today we have another example of what co-operation can mean to Manitoba. I would like to pay particular tribute to the contributions that have been made by my colleagues, the Minister of Highways and Transportation, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, the Minister of Energy and Mines - the contribution of the Federal Minister of Transportation, Mr. Axworthy, in order to ensure that the reality of this agreement could be reflected in the contribution toward

the long-term investment, improvement and strengthening of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome and thank the Premier for his comments on this new federal-provincial agreement and the announcement of funds to be spent and invested in Manitoba in the future. We're always pleased to see announcements of developments taking place in Manitoba.

We would prefer to see some evidence of some of this happening in the private sector so that we know that there is a feeling of confidence and optimism here that has been lacking but, if necessary I suppose, we'll accept the contribution of federal funds because at least it means that there is some money being invested in Manitoba at these difficult times.

It's nice, as well, to see a focus on Northern Manitoba because the first two years of this government's activity did nothing but destroy the hopes and the ambitions of people in Northern Manitoba. We see the evidence of the very difficult times that are being experienced in the mining industry in Northern Manitoba. We saw the hopes for future hydro development dashed when this government lost the mega projects, which would have of course provided a very heavy energy intensive Alcan and Western Power Grid, which would have contributed towards hydro development and would have contributed, of course, to some significant benefits for Northern Manitoba.

Having seen this government dash the hopes of northern Manitobans in its first two years of government, it's nice to see that with the assistance of federal money they are now turning their focus of attention onto Northern Manitoba and the very real problems that exist there, in particular, their focus on Churchill.

Their focus on Churchill is welcome because, as members will recall — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the back row is getting so thin over there, they're all anxious to have their say during the question period because they don't get a chance, obviously, to have their views known in caucus and they've got to have some forum here.

But as they came in yesterday we could see, Mr. Speaker, how few of them there were in the back row today . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition may complete his reply.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I say, we welcome the attention to Churchill. It was an area that our government focused attention on by calling together . . . Mr. Speaker, I realize how sensitive the members opposite are. They took such a hammering yesterday after their poor excuse for a Throne Speech that they're anxious now to tell everybody how great things are.

As I say, the focus of attention on Churchill is something we welcome. During our government's term of office, we held a federal-provincial meeting that brought people from all different areas who had concerns about Churchill together, including the Hudson Bay Route Association, including Ministers of Transportation and Agriculture, to focus attention on the need to establish the long-term viability of that port and to ensure that that port would be supported for its future promise to Manitoba and its future contributions to Manitoba. So we're glad that this focus of attention, and the awareness that was created by that meeting in 1981, has resulted in some positive action by this government.

Mr. Speaker, we also welcome the contribution of federal funds toward airports in Manitoba. I believe that statistics a year or two ago indicated that, on a per capita basis, the federal government's support for airports in Manitoba was the lowest of any province in the country, so we welcome this contribution to help us to upgrade the airport facilities throughout Manitoba because it's long overdue and it's something that we're glad to see the federal government recognize its responsibilities for.

The mention of the rail bus was something that was brought up in response to meetings that were held on rail line abandonment and rail line closures in Manitoba in 1981, again by our former Minister of Transportation. It was a suggestion that was made in that response and I'm glad to see again that finally the two governments have worked together to bring that to fruition.

We thank the Premier for his announcement. We realize that there are a great deal of self-serving words in here about co-operation and we realize that there's a great deal of self-interest in two sagging governments attempting to prop up their image through some of these joint agreements, but we welcome any contribution to Manitoba's economic development.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge on my right. We have two former members of this House, the Honourable Mr. Axworthy and Mr. Asper.

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

In the gallery there are 40 students of Grades 8 and 9 standing from the MacKenzie Junior High School in Dauphin. They are under the direction of Mr. Bill McCallum and they are from the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

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

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, prior to Oral Questions, I rise on a matter of House privilege. I rise on this

matter of privilege, Sir, knowing that a matter of privilege must be raised at the earliest opportunity and that it must be followed by a substantive motion.

I am also mindful of the fact, Sir, that Mr. Speaker's role in the question concerning a matter of privilege is to determine whether or not there is, indeed, a prima facie case to be established that a breach of privilege of the members of the House has actually occurred; and, Sir, that is what I intend to show.

The matter which I rise upon is the matter of the Executive Council passing a Special Warrant for \$1.5 billion without any reference to the Members of this Legislature.

Normally, Sir, when the government needs authority to spend money and the appropriate Supply bills are not yet passed, or the House is not sitting, it is indeed appropriate for the Executive Council to pass a Special Warrant dealing with the amounts of money that would be required to carry on the business of the government until such time as the Legislature is able to vote the necessary funds.

Since the House was not sitting, Sir, at the end of March when that Interim Supply bill would normally be passed, then certainly it was appropriate that the Executive Council would move to pass a Special Warrant to provide the funds necessary to tide them over until such time as this Legislature could deal with a question of Interim Supply, and have the opportunity to vote upon that question of whether or not the government should have taxpayers' money to spend. But, Mr. Speaker, what this government did was to pass a Special Warrant for \$1.5 billion, which is not only the largest Special Warrant that this province has ever seen, but it is larger than any Interim Supply bill ever passed by this Legislature.

Normally the Interim Supply bill allows the government to spend up to 30 percent of the amount of money which they intend to expend during the upcoming fiscal year. Now either we can expect this government to be spending \$5 billion in the coming year, or else they have greatly exceeded even the normal guidelines for Interim Supply, which is 30 percent, Sir.

What this government has done is move to deny the House the privilege and the right to debate the question of Interim Supply, and we then are presented with a statement by the Minister of Finance, by way of a press release, in which he says there will be extensive opportunity to discuss the province's fiscal plans for '84-'85 during the Throne Speech Debate, the Budget Debate, and under Loan Act bills to be introduced early in the Session, as well as under Supply.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of contemptible action is this by the Minister of Finance to presume to tell members on this side of the House that we don't need this traditional right and privilege to debate the question of Supply, when those members opposite took eight different occasions in 1981, when I was Minister of Finance, to debate the question of Interim Supply and didn't pass it prior to the end of March; and at that time they still had the opportunity to debate during the Throne Speech, and during the Budget Debate, and during Capital Supply, and all of those other opportunities which the Minister of Finance points out in his press release.

What they have done is run with their tails between their legs because they're afraid to debate the question.

They are afraid to have Interim Supply debated here and they are moving to spend \$1.5 billion of the taxpayers' money without any reference to this Legislature. They have gone down the hall into the Cabinet rooms, sat together, signed a Special Warrant to spend \$1.5 billion of the taxpayers' money, Sir. That, in my view, is a Breach of Privilege if ever the House has been presented with a question of a Breach of Privilege, and I appeal to the backbench to take into consideration what has happened here; that their Executive Council has moved to spend this money without their approval and without ours.

So I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you and I refer back to the statement that you made when you were appointed as Speaker of this House, at which time you stated that you would preserve the decorum, and that you would recognize the rights and privileges of the honourable members. If ever there was a right and a privilege of the honourable members in Parliament and in this Legislature, it is the right and the privilege to debate Interim Supply.

We have been denied that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, and therefore, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that this House condemn the action of the Executive Council in passing a Special Warrant of \$1.5 billion, thereby depriving the Members of the Legislative Assembly of their right to vote on matters of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Government House Leader wish to advise the Chair on this matter?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question of privilege raised by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, and with regard to the motion he has moved, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that that question of privilege is: (1) not a question of privilege of the House on the grounds that are provided under our Rules; and (2) that the motion, even if there was a question of privilege, is out of order.

Mr. Speaker, the grounds on which the motion is based . . . Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Charleswood has something to say I'd be happy to hear his words after I finish my remarks. The Member for Charleswood, Mr. Speaker, who has announced his retirement wants an election so that he can be out of the House sooner. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to be out of the House sooner he only needs two of his colleagues to witness his letter of resignation and, Mr. Speaker, we'd help him.

Mr. Speaker, the grounds on which the Executive Council of this province issues a Special Warrant are provided for by Section 42(1) of The Financial Administration Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, that act specifically provides - and for the benefit of the Member for Turtle Mountain I won't read it because I am sure he is familiar with it and researched it when raising this question - specifically provides, under amendments introduced when the Member for Turtle Mountain was a Member of the Executive Council, specifically provides for the situation in which the government found itself between February 27th and April 12th. Mr. Speaker, those changes were made because of objections members opposite had to the issuing of a Special Warrant to provide Interim Supply in early April, 1974.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Legislature has specifically given, in the last 10 years, special authority to meet these requirements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first requirement under Citation 80(2) is that a question of privilege must be partly of fact and partly of law. Well, Mr. Speaker, the law they refer to is the law of contempt of Parliament.

How, Mr. Speaker, could there be a question of privilege relegated to contempt of Parliament if the government and the Executive Council is specifically following the mandate given to it by this Assembly in an act passed by this Assembly? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no contempt of Parliament.

But more fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, what kind of contempt of the rules of this Assembly would be placed upon this Assembly if we followed the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and that is, that a Special Warrant must then be voted by Interim Supply covering the same funds, for which no provision is made under either our Rules or the Statute, first of all, so the suggestion he provides is that it should be provided twice under the authority of the Statute and then a third time, Mr. Speaker, then this House should vote a third time to pass the Main Supply subsequent to that. So he's asking for the authority granted by this Legislature to be used three times in one Session.

Now we normally do it twice already, to provide members of the opposition with an opportunity to debate Interim Supply. Now, Mr. Speaker, why? If there was a contempt of the privileges of the House, that contempt would relate to the removal of the opposition's opportunity to what we generally call a "cover-the-waterfront-type debate", a debate in which all items under the purview of government can be debated. And the suggestion is, that that right - that's what the member said - was being denied. Well, Mr. Speaker, we begin today the Throne Speech Debate. That's a debate in which that whole cover-the-waterfront style of concerns can be raised. But the Member for Turtle Mountain says that that opportunity is being denied.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure his House Leader has advised him that it will be the government's intention, although we can't be date specific at this time, to debate the Budget shortly after the Throne Speech and that the Budget will be brought in shortly after the Throne Speech is completed. Mr. Speaker, that again will be a debate on the fiscal policy of the government.

So the member has, during the next two weeks - a period of up to 16 days - available for the kind of debate he says is being denied by the fact that Interim Supply is not being brought in. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a problem with that and I refer you, Sir, to Citation 84(2) which says that the formal question, Sir, that you must decide is whether or not the case conforms with the conditions which alone entitle it to take precedence over Notices of Motions and Orders of the Day standing on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that in considering that, you must not only consider the provisions of Section 42(1) but, Sir, also the fact that the member is asking for a debate to take place, which is already available to the House in the next two immediately scheduled debates and that therefore, Sir, there is no grounds for giving the motion precedence over all other items on the Order Paper. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the type of debate the member feels is being denied can be more wide-ranging

under the Throne Speech provisions in our Rules and under the Budget provisions.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the motion, this is perhaps the most important one. The motion moved by the honourable member is a motion of non-confidence in the government. It clearly is designed to be that. It refers to contempt for the legislative process and asks the House to vote non-confidence in the government for that. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's what the Throne Speech Debate and the Budget Debate are for. They are votes of confidence in the government and the opposition traditionally moves amendments to those motions, amendments of non-confidence in the government. Mr. Speaker, we have two scheduled within the next three weeks.

Mr. Speaker, for the honourable member to try and intrude on the Throne Speech Debate and on the Budget Debate with a facetious motion of non-confidence designed to pre-empt those debates, I believe is a contempt of the privileges of all members in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I thank both members who have spoken to this matter and will take it under advisement and report back to the House.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, in taking it under advisement it would be my hope to be able to offer you some further advice in so doing. I think that the Honourable Government House Leader has but read the portions suitable to his argument from our own Statutes and I think they have to be pointed out to you, Sir, in taking this question under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: I have heard one member from each side on the matter. If I hear another one then there will be another one and a debate on the matter will probably develop from that. I will take the matter under advisement.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Jobs Fund

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund. In view of the fact that recent information indicates that the average length of job created by the Jobs Fund's efforts during the past year is 13 weeks, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what is the minimum length of a job created to be used in the statistics that have been gathered, as to the effectiveness of the Jobs Fund. Is it one day, is it one hour, is it one week, one month? What minimum length of job creation is required in order to be part of the statistics for the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund is not present. I'll take that question as notice.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, is that an indication that the Premier is no longer responsible for the Jobs Fund? When the Jobs Fund was announced, the Premier was announced as the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there was a list presented, I thought, to the Leader of the Opposition in November. It was well indicated some weeks ago.

A MEMBER: And in the Throne Speech.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I have the latest list which I obtained from Executive Council this morning and it doesn't seem to indicate that the Premier is no longer responsible. Is he confirming that he is no longer responsible for the Jobs Fund?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that was indicated, I believe, on November 4th. It was indicated in this House during the last Session to the honourable member. I don't know just where the honourable member was. If he will review Hansard, he will see that the Minister responsible for Industry, Trade and Technology answered a number of questions last Session dealing with the Jobs Fund.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister on the same topic. In view of the fact that the information distributed last week with respect to the effectiveness of the Jobs Fund indicated that as part of the statistics released by the government on it, the government was taking credit for 100 percent of the jobs created in instances when they contributed less than 5 percent of the money to the projects, what percentage or what proportion of contribution does the government feel it has to make in order to take credit for the jobs that are created?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the opportunity for me to deal with the overall question because the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is working under either an uncalculated apprehension or a calculated apprehension.

At no time has this government attempted to take 100 percent responsibility for the excellent employment growth and reduction of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba.

In the Throne Speech, specifically yesterday, in the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology's press conference a week ago, the Minister, the Throne Speech made every effort to provide thanks to the people of Manitoba, to the businesses of Manitoba, to labour in Manitoba, to the farmers in Manitoba, to the communities, to other levels of government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to disabuse the Leader of the Opposition with the notion that he wishes to plant, either in a calculated fashion or otherwise, that this government is claiming full responsibility. What we do claim responsibility for is that we are, rather than an inactivist Conservative government, we are a government that believes that a stimulating role can be provided and government has a responsibility, rather than no responsibility for stimulating economy; that a government has a responsibility for leadership, rather

than no leadership in managing the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, due to that team-like effort, due to that participation on the part of the province with the business community, with the working community of this province, with the farm community, with other interested groups, I am pleased and honourable members, as good Manitobans, should be pleased, that we are now at the lowest unemployment rate of any province in Canada; that we are witnessing a demonstrable increase in employment in the Province of Manitoba; that housing starts are up beyond the national average; that investment projections - not according to our figures but according to StatsCan figures - are going to be up at a rate which is virtually the highest in Canada. I think, as Manitobans all, we can be pleased with that demonstrable improvement as a result of combined and co-operative efforts of governments at all levels, and Manitobans in every walk of life.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that will be a great deal of comfort to the 46,000 unemployed in Manitoba today, that figure being at least 20,000 more than the number that were unemployed in 1981 when this government took office.

By way of preamble, I'll just simply say that . . . I realize how sensitive the Minister of Finance is about all this information, he's in absolute economic and fiscal disaster and he wants to get involved in the debate. Mr. Speaker, it is not I who wishes to present that suggestion that the government is taking credit, in fact, I quote only from a newspaper article last week in which it is said that the province contributed about \$55,000 of a \$1.6 million project at the Elkhorn Resort in Riding Mountain Park and took credit in its statistics for all 23 jobs created - less than 5 percent of the money, taking credit for all 23 jobs.

My question is, what proportion of the money invested in a project should come from the provincial Jobs Fund in order for it to take credit for 100 percent of the jobs that are created?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again, in case the Leader of the Opposition didn't hear my earlier comments. We, as a provincial government, recognize the responsibility, in fact the obligation to provide leadership, to be a catalyst in the creation of employment in the Province of Manitoba. If, indeed, provincial Jobs Fund monies can provide a trigger to employment we are pleased, we are satisfied. We are pleased and we are satisfied when we can work with other levels of government, when we can work with the business community and other groups within the economy. Mr. Speaker, we are not so presumptuous as to claim that there is only one level of government, that there is only one group of individuals. That may, indeed, be the attitude of honourable members across the way, but this government believes in teamwork, in participation, in being a catalyst, to strive to reduce unemployment.

I would be the first to acknowledge that unemployment is still far too high in Manitoba and throughout the rest of Canada but despite the fact that it is difficult, despite the upward battle we are

undertaking, we are reducing unemployment. Manitobans can hold their heads high in the full knowledge that Manitoba is providing leadership, is providing a model, is providing an economic direction and strategy that is superior to that in any other part of Canada.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier is now saying that the government can't take credit for those jobs because they did involve many other participants, will he be asking the Minister responsible to change the statistics to indicate what proportion of the jobs created really were as a result of the involvement of the Jobs Fund, and what proportion would have been done in any case without the government's participation?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is suggesting that we tamper with statistics, that we tamper with the work weeks that can be demonstrated to have been generated as a result of this team effort, because we have, and I have personally on numerous occasions, applauded municipal government, community organizations, the Federal Government, for contributing to the Jobs Fund.

We will not tinker with the figures. Honourable members may not like those figures, we're not going to tamper with those figures because those figures are factual, those figures are based upon the combined efforts of different levels of government, business, community organizations in the Province of Manitoba. We won't fix the figures: they can do all the fixing they want in the pamphlets they send out to their constituents, Mr. Speaker, we will not fix the figures on this side.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a senior official of the Federal Employment and Immigration Commission was quoted as saying that the statistics that we're referring to right now are misleading - and that is the origin of my questions on it, that's not my opinion, in view of the fact that this federal official who analyzed the information has concluded that the statistics are misleading - will the Premier tell me whether or not any representative of his government, or any member of his government, complained . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the honourable member complete his question?

MR. G. FILMON: Will the Premier tell me whether any representative of his government, or any official of his government, or member of his government, approached the Federal Government to complain about the statements that were made by this federal department official with respect to the misleading statistics that were provided by this government on its job creation efforts?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I don't know whether anybody has approached the Federal Government. I suspect not, though I have received an indication or advice that there was some unhappiness about the misleading information that that particular official provided. It's now rather interesting that the Honourable Leader of

the Opposition, rather than depending upon his own base, his own foundation for his allegations of a few moments ago, is now relying upon a statement issued by some Federal Government official in some Federal Government department in the City of Winnipeg. Why does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have no views of his own, no opinions; that he must lean upon the expressed opinion of some public servant in Ottawa?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I might only indicate that the federal official only confirmed statements that have been made, not only from this side of the House, but by the media in the past and many other thousands of Manitobans who know that it's a fraud, who know that their efforts are a fraud. In view of the fact that further comment was made to the effect that many of the jobs that were cited in the Minister's statistics of 21,000 created would have been created anyway by regular government efforts and line department spending, what proportion of those jobs would have been created in any case?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues continue to whine, continue to demonstrate their uneasiness and their sensitivity to the economic development and job creation in the Province of Manitoba. They have lots of reason to be whining and to be uneasy now at the inception of this particular Session. We will not be dissuaded from our course of action, whether it be by the Leader of the Opposition, whether it be by way of some Federal Government civil servant that may or may not be speaking for his Minister in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, we will continue with our efforts to ensure that we continue to perform and out-perform the rest of Canada; and if honourable members want to call the Jobs Fund a fraud then I challenge them to speak to the thousands of Manitobans that have been employed directly and indirectly because of the efforts and strategy and direction provided by this government through the Jobs Fund.

I challenge them, Mr. Speaker, to look at the statistics. I challenge them to compare Manitoba's record, by way of employment growth, by way of reduction in unemployment, by way of projected capital growth over 1984 with that which exists in any other province. Mr. Speaker, I understand the sensitivity and uneasiness of honourable members across the way because this government's direction, this government's strategy is showing that there is an alternative, an alternative that is available to Manitobans in these difficult times.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the First Minister.

I wonder if he could inform the House as to whether, out of the 273 persons to be released from the Civil Service in this fiscal year, whether over 40 of those persons have over 20 years or 25 years of experience in the Civil Service, and has he spoken to those individuals, Mr. Speaker?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Minister of Finance will respond to the specifics of the question, but as usual the

Honourable Member for St. Norbert is jumping the gun. I am not aware of 270-some persons being released from the public service. I am aware of the reduction.

If honourable members would prepare themselves better, if honourable members would read better the information that is released, if honourable members would listen, Mr. Speaker, then they would be aware that what we are discussing is a reduction in positions. If honourable members are protesting a reduction in positions, let them say so in the public service. Let them say so and let them say it clearly, but let them not speak out of both sides of their mouth. The Honourable Minister of Finance will deal with the specifics.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In working on this year's spending estimates we went through each department to determine whether there were areas where we could make savings in order that we could protect the public health system, the education system and so on.

Members opposite will find when we table the Estimates, that departments such as the Department of Finance, for instance, will come forward with spending increases of less than one-half of 1 percent including the salary increases that have already been budgeted for; and that means some internal cuts in order that we can transfer funds outside.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to provide the greatest notice possible in order that we could avoid any layoffs and that is the ultimate hope and objective of the exercise we entered into. Rather than, as in some provinces simply announcing large numbers of layoffs, we went through the lists very early, departments identified the positions that would become redundant, and we then began a process of dealing with putting those workers in other jobs if possible and making the various adjustments that can be made.

We are a large employer; we've got some 16,000 employees. We believe that of the 400-and-some positions that were eliminated, almost every one of those people will be replaced - if not every one of them - in another job, and they will be able to perform a service for the government; but we can only do that with planning and you can't simply say that because a position has an employee in it with a certain number of years that therefore that position can't be touched. It doesn't mean we will eliminate that employee.

A couple of years ago we entered into an agreement with the MGEA to avoid layoffs. We have already told the MGEA we are prepared to have similar discussions now; we are prepared to enter into a similar agreement to avoid any layoffs at all, so we are working on those kinds of things.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the First Minister. It's unfortunate he doesn't read the press releases of his own Finance Minister because he would know that the Finance Minister announced that 273 positions would be eliminated.

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please.

MR. G. MERCIER: My question to the First Minister is this: In light of the Finance Minister's announcement and the probable release of people with over 25 years experience in the Civil Service, how does the First Minister justify the doubling of expenditures on political staff and image makers and apple-polishers, Mr. Speaker, and the excess of advertising costs undertaken by this government, when people with this number of years of experience in the Civil Service are being released by this government?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before calling on the First Minister, may I remind members that questions should seek information from the Treasury Benches and not be argumentative or ask for justification which could well justify a lengthy answer that members might not appreciate.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think what we should have probably set aside, it ought not to be necessary, but a five or ten minute aloud reading session of press releases so honourable members would hopefully understand that which is in the press releases so that they don't enter into this House and misrepresent, obviously because of ignorance or lack of time, the contents of press releases. I think it would be more fruitful to all members and it would waste less time of honourable members because what we're dealing with - and as the Minister of Finance has indicated - a reduction in the number of positions in the public service.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear that I do not for a moment apologize for the fact that an important function and role of government is to communicate, is to ensure that Manitobans are aware of the existence of programs, and rightly so honourable members at times in the past have criticized government for not ensuring that Manitobans are aware of new programs as they are announced, that programs that indeed have been announced are not being explained sufficiently and fully. Mr. Speaker, one of the essence of the democratic system is not only to announce programs but to ensure that those programs are communicated to Manitobans.

Distribution of hate literature

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General.

Recently what has become more and more apparent to many Manitobans of the campaign of hate literature which is being brought upon Manitobans by people opposed to the visit of the Pope and against both the Pope and the Roman Catholics of this province and across the world, would the Honourable Attorney-General please inform this House and the citizens of Manitoba what measures are being taken so that we will be able to address this concern and stop this sick campaign of hate-mongering against the Pope and against Roman Catholics?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I think all members of the House are aware of the shocking increase in the distribution of hate literature of all kinds in the last year particularly, but in recent weeks especially directed against the Pope and Catholics everywhere. I have seen examples of this which really shocks the conscience.

Two things have happened in recent times. I had made representations some months ago to the Minister of Justice asking that the provisions of the Criminal Code be strengthened. They are not adequate to deal with - as they should be adequate to deal with - this kind of phenomenon. I think one need have no hesitation in asking that there be strong measures that can be taken under the Criminal Code in those situations which warrant and believe me, in my view, some of the examples I've seen certainly warrant.

Nevertheless, given the existing ambiguities and uncertainties of the Criminal Code, I have asked senior officials in my department to give me an opinion as to whether or not some of the literature which is currently being distributed comes within the provisions of the Criminal Code. I want to assure Members of the House and members of the public that if I am satisfied, through discussions with senior official in my department, that we can reasonably lay a charge and bring a prosecution that will be done to indicate, if nothing else, the way in which this community feels about that kind of literature.

I have also directed the attention of the Human Rights Commission to this kind of literature and they, too, are looking into what action can be taken within their jurisdiction.

Delay of Bilodeau case

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Given that there is considerable concern throughout the province about the determination of the Attorney-General and the government to defend the public interest in the Bilodeau case, and the Federal Government's reference, can the Attorney-General explain why he has added to this concern by asking for a delay of proceedings last Tuesday, thereby implying that he was neither ready nor prepared to proceed in the Supreme Court?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, the matter is before the Supreme Court. A date has been set; an explanation was given by our Counsel as to why it was thought that a date in October would be preferable to a date in June, but we are perfectly satisfied with the date and our Counsel, who is competent counsel, will be ready, there can be no doubt about that.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether, in view of the federal Liberal leadership race, or the Honourable Marc MacGuigan's candidacy, was he approached by Mr. MacGuigan, or any federal Minister to support or request a delay in the date of hearing?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you, this kind of unconscionable mucking about may be

characteristic of what the member thinks and so on, but it's really shocking that this kind of suggestion can be put to the House by way of a question. The fact of the matter is, if the member would read the paper, that it was the Government of Canada that made the motion for that particular date, for heaven's sakes.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my questions are based partly on headlines in the Free Press indicating "Penner seeks hearing felay in French language case". Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney-General, again, for clarification, did Mr. Twaddle, who is the province's Legal Counsel, ever indicate to the Attorney-General, particularly in the past 30-60 days, whether he was not ready and able to proceed in the Bilodeau case or in Mr. MacGulgan's federal reference?

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Advice received by members of the Executive Council from their Legal Counsel is not a matter for questions and has always been regarded as privileged information in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood would wish to rephrase his question?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I will simply then ask the Minister, the Attorney-General, on what basis he was quoted in the paper, on what basis he made statements indicating the province would prefer to have a later date?

HON. R. PENNER: I've answered that question, it was contained in the same press article to which the member refers. There happens to be a situation in which there is no Chief Justice and we raised the question as whether or not we would be able to argue the case before the full court. In view of the Federal Government reference raising new issues, it was question of what would be the most appropriate date. It's all in the same press report.

Assessment review

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't wish to rise on a point of order, nor do I want to refer to hate literature. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs about the Throne Speech, and I want to ask the Minister if he was still in shock from the last Session when he forgot to put a piece in the Throne Speech referring to assessment review; and is it his intention to bring forward any legislation in this coming Session dealing with assessments in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, unlike members opposite, it is not the habit of this government to place in successive Throne Speeches announcements of

government policy. We made a commitment — (Interjection) — Members opposite have a problem. This government was very proud to put in its Throne Speech a record of its accomplishments and its projections for what will be happening in the future, but we are not in the habit of doing what members opposite did, which was repeat promises for Throne Speeches. We said we were committed to assessment reform in this province and we would be proceeding with it in orderly fashion, and that commitment stands.

I cannot tell the honourable member that that will happen tomorrow or the week after. In fact, the Minister who previously had this responsibility advised the member opposite and his colleague, the Member for Swan River, during Estimates consideration last May, that there were specific things that had to be done so that the analysis of impact of assessment reform — that members opposite asked for, they said it was important — so that that analysis could be done. Now, if members are telling this House that they want assessment reform done immediately without knowing what the impacts are, I'd appreciate being so advised, but certainly after the completion of the Weir Report — which is an excellent report and contains excellent recommendations — I believe, members on both sides want to know the full impact of the implementation of those recommendations before you are asked to debate legislation.

If you would rather jump in with both feet into water over your head please so advise and we will give you that opportunity, but this government will not be irresponsible and introduce changes that the people of Manitoba do not understand, that members don't understand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for Virden's question was a perfectly legitimate question. This government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is no point of order unless the honourable member wishes to raise one.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this government has a habit of doing many things that they don't refer to in their Throne Speeches. I don't recall a question of French language proposals being in the last Throne Speech. But, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Virden asked a perfectly legitimate question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I'm not sure whether the Honourable Member for Lakeside is raising a point of order or whether he's asking a question. Perhaps he could clarify that so that it could be dealt with by the House.

If not, the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Then I would ask a question of the Honourable First Minister. In view of the fact that the present Minister of Municipal Affairs says that this is being done in an orderly fashion, and in view of the fact that the present Government House Leader has been one who has

created more disorder and has, in the past, created chaos, would the First Minister, in response to the request of some 30-odd municipal organizations in the province of Manitoba, replace the Minister of Municipal Affairs with some other member of his Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I believe it was two days ago the Opposition House Leader said that there would be some effort to tone down on senseless personal attacks and rhetoric in this House. We've been into the commencement of the Session now, yesterday and today, one-hour-and-eight-minutes, and all that I can say is I'm simply surprised that the Opposition House Leader has so little influence on members in his own caucus as portrayed by the last question.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Honourable First Minister seems to be rather insensitive to the wishes of municipal people in this province — and I'm rather surprised at that because he was a Minister of Municipal Affairs — then I would like to ask the Deputy Premier if she would use her good offices to try and influence the First Minister to change the office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the former Speaker wants to abuse question period, I've been more influenced by the fact that 170 municipalities said that they want nothing to do with the request of a small minority of municipalities a couple of months ago, that 170 municipalities expressed by their refusal to be involved in such an exercise, that they had confidence in the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Health and Education Tax underpayment

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. One of my constituents, in error, made an underpayment of \$7.98 on his Health and Education tax due on March 15th. On March 20th he was advised that he would be penalized \$20.00, a penalty equivalent to an annual interest rate in excess of 2,000 percent.

Mr. Speaker, is this how your department helps small business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, it's too bad the Member for Brandon West didn't pick up on that particular clause in the bill when the Legislature voted on that bill a couple of years ago, because certainly it would have been changed then.

I have indicated to the House that that was something we should not have done. I've said that before. I have also said we will make changes. But he knows what the law now is. The law now is, that the minimum penalty is \$20.00. I have indicated that we are reviewing the penalty and the administration of that act and there will be changes. But until the changes come in the law

is the law and I am sure, as a lawyer, the Member for Brandon West knows full well that the staff in the department have a requirement to obey the law.

Now on the particular case in question I am certainly prepared to take a look at it and see whether there is some way within the law to relieve his particular constituent of what was probably an unfair penalty.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Finance. I would ask him if he does not have the discretion to waive that particular provision so that these absurd situations won't continue to happen.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, there is indeed a discretion and the particular case will be examined. I'm sure the Member for Brandon West wouldn't want a blanket statement from the Minister of Finance just exempting everything because, just for example, you could have people who haven't paid for a year. That is why you have to have some system where there is a review, but you don't do it at first instance.

MR. H. CARROLL: Will the Minister give assurance to the House that he will be presenting an amendment in the very very near future and not waiting till the end of the Session before such an amendment has been presented?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, we will be presenting amendments just as quickly as possible and if members will help to expedite that, certainly we will see whether we can do it quicker rather than later.

Operating Capital assistance to farmers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the absence of any positive policies or actions taken by this government dealing with agriculture, the main thrust, Mr. Speaker, being that they're going to monitor the rain and report to the Legislature, will the Minister of Agriculture take seriously his job as Minister of Agriculture and make an assessment of the numbers of farmers in Manitoba that are extremely hard-pressed for operating capital and credit this coming spring, and those who are unable to put their crops in due to economic hardships, and report to this Legislature how many numbers there are - and I can assure him he'll find quite a few - and what is he going to do to provide assistance to those people?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I guess the Honourable Member for Arthur has not been in Manitoba for some period of time. Maybe they were discussing matters somewhere out of the province.

Mr. Speaker, this government has done more to provide assistance to agriculture than any government in the history of this province. We admit that it will never be enough; that the money that we are providing to assist agriculture will never be enough in terms of

the needs of Manitoba farmers and Western Canadian farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we have provided funds to stabilize the incomes of the red meat sector, of hogs and beef. Over \$30 million of actual payments of price support have been made in the last two years to those two sectors alone.

As well, we have provided financial assistance through the Interest Rate Relief Program to some 1,400 Manitoba farmers who we know are in serious financial difficulties. Almost \$7 million of financial aid has been provided to Manitoba farmers. No other province has provided that kind of help in the last two years.

Mr. Speaker, we have made submissions time and time again to the federal government that this is a national responsibility and it requires national action in terms of assisting farmers, whether through legislative means or through financial means by virtue of a cash payout through the Western Grain Stabilization Fund.

We have made concrete proposals to the Federal Government to make immediate changes so that there can be cash advance to Manitoba and Western Canadian farmers, Mr. Speaker. Last fall, Mr. Speaker, we discussed it. Last July and as late as a week ago, Mr. Speaker, we reiterated the need for that payment to Western and Manitoba farmers. We recognize that farmers require assistance and we are doing as much as a province can, and we have, Mr. Speaker.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the matter of the consideration of the speech of the Honourable Administrator, the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland that a humble address be presented to the Honourable Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba as follows:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present Session.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First and foremost I would like to pay my respects to the people I represent, the special people of Wolseley, for continuing to support me during the past year and for allowing me to act as their spokesperson in the Legislature.

I am honoured to pay these respects for it is important for all of us to keep in mind that our foremost responsibility is to serve the needs of our neighbours and constituents as best we possible can.

Secondly, I am honoured to have been given the opportunity to move acceptance of our government's

third Speech from the Throne; honoured because I believe it offers a clear and distinct plan of action and makes a firm commitment to the people of Manitoba and to the constituents whom I represent, a commitment that this is a government which will continue to work in the best interests of Manitobans. This is a government willing to provide every effort to deal with and address the most pressing and important concerns of Manitoba families, the working men and women of this province, and those requiring protection and support because of difficult circumstances which are beyond their control.

I think it is important to echo some of the sentiments which were expressed in the Throne Speech, particularly the section which provided us with an overview as to how well Manitoba has coped through what has been the worst recession experienced in the past half century. Every single one of us in this Chamber should take pride in the achievements of Manitobans during the past two years and in the role which our government has played in maintaining and strengthening the fabric of life in Manitoba, despite its severe external difficulties. The record is clear, it is encouraging and it speaks well for our future.

During the past two years, overall employment in the Province of Manitoba has grown by over 1 percent, a significant achievement when compared against the rest of the country which showed a negative growth in employment. There are over 9,000 more Manitobans working now than when we took office in 1981, despite the fact that our provincial population has grown at a rate unprecedented in over 20 years.

The unemployment rate in our province has been solidly at the second lowest in the country for over a year and during the past month has improved to the point where now we have the lowest rate in all of Canada. This, of course, while in all other provinces' unemployment rate went up, we went down by a tenth of a percentage point. Saskatchewan, who has always been below us, now having a Tory Government, went up .8 percent.

And as one looks through all the major economic indicators, all those economic barometers which people use to determine the relative health of the economy, the facts are clear and indisputable. Manitoba's economy is turning around and one doesn't have to take our government's word to prove this point. One need only to consult the record and forecasts offered by independent third parties, and again that record is clear. While investment activity continues to decline nationally, investment in Manitoba's economy increased by 10.5 percent in 1983; and for 1984, investment in Manitoba is expected to increase by a further 11.8 percent, the strongest growth for any province in the country. And when one combines these optimistic signs with the statistics on housing starts, retail trade and the other major economic indicators, you see a trend which is very encouraging and this record has not come about just by accident. Rather it is the solid result and proof of what can happen when the government and the people of the province take joint action against tremendous challenges.

Our economic record is positive proof that combined hard work and optimism of men and women, co-operation amongst all the key players in our economy and the Provincial Government programs such as our Interest Rate Relief Program, the Homes in Manitoba

Program, the Income Stabilization Program for farmers and, yes, but far from least, the Manitoba Jobs Fund can and do make a difference in the lives of our people.

For all the programs and economic indicators in the world don't mean anything if they don't make a difference and if they don't bring about improvements in the lives of working men and women, our senior citizens, our parents and our children. I am pleased and proud because I know that efforts which our government has taken on behalf of Manitobans has and is making a difference in the everyday lives of the people I represent and meet.

I can say this with confidence because I can see how quickly this government has moved to deal with the basic concerns of my constituents. When I was running for office back in 1981, I heard over and over two basic concerns being expressed by the people I met door to door. The first concern was the question of employment and the second was housing and the need for rent controls to protect them from sudden and dramatic rent increases. I represent a working class neighbourhood and I saw just how important these two issues were to my people and I've seen just how quickly and forcefully our government has moved to address both of these major concerns.

We re-introduced rent control immediately, so that once again average families and seniors on fixed incomes would have a security net against huge rent increases, a security net, by the way, which the previous administration aided and abetted by its current leader, cruelly stripped away from Manitobans and it would strip away once again if it ever had the chance. Of course, rent controls have been just one facet of this government's thrust to provide secure and affordable housing.

Our Affordable New Homes Program, certainly one of the most imaginative and useful housing programs introduced by any government in Canada during the past two years, made the dream of owning a home possible for hundreds and hundreds of Manitoba families. That program, of course, provided a tremendous incentive including employment to our provincial housing industry.

Finally, the Buy and Renovate Program has proven to be most popular and particularly important to many residents in my constituency alone, for as you know, Wolseley is an inner city neighbourhood which is attempting to rehabilitate its housing stock so that inner city revitalization can become a reality in Winnipeg.

On the issue of unemployment, clearly the most important issue facing people and governments today, an NDP Government under my Premier has taken bold and forceful action, and it is no exaggeration to say that our war on unemployment far surpasses virtually anything undertaken by any administration in Canada, mostly Progressive Conservative administrations, during the past two years.

Our Jobs Fund, which is now combined with some \$400 million in initiative, under the new package ERDA Agreements are making significant inroads in battling unemployment.

This has happened because our efforts have been coupled with the contributions of business, industries, labour and communities so that in the past year over 21,000 Manitobans have been put to work on Jobs Fund projects alone; 21,000 people who would

otherwise have been collecting Social Assistance or unemployment. And this NDP Administration's record in these two areas - unemployment and housing - are really just symptomatic of the kind of caring and concerned approach which has characterized the steps and programs of virtually all of our government's initiatives.

This approach, this concern and effort to provide assistance and contributions which will meet the needs of Manitobans is certainly one of the major things which separates this government from the previous administration and indeed separates us from the kind of government leadership which is provided in so many other provinces where Progressive Conservative Governments abound.

I say that advisedly, because I have had occasion over the past few months to visit or speak with people from and in the cities of Vancouver, Regina, Montreal and Toronto and listening to the radio and reading the newspapers in these provinces. I see how much worse the problems of unemployment and social service programs are in other parts of Canada. It has made me realize just how lucky I am to be a Manitoban.

I would like to use one example. A few weeks ago when I was in Toronto. I took a taxi from the airport to the downtown hotel, which is a fairly long drive - in fact, it's a smidge over half-an-hour - and I had a chance to discuss with the taxi driver, who of course as a PR person for his city, spent a fair amount of time raving about the marvellous City of Toronto. So I asked him a few questions. He asked me what I was coming to Toronto for and I said it was a conference on jobs and employment, so he asked me how employment was in Manitoba and of course I informed him that our unemployment rate was, at that time, the second lowest in Canada; that it was going down steadily; that we had put \$200 million into a Jobs Fund, whereas the Federal Government had announced \$150 million to do the entire country. I talked to him about what a marvellous, rich province they had and why they had such high unemployment. I also asked him what their minimum wage was. Their minimum wage is \$3.85, where ours has been \$4.00 since 1982. In fact, unemployment in Ontario was 9.9 percent in February and has gone up to 10.5 percent.

He was a man about 60-plus who was a grandparent, had grandchildren who were in Day Care. I asked him if his daughter was receiving any kind of assistance from the government. She was paying \$20 a day for child care for her little one and there was no subsidy whatsoever in the centre that his granddaughter was in. I asked him whether there was rent control and he said there was none. I asked him about his Medicare premiums. He asked me what those were. I talked about OHIP and I said, what do you pay? He informed me that for his family of two they pay \$680 a year, but went on to say that a weeks before he had had a very serious nosebleed and had to go to his doctor who charged him \$49.50 for 15 minutes in his office to cauterize this nosebleed, over and above the \$680 that he had already paid for the year.

By the time we got to the hotel he shook my hand and said: "Perhaps I and my wife should consider moving to Manitoba." I suggested that it would be much more useful for him to stay in Ontario and start canvassing both provincially and federally for the NDP.

It made me realize just how lucky I am to be a Manitoban, and how fortunate Manitoba is to have escaped the kind of double-digit unemployment, per diem hospital fees and health premiums, and cutbacks in welfare payments which exist and are increasing elsewhere. That is why I am so proud to be part of a government that dares to take, and chooses to believe, in a different approach, a compassionate approach, an approach which makes its top priorities the same as those of the ordinary men and women of this province.

It is clear by the record of the past two years, and it is clear by the words and commitments contained in the Throne Speech, as the Premier has indicated, this will be a Session devoted to the top priorities of providing a climate which will invite long-term economic development and permanent jobs and, secondly, the maintenance of our important health and social programs so that a higher quality and equality of life for all Manitobans can be ensured. The Throne Speech outlines clearly the path we will take and the vision we will pursue over the next several years. The relative stability and strength of the provincial economy and the character and will of our people will provide the solid foundation we will need as we pursue in earnest the all-important tasks of meeting these priorities.

The Throne Speech shows that we will undertake action on a broad range of new areas. The focus of our efforts will continue to be the Jobs Fund and it will evolve into a catalyst which will shift its emphasis from shorter-term job creation to longer-term job opportunities. By working ever more closely with our communities, small businesses and key sector industries, the Jobs Fund will concentrate on activities which will best ensure that our potential in key areas is realized over the next several years. This will involve, of course, programs with our new technology and export industries, our agricultural community, our small businesses and forestry, and our energy industry. There will be new initiatives, such as, the new Manitoba Investment Program, and a new provincial training strategy that will make sure our businesses have the resources and our young people and workers the skills they will need for the '80s and '90s.

As Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, I am looking forward to actively participating in these new thrusts as he has assigned to me the co-ordination of our technological policy. I will continue to be particularly interested in these new programs which will provide retraining opportunities, especially for women. For, as we should all be aware, the technological revolution is and will have a tremendous impact on the working lives of women and the traditional jobs in which they have been involved. So I am especially pleased that my government is proceeding at full speed to ensure that in our province men and women can participate fully in the workplaces of tomorrow.

I should also mention that I'm proud my government is maintaining its strong commitment to our precious health and human services. We have listened and are sensitive to the needs in these key areas, and that is why we will continue to fund our health care system and our day care program at levels which exceed the levels of support to most other government-funded operation.

I got just a small first-hand glimpse of what happens when a Provincial Government abdicates its

responsibility to do all it can to provide assistance and initiative for its people, particularly those on the bottom end of the scale and those most vulnerable, and those who depend on income security and other government programs, and the kind of callous attitude which seems to permeate the minds of Progressive Conservatives and their attitude to those who have become victims of economic recession. This was clearly illustrated to me as I was listening to an open-line CBC radio show in Montreal just a few days ago. On that program, which is similar to our noon Information Radio show, was a guest from the renowned Tory Fraser Institute in B.C., and an economist from McGill University who were advocating that one of the solutions to the Federal Government's \$30 billion deficit was to cut back on universal social allowance programs. By this they were talking about Family Allowance, Old Age Pension and the Medicare Program, these programs which have become birthrights to Canadians after decades of struggle.

As the program unfolded a woman who I would guess would be in her 50s to 60s, with a very strong Scottish accent who had lived in Canada for decades, phoned in to comment to these two eminent people that they had seemed to totally disregard the fact that her family allowance cheque was the only money she had ever been able to call her own, the only money that she'd never had to ask for. In fact, talked about several of her friends whose husbands go shopping with them and decide what goes into the grocery cart or doesn't, and that that family allowance cheque was extremely important to the economy of her family and to the little bit of economic independence that she had. There were all kinds of glorious discussions about whether it was cost-effective, whether it would cost more in administration to make those programs selective, rather than universal. But I think that the perspective that woman brought on how important those programs are to the economy of the family was the most relevant one.

Now you would think that this particular professor, who was an economist with a speciality in public finance and income distribution, would have analyzed all those situations, would understand the structure of the economy of the family. But no, this fellow replied, "Well I'm sorry Ma'am but I'm an economist, and that's a problem between you and your husband," without any understanding when he talks about what is good for business, what is good for working people. He was advocating again that the people who help solve this problem of a \$30 billion deficit should be the people who are receiving and depending and relying on family allowance, old age pension and unemployment insurance and all the kind of health care programs that benefit the people at the bottom the most. He had totally disregarded, in his economic analysis and his advice that he was giving both the students and to government, on public finance and income distribution that the economy of the family needed to be addressed at all, and I can't imagine how someone could be in that position. It seems to me that it's very typical of the majority of economists and I think it's extremely tragic, and that's the kind of narrow and hard-hearted mentality which seems to be gripping far too many politicians and governments in this land, in this age.

All of us here, all men and women in Manitoba, should welcome the news that this government will take ever

more vigorous steps to promote economic equality and social justice for Manitoba women. The aspirations and efforts of women and the expectations they have for a more just and equitable footing in our society are efforts which this government respects and will support. We should all be heartened by the news in the Throne Speech that affirmative action will be taken, not only reduce the inequities we see in the workplace and in the standards of living experienced by many women, especially sole-support mothers and widows, but we should be further encouraged by the promise that this NDP administration will take a leading role in dealing with the particular tragedy and heartache associated with violence against women, whether that violence be in the form of physical abuse and wife battering or the degradation and humiliation associated with and caused by violent pornography.

This government's policy commitments in these and other issues of fundamental concern to women is clear and this Throne Speech has underscored that commitment. The province will be committing more resources, additional dollars and greater action in these areas and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the year ahead to assure that this campaign proceeds with strength and determination.

It is an honour and a privilege for me to be able to move this Third Speech from the Throne from the Government of Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to wish you well in your position and the best of health. I also would like to extend the same wishes to the people of Manitoba, and also to my constituents in Rupertsland. I also would like to extend best wishes, the best of health to everyone in the Chamber here.

It is a privilege for me to second this Throne Speech. The Throne Speech has set forth a number of initiatives which will benefit all Manitobans and I am going to highlight some of the areas, some key areas that will have a major impact on my constituents in Rupertsland.

The aboriginal people living in the Province of Manitoba have not benefited from the resources and services offered by agencies and governments to the extent that poverty and conditions that prevail have not been wiped out.

Mr. Speaker, some of the key areas addressed by the Throne Speech include economic development resources for those least able to benefit from the resources of this land. The Throne Speech touched on training for all sectors to soften the devastating impact of unemployment. It has touched on small business development; it has touched on new thrusts in post-secondary education and to combat adult illiteracy and to improve adult basic education.

There will be continued development to the Core Area Initiative in Winnipeg, and also the Northern Development Agreement, and a shift in health care resources to provide alternative service delivery, services for the elderly and services for the disabled. Programs for the children and their families, and shelters for abused women, legislation for the young offenders all will receive new attention in this Session.

Native rights, language rights, and greater recognition of Manitoba's cultural heritage and all these programs, agreements, plans and services, Mr. Speaker, have been identified in the Throne Speech. I have selected to cover some of these initiatives because they will directly impact and will directly benefit the people of Rupertsland and all aboriginal people in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, when I was born in 1949, I was not born a Canadian, I was not even a person according to the law. Yet, today, I stand as a member of this Legislative Assembly to move this Throne Speech. There is a vision in this speech, a major change will stem from these proposals. The proposals are innovative, they break new ground, and to enact some of these proposals and changes will take much debate, courage and strong belief in their inherent justice. They are new thrusts and yet they arise from a tradition of courageous and compassionate legislators and leadership. People who see what this province can strive for and achieve come from a proud history of the search for social and economic justice and human resource developments.

First, Mr. Speaker, the measures to address unemployment. Manitoba's unemployment rate has been one of the lowest in Canada for some time, yet hidden in those numbers is the ongoing and overwhelming unemployment of the aboriginal people. In small northern and remote communities there is no economic base, the resource potential is still undeveloped. Forests, mineral and water resources and tourism are possible contributors to a potential, viable northern economy. The goal is self-sufficiency, not welfare dependence. Economic self-sufficiency is fundamental to a stable and responsible society.

In the cities, by contrast to the North, the economic base is highly developed. Aboriginal people still experience disproportionate rates of unemployment, the people are hampered by lack of education, poverty and clear-cut discrimination in the job market, affirmative action programs will be necessary, to begin with collaboration with the three levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal, and also with the private sector, the unions and other organizations are needed to effect policy changes required for aboriginal job development in both urban and northern communities.

Job training is a fundamental component of job development. When I speak of job training for aboriginal people I am not just speaking of skilled labour. High technology, training in the area of computers and telecommunications are examples, as is training in management and business administration. A concentrated effort to recruit Native people into such programs in the community colleges and universities is required. Extension of programs in business administration, management, computer programming and so forth can be offered right at the community level so that more people will have access to job skills relevant to today's market.

Small businesses are going to be encouraged and supported this year. Aboriginal-operated small businesses are going to be developed rapidly given just a small amount of support, the development of communities is needed to have business going in a community.

Other programs in place to compliment these efforts include federal initiatives, such as, the ones that were

announced this morning. New programs are needed in mining, forestry and tourism so that the people in these communities can benefit from the resources of the Province of Manitoba.

Recent statistics demonstrate that Rupertsland has the fewest residents with university degrees in Manitoba. Since Rupertsland riding is predominantly aboriginal populated I take great pride in mentioning the fact that there are 190 people that have university degrees from Rupertsland. Even 10 years ago that number would have been much lower. Lack of education is one of the underpinnings of the poverty cycle. Native people have had a particularly high rate of school dropouts and education failure and frustration. In recent years there has been tremendous catch-up growth. This is due to the changes in the system and accessibility and also because Native people are encouraged by those systematic changes, and also they are seeking, in great numbers, to get an education.

Health care in Manitoba unquestionably ranks with the best in the world. The quality of the services and personnel, combined with the guiding principles of Medicare, make the health care delivery system here a model and a challenge to other jurisdictions. Yet Native people in Manitoba have relatively poor health and their patterns of illness are more typical of Third World countries than of First World countries. Native people have high rates of hospital utilization. The move, generally, in health care to prevent institutionalization is needed in Native communities. Community resources, such as, Home Care and Adult Day Care for senior citizens are required. This is not to say that we don't need running water, sewage disposal and adequate housing; the needs persists. The failure to achieve standards that other Manitobans enjoy is reflected in our rates of hospitalization. However, as newer kinds of community support services are planned and developed it is crucial that Native communities be involved in the developments.

Prevention has always been accepted by Native people as the most effective kind of health care. We look forward to the development of community health clinics that combine prevention and education with acute Medicare and social services. Because our approach has always been holistic we can see the sense in offering holistic health care.

Health needs of the elderly are becoming well-known because they have been the topic of much discussion and research, but health needs of elderly Native people are far less understood and services delivery to the elderly and Native people in their homes in their communities are not well developed. There is not even accurate knowledge about where elderly Native people live - in the cities or in the small communities. The same may be said for disabled Native people.

Let me quote from the report from the Special Parliamentary Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped. This is publication 1981 - "The Obstacles," and I quote, "Native communities and Native people in non-Native communities suffer on a daily basis from living conditions which other Canadians experience only rarely. These adversities - political, economic, social and cultural - in Natives greatly increase the probability of being disabled at some point in a person's lifetime. Although hard data is not available, it is generally felt that the percentage of

disabled persons is much higher among the Native population than it is among other groups of Canadians."

A full range of measures designed to address the difficulties encountered by disabled Native people was put forth in that publication. So far there has been little change. Any effort in Manitoba to assist disabled people must take as a priority the overwhelming problems of disabled Native people.

As we look toward the youth for tomorrow we, as aboriginal people, are experiencing a dramatic growth at the community and reserve level. There is a need to move from a paternalistic and human bondage role of governments to allow our young people to function with the main stream society. Native people need to be self-governing in order to control their lives and their destiny. The Native people will settle for nothing less. To deny the Native people self-government is to deny them their heritage; it is to deny the preservation of their culture and their customs and their beliefs; it is to deny their identity; it is to deny their existence and to co-exist with other nations of this country; it is to deny the contribution that they may make in this great wealth of Canada.

I am disappointed with the result of the First Ministers' Conference. There is an apparent need to educate other governments in this country. There is an apparent need for greater understanding and co-operation among the provinces and the aboriginal organizations.

The greatest contribution the aboriginal people have made in this country is to give part of themselves, and what is dear to their heart is the land and the life blood that is associated with the land.

It is with that passion that I seek self-government for my people. It is with this vision and the great wealth of human understanding that we once again, as aboriginal people, can be proud. It is with this vision that I am honoured to Second this Throne Speech.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House for today, I'd like to just speak briefly to House business for next week.

Obviously it would be anticipated that the House would continue with the Debate on the Throne Speech for all of next week, but since next Friday is Good Friday, Sir, the House would not be sitting that day and I believe there may be agreement amongst members for Thursday of next week, Maundy Thursday, to sit normal Friday hours so that members who have to travel to their constituencies and be home for the Good Friday and Easter weekend can do so early Thursday afternoon. So, Mr. Speaker, it would be our intention then to sit Friday hours next Thursday and adjourn at the normal Friday adjournment hour of 1:30 p.m. on Thursday next.

Mr. Speaker, if there's no other further business before the House now then I would move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock.