

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 18 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 . . .

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to make a non-political, non-partisan statement at this time, please.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Minister have leave? (Agreed)

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that all the members of this House want to join me in congratulating the Ursel rink who won the Canadian Championship over the weekend, especially the way they did it. They continued the good work that they had started last year by winning the Canadian Championship. Of course, we all know that the rink was composed of Skip, Bobby Ursel; Third, Brent Mendella; Second, Gerald Chick; and Mike Ursel, the other brother at lead; and that the rink was coached by the father of two of the boys, Mr. Tim Ursel, who is also well-known in the curling circles.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, we, on this side, wish to add our words of congratulations and support to the Ursel rink for their winning the International Championship in curling. We certainly are pleased with this continuing show of strength for Manitoba curlers on a worldwide basis. We're delighted with the results and we're pleased that this is another topic for potential inclusion in next year's Throne Speech.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, I have a Ministerial Statement, Mr. Speaker.

As you know, Manitoba has long been a leader in this country in the use of computers in our schools. Last year, I had the pleasure of announcing an innovative program sponsored by the Manitoba Jobs Fund which would continue and extend that leadership. The information technology program, InfoTech, is designed to improve the utilization of computers in the classroom.

Through Canada's first joint Industry-Government Computer Resource Centre for schools, we will be

helping teachers to upgrade their skills. This, in turn, will help to ensure that Manitoba school children will have better opportunities with computers and to be prepared for the technologies of the future.

We will also be helping school districts and school divisions to make and form decisions when they purchase computers and their related software and courseware; and through InfoTech they'd be able to take advantage of volume purchase discounts; and we will be nurturing the development of a courseware development industry in Manitoba, an industry which will have worldwide markets.

Mr. Speaker, IBM Canada became the first major computer manufacturer to join with us in this venture. They were followed by Burroughs of Canada and then by Apple.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that another major company - this time one with a long history in Manitoba - has become the fourth participant in InfoTech.

This morning the general manager of Sperry Canada - a company which employs some 300 Manitobans in its Winnipeg operations - and I signed a three-year agreement to work together in this unique and ambitious undertaking.

Sperry Canada will invest more than three-quarters of a million dollars in equipment and personnel over the length of the agreement. The company has studied our program, has conducted research into the needs of Manitoba schools and has developed a strong program which will be an important contributor to the success of the InfoTech Centre.

A unique feature of their contribution, Mr. Speaker, will be the provision of a mobile demonstration van which will take the message of InfoTech and of Sperry Canada to schools and businesses throughout the province. This mobile unit will provide access for students, teachers, farmers and business people for "hand-on" training in computers.

Sperry will be actively supporting the development of computer software in three areas, schools, school divisions and in business education instruction.

As Mr. Hal Fischer, the general manager, said today, "This agreement is consistent with Sperry's commitment to provide state of the art computer technology and education for people in Manitoba." I welcome that commitment on the part of Sperry and welcome their commitment to the Manitoba InfoTech Program.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the Minister's statement and say to him how pleased I am that Sperry have decided to participate with the Provincial Government in this venture. I might say that the Minister leaves out a fair amount of description of Sperry Univac. I don't mind giving him some more information on it as it happens to be a company that is within my constituency.

Monday, 18 March, 1985

Sperry has not just started to be a contributor to working with the Provincial Government in Manitoba; they have been a very fine corporation and a corporate citizen since they came to Manitoba several years ago and expanded their factory since they came about three years ago from this date.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I compliment Sperry for working with the Province of Manitoba in this regard. I can assure the Minister that my knowledge of the company is such that they will work with him with full co-operation in his endeavours, and I would also say that I am pleased that Manitoba companies, with factories in Manitoba, are participating in this particular venture.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in tabling the Annual Report of Manitoba Community Services for the year ending December 31, 1984.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. R. PENNER** introduced Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act.

**HON. B. URUSKI** introduced Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS** introduced Bill No. 8, The Ambulance Services Act; Loi sur les services d'ambulance.

**HON. J. COWAN** introduced Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Co-operatives Act.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 40 students of Grades 8 and 9 standing from the Alf Cuthber School under the direction of Mr. Koch. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

There are 15 students of Grade 3 standing from the Robertson School under the direction of Mrs. Snifeld. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Education - polling expenses

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier. It follows on a news report of yet

another series of polling being done by the government, this one on topics related to education. My question for the Premier is, how much will the government be spending on polling this year?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information. Obviously there is market research that is taking place on the part of this government as well as other governments in Canada, both provincially and federally, to ascertain the views of Manitobans in relationship to particular subjects.

#### Advertising - government spending

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that just a short while ago it was revealed that the government plans to spend \$4.7 million on direct advertising, another \$3.7 million on additional staff in the area of image building, public relations and advertising, how much is the government spending for this current fiscal year, the year that has already been committed on polling?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, that might be a matter that could better be dealt with during the Estimates Review.

#### Future polling topics

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier then, in view of the fact that it appears from the Throne Speech that some of the initiatives that have been put forward in legislation with respect to wife abuse, child abuse and other initiatives were undertaken after polling was done on that particular topic, and in view of the fact that a decision with respect to the construction of Limestone was made after some extensive polling, what other topic will the government be polling on with respect to its future plans?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the statements from the Leader of the Opposition are not true. They're not based upon appropriate research. In fact, the decision to proceed with Limestone was made prior to the last election in 1981 when we indicated as a party in seeking a mandate from the people of Manitoba that we supported the orderly development of Limestone, and we would proceed with the orderly development of MANDAN during our term in office.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, decisions with respect to the spouse abuse program, child abuse program, certainly did not follow on the heels of a polling in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm interested to find out that the decision on Limestone was made four years ago without any knowledge of markets or anything else that the government might need to have in order to develop that generating station. My question then to the Premier is, in view of the fact that the public has paid for this polling, will he table the information in the House so that all Manitobans can know what evidence and what information the government is getting that leads to its decisions?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I will certainly accept that suggestion as one that is worthy, I believe, of consideration on the part of the government.

Mr. Speaker, again, I'd like to refer to the misconception that the leader has in regard to Hydro. The decision in respect to Hydro development was not only part of the mandate that this government received in 1981, but was a result as well of a very clear and very direct decision by the Board of Manitoba Hydro based upon recommendations of management to the Board of Manitoba Hydro in August of 1984. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know from where the honourable member would have information that was based upon polling, unless it was from thin air that he arrived at the erroneous impression.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, is the Premier then denying that any polling was done by any department of government, or Manitoba Hydro, or the New Democratic Party on the topic of Limestone development? Is he denying that?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, let us be very very clear. The Leader of the Opposition posed a question that the decision to proceed with Limestone was based upon polling, polling that had been done in respect to whether or not Manitobans supported the resumption of Limestone. I, again, disabuse the Leader of the Opposition with any impression the Leader of the Opposition might have that our definitive decision to include Limestone as a major portion of our campaign commitment in 1981 had anything to do with polling, and also to disabuse the Leader of the Opposition that the decision that was made by Hydro management, Hydro Board, had anything to do with polling.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, a very simple question. Is the Premier denying that any polling was done by the New Democratic Party, or the Government of Manitoba, or Manitoba Hydro, on the topic of the development of Limestone Generating Station?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, but that's not as important as the first question the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised with me.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I'm pleased now, Mr. Speaker, to get the answer that indeed they were polling, and they did do that polling before they made the decision. Mr. Speaker . . .

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** A point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I did not, and again I have said several times already during this question period, we did not poll prior to the decision to proceed with Limestone. Let that be very very clear on the part of the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, that's news, because my understanding is that the decision wasn't finally made . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** . . . that it was based on the National Energy Board decision.

### **Manitoba Film Classification Board - home-use videos**

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the Premier, and it has to do with the information that was tabled in the House on Friday. In view of the fact that the government has indicated that they are prepared to institute a system of screening for home video cassettes to ensure that pornographic material and material that's not in keeping with the moral standards of this province is reviewed by an objective body before it's allowed to be seen by the public, will he institute the same sort of screening procedure before material is allowed to go into the public schools of this province?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed the policy, as I understand it, of the Department of Education to ensure that the local school divisions and the librarians of those local school divisions screen, review material that is submitted to them for distribution within the school division. I assume that the Leader of the Opposition is not suggesting that he lacks confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the prudence and the good judgment of the school division officials including the libraries of the various school divisions in the Province of Manitoba.

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

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

### **Pornographic literature in schools**

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I lack confidence in the prudence and good judgment of this government who let that material get in there in the first place. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the screening procedures in place did not prevent this material, this unacceptable pornographic material, from getting into the public schools of this province funded partially by his government, will he undertake to provide a proper screening mechanism so it won't happen again in future?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, just one brief comment and then the Minister of Education will deal with the details of the question. Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the material that was submitted on Friday was rejected by a librarian in the school division in which the material had been submitted to indicates, indeed, that there is good judgment on the part of the librarians in the Province of Manitoba, good judgment on the part of the school division officials in the Province of Manitoba. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition again, Mr. Speaker, I have confidence . . .

Monday, 18 March, 1985

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . in the school division librarians. I have confidence in the officials of the school divisions in the Province of Manitoba to use reasonable judgment in such cases.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am quite pleased to be able to report to the House the steps and action that I have taken since this matter was brought to our attention.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, just so that we don't get ourselves into any difficulty, I just want to indicate to you, the Opposition is quite prepared to revert to Ministerial Statements. Indeed we might have expected one, but if the Minister is now standing up at the request of her Premier to make a Ministerial Statement, then I reserve the right for our education critic to respond in same.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health to the same point.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, on Friday last there was a question asked in this House. One of the Ministers wasn't present at this time; I took it as notice. The Minister of Education knew nothing about it until it was brought to the attention by the Member for Morris, and now all she is doing is just trying to answer the question that was asked before; it's a continuation of last Friday. I certainly see nothing wrong with that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. If the Minister intends to answer a question which was taken as notice, then it would be in order. It would not be in order to make a Ministerial Statement at this time.  
The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of making a Ministerial Statement. I do have an intention of answering a serious question that was raised in this House on Friday that I took as notice and I would like the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it was a serious question that was raised and it's one that concerns all of us, and I want this House to know that within one hour of receiving the information in this Chamber that I took very swift and very strong action. I instructed my department immediately that they were to make contact with school divisions and inform them that that was there any chance that this material had been ordered and received and put on the shelf in their libraries that it was to be removed immediately.

I was very clear that this material is unacceptable and is inappropriate and we will not tolerate material like that in our school at any level, at any grade, with

any group of children. Mr. Speaker, it's also clear that the procedure is working well.

I remind the members opposite that in 1979 it was the decision of the former Conservative Government to have the Department of Education stop reviewing periodicals, and they gave the responsibility to the school divisions and the librarians and the teachers, where it belongs, Mr. Speaker. The procedure is working well because when the teacher, when the librarian, saw the material, it often happens that they order material that they think is okay and when they review it they find it is inappropriate. It is their job to make sure it does not get on the shelves of the schools; and they carry that out well, as I believe will all other librarians in the province.

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

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I must say that I'm shocked that the government shows not to make a public statement at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister had a chance, particularly in light of the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** . . . the events of last Friday.

Mr. Speaker, just to review, as a preamble to my question, Sir . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Speaker, in light of Friday's revelation that the government, first of all, paid for the production of so-called culture that is pornographic in nature; secondly, has recommended the material for use in school libraries; and thirdly, supported by grant its distribution throughout the school system; in light of those facts, how does the Minister of Education on a CJOB interview last Friday have the gall to shift the blame from the government to the school boards for the presence of these particular materials within our schools?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question is argumentative. Would the Honourable Member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister said and I quote: "I find it hard to believe that anybody could use that material and believe that it was appropriate for any grade, in any school, at any level. It is clearly unacceptable . . ."

**HON. R. PENNER:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

**HON. R. PENNER:** The members should well know by now that it is out of order to quote any kind of a media announcement, or thing of that kind, in the House and ask for a Minister to comment on it.

Monday, 18 March, 1985

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the Honourable Member for Morris has a question, would he please pose it?

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. If you made a ruling, I didn't hear it. But, Mr. Speaker, I am quoting specifically what the Minister said on that interview. I would ask her if it is clearly unacceptable, how is it that her department recommended this material as indicated by the letter I gave to her?

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

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated before that the Department of Education has made a conscious decision not to review periodicals since 1979. This procedure is clearly understood by the school divisions, and the responsibility for reviewing the hundreds and maybe even thousands of newsletters, magazines and periodicals is up to the teachers and the librarians in the school. The Department of Education did not recommend, the Department of Education did not review, approve or recommend those periodicals for the schools.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister or any Minister, was the material recommended or not? I have a letter in front of me, signed from the Department of Culture. It says that, "Each book title and cultural periodical has been assigned recommended grade levels by the Manitoba Department of Education." Was the material recommended or not? Where is the truth in the matter, Mr. Speaker?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will respond to the question, and also take the opportunity to respond to the other questions that the member raised that were taken as notice by some of my colleagues last Friday.

First of all, I regret that the letter the member made reference to could be interpreted as an endorsement of the material by the Department of Education or by the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

The purpose of the program that is being debated, Mr. Speaker, is to allow school divisions to make a choice of publications, either books published by Manitoba publishers or periodicals, from a list of Manitoba-published books and periodicals. There was not to be any reference made that these were endorsed by the Department of Culture nor by the Department of Education.

I regret, and I apologize if there was any inference from that letter to that, and will certainly ensure that the school divisions are made aware that we are not recommending those publications for use in the schools. Rather, it's up to them to decide whether or not they would like to use that and if they do, then they will receive support under the Public Periodicals Support Program.

I should also inform the member, Mr. Speaker, that Midcontinental, the publication in question, has written to me and has voluntarily removed itself from the school program.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister mentioned "interpretation". How does he interpret an offer of money from his department for the schools to buy that literature if he doesn't interpret it as your approving it by giving them money to buy it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question is argumentative. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister how people are to interpret the fact they are offered money from his department to buy those pieces of periodicals. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Manitoba Arts Council — (Interjection) — okay, I've got another question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister.

The report of the Manitoba Arts Council is for 1983-84, where it shows support for the Midcontinental of \$4,000.00. Was that periodical given any money from April 1, 1984 to this date?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That same question was asked by the Member for Morris last Friday, and I had intended to provide him with that information.

The Manitoba Arts Council, as you, Mr. Speaker, and members are aware, is an arms' length agency that is charged by legislation with respect to the development of culture in the Province of Manitoba, and receives part of its revenues from the Government of Manitoba and part from lottery revenues, and operates as an arms' length agency in the same way as the Canada Council and the Ontario Arts Council.

The publication did receive funding in the 1984-85 fiscal year of \$4,500 from the Manitoba Arts Council.

There was also a question with respect to Herizons Magazine asked by the Member for Morris. They did not receive any funding in that same fiscal year, 1984-85, from the Manitoba Arts Council.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is going to be very clear. When is this Minister - the letter that was sent out comes from his department - when is this Minister going to stand up and ensure this House that taxpayers' money will not be supplied through his department or any other department to the spreading of smut in this province? I wish the Minister would tell us what he has done to assure that those taxpayers' dollars will not be spent to support those periodicals.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The question makes representation. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I can't make it any clearer.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make very clear the fact that the inference in the letter that went out to the school divisions, or the fact that it could be interpreted as an endorsement of

those specific publications was not intended. If that was the way it was interpreted, I regret that, and apologize for the fact that the letter wasn't worded in such a fashion to indicate that the decision on the use of any material is up to the school division.

I also indicated that the publication in question has removed itself from the school program, so they have made that determination, I presume, based on the questions that have surrounded their inclusion under the program.

I think we should also be clear, Mr. Speaker, that we are not in the position of censoring material in this province or indeed in this country. There has been something that has developed in terms of culture and in terms of freedom of speech in this country that allows for the publication of cultural periodicals . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** . . . any publication at any time could contain material that is offensive to some individuals. In fact, some of the greatest literature in our lifetime, Mr. Speaker, has contained material that may be offensive to some. It is certainly the decision of the person that is reading or purchasing that to be aware of that.

If there is any concern with respect to whether or not that material is offensive in terms of the Criminal Code as it relates to pornography, there is clear action that can be taken under that act. I repeat that our intention was not to suggest that the material was endorsed for use in the schools. — (Interjection) — that's what we did. If that is what has been interpreted by some, we apologize for that fact, but we do not apologize for the fact that we are attempting to provide the opportunity for school divisions, if they so choose, to use more Manitoba books, Manitoba periodicals in their schools.

In fact, outside of this one situation, the program has been endorsed and we have received many letters of compliment to the fact that they can use Manitoba materials in the schools under this program.

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs, and ask him if he thinks that any other impression could possibly be garnered from an official government letter which provides funding, provides instructions, provides an order booklet, provides a list of the material, says that it is recommended by the Department of Education and thanks you in advance for supporting Manitoba "culture." Does the Minister suggest that it is creating a false impression, that that isn't clear in black and white?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question seeks an opinion and is argumentative and makes an argument. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

**MR. R. DOERN:** I ask the Minister how any other impression could be garnered but that two departments of government recommend the material?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question is still argumentative. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'll try another question.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education, who has been running for cover since Friday morning last, is she telling this House, is she prepared to stand in her place and say to this Legislature, as she did to the media, that she is not acquainted, or unfamiliar, with the magazine "Herizon"?

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

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that the member opposite should be predetermining what my personal reading material is. I am not familiar with the magazine and have not seen it.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I did not hear the very end. Did she say she was unfamiliar with that magazine?

**A MEMBER:** Yes, she did.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Cultural Affairs whether he is familiar with this magazine which has been around for a couple of years, which is supported in advertising by the Manitoba Arts Council, the Department of Labour, and the Jobs Fund. I want to know whether this magazine which promotes foul language, which promotes militant feminism, which promotes the lesbian position, and I want to know whether he is familiar with this magazine which he has funded and he has promoted in the schools of this province.

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would then like to ask a question of the Minister of Education who was lecturing and thinking out loud over the weekend, and saying to school divisions that they should be vigilant and that they should review their procedures. Given that's the advice . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. May I remind the honourable member that the purpose of Oral Questions is to seek information and not to give it to the House.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

Mr. Speaker, given that the Minister of Education has said in recent days, the last few days, that school divisions should be vigilant and review offensive materials and review their procedures, I wonder whether she offered that same advice to her colleague, the Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question is argumentative. I would refer the honourable member

Monday, 18 March, 1985

to a list of appropriate questions, a form of questions which I sent around to all members fairly recently. It would probably help all members to review the guidelines contained therein.

### **Petrocan - bulk sales in Manitoba**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Friday last, the Member for Roblin-Russell asked me a question regarding Petrocan activities and possible Petrocan purchase of gas co-ops in the province.

I can report to him now that we are aware that Petrocan approached one or more gasoline co-ops in Saskatchewan this January regarding a number of alternatives for their participation in the business of that co-operative ranging from purchasing all the co-op's assets to supplying fuel to the co-operative and a range in between the two.

Since that time there have been discussions at many levels and I am pleased to inform the Member for Roblin-Russell that just this last weekend, Petrocan announced that it would not be pursuing that marketing strategy in respect to the co-operatives, and that they would not be making any more such offers to the co-operative gasoline sector.

We are pleased to hear that because we believe that the co-op sector is truly independent, provides a service to their communities, and we would like to see many more co-operatives supplying gasoline to communities throughout this province and throughout Western Canada; and are pleased that Petrocan has stated that they will not be pursuing that marketing strategy.

### **Flyer Industries - sale of**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister responsible for Flyer Industries and would ask the Minister if he could inform the House as to whether or not the government has now officially put the tax-owner paid and subsidized company, Flyer Industries, up for sale, and that the government is now waiting bids for that company?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As has been indicated in the past, the government has recognized that there are serious problems with respect to Flyer Industries, and is pursuing a number of activities with respect to ensuring that we come to grips with the problems facing Flyer and the taxpayers and the government of this province.

One of the options that is being pursued is the possibility of investiture or sale of Flyer Industries, and the government, through the Manitoba Development Corporation and the Flyer Board, is pursuing a number of options in that regard.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Is the Minister telling us that the government is now officially seeking bids from different

companies with regard to the divesting themselves of Flyer Industries?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I believe I have indicated that the province is entertaining discussions and - using his term - "bids" with respect to Flyer and have received a number of inquiries. We are involved in a number of discussions and, in some case, negotiations with respect to Flyer Industries.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I would ask the Minister, since Flyer lost in excess of \$12 million last year, would he be able to tell the House whether or not the government or Flyer Industries has done a projection as to the amount of money that Flyer is projected to lose, let's say, in the next five years?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The corporation obviously has done budget planning in terms of its current operations and for the near future. In terms of asking specifically if there has been projections done for a five-year period, I can't respond to that and I would be pleased to provide that information at the usual time in terms of when we go through the actual report of the Manitoba Development Corporation with respect to Flyer.

### **Acid rain - negotiations regarding**

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

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of the Environment.

Was the Minister of the Environment consulted by the Government of Canada at all during the negotiations with the United States toward the new pact on acid rain?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The most recent discussions with the counterpart in Ottawa took place at the beginning of the month of February when announcements were made of funding toward future abatement policies.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** From the limited information that we have on that pact that was signed this past weekend between President Reagan and Prime Minister Mulroney, can the Minister of the Environment see any improvement in the conditions on acid rain in Canada or in northwestern United States?

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

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Well, Mr. Speaker, then, is there any evidence in the hands of the Minister that another study involving Premier Davis and a negotiator appointed on behalf of the United States will result in any reductions in acid rain deposition in Canada?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is safe to say that every Canadian, including the Prime Minister,

would have liked to be able to announce a greater step forward over the weekend. We will not despair that this will not achieve anything. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, in the months ahead we will see further movement, and we will look forward to that type of movement in the meantime.

### Natural Marketing Council - Dairy quotas

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister of Agriculture taken action to reverse the decision made by the Natural Marketing Council in which they are prohibiting the transfer of partial dairy quotas and dairy herds in this province?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the Natural Products Marketing Council and the Dairy Board have been in discussions over the transfer of dairy quotas since July of 1984 when the Dairy Board filed its new quota order and its whole marketing policy with the government, which was passed I believe in the month of July, and part of that agreement or order was that there shall be no quota value established. Subsequent to the filing of that order, the board decided to have quotas traded on the marketplace, which this administration does not support, and as I understand the member opposite, when he was in office when queried, did not support value for quotas, Mr. Speaker, so that the position taken by the council and the board are consistent with that order.

However, it's been seven months since the original plan was filed, and the board has not come up with policies in which to deal with transfers other than sale of complete farms or dispersal of complete farm units or in-family transfers. Those kinds of transfers are not impeded by the council at all. What we are trying to get at is the problem of value for quota and the escalating costs which, Mr. Speaker, down the road can only impact on the cost that consumers would pay for the price of milk.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that for some four years under our administration the dairy industry and the consumers got along very well, and, by his own admission, the dairy policy has been in limbo and in shambles for the last seven months, will the Minister of Agriculture provide for the dairy farmers of this province and this Assembly what his dairy policy is? Is he going to ask the Natural Products Marketing Council to withdraw their order, or is he going to develop a new policy that more reflects the wishes of the dairy farmers in this province?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that last year the honourable members were crying and were giving this ministry what one would call the proverbial gears about the cost of milk in this province. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member — (Interjection) — well he knows that . . .

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the question is more involved than the Honourable Member for Lakeside wishes to let on, Sir. The government policy, in terms of the sale of quotas, is that quotas should have no value.

Mr. Speaker, we have, Sir, worked with the marketing board and will continue to offer assistance to the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board to come up with a policy which meets the objectives of their plan, which they filed with the government last July, that there shall be no value for quota. The Member for Arthur to get up in this House to say that he now supports the sale of quotas, Mr. Speaker, and that there be value in quotas is I believe a reversal of Conservative policy, and he should tell us whether he is reversing his position.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister wants to go to some extended answers, will the Minister of Agriculture call the agriculture committee and the dairy producers of this province so that they can have some input into what the best policies are for them as producers and not try to fudge the issue in the Legislature?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, there's no one that's trying to fudge the issue other than the Member for Arthur, who either wants to be malicious in his accusations or whether maybe he doesn't understand the situation. Mr. Speaker, it's very clear, and my colleague, the new Minister of Agriculture from Ontario, just recently, as quoted in the Co-operator, indicated that the greatest impediment for producers entering the industry is the cost of quota in that province. The Province of Ontario does allow the producers to sell quota on the stock market basically, Mr. Speaker, and I want to be very clear that we will not allow quotas to be sold in this province, because the direct implications on all consumers in this province are that the cost of milk may rise. We are now finally, Mr. Speaker, being supported in our position by the new Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Ontario.

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

### HANSARD CORRECTION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a correction in Friday's Hansard. At the bottom of Page 156, the comments attributed to the Honourable Mr. Lecuyer, I made those comments as the Minister of Northern Affairs, and it should have read: ". . . even though they may not fall within the latter due to geographic area, enterprises which receive Special ARDA grant assistance may also be considered . . ."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The clarification is noted.



## NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

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

**MR. H. CARROLL:** Mr. Speaker, I would like permission of the House to make a non-political statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Has the honourable member leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. H. CARROLL:** I'd like to congratulate Brandon's Vincent Massey Vikings Varsity Girls Basketball team, who won the Manitoba Triple A championship on Saturday night. I'd like to congratulate Coaches, Stew Farnell and Mike Hill; Managers, Lindy Choy and Sandra Dettrich; and the players, Cindy Gabor, Paula Gabor, Stefanie Labuick, Michele Andreson, Karen Lorimer, Lorna Braaksma, Judith Friesen, Lisa Mazur, Lynn Zemliak, and last, but not least, my darling daughter, Leslie Carroll.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I have a clarification for a question that was asked on Friday, March 15th, by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert when he asked about our department holding up an application for a grant. Is that out of order?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Is the honourable member attempting to answer a question? Oral Question period is over.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I thought it was a time for clarification, Mr. Speaker. If not, I can wait for tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the member has a clarification or a correction of Hansard, now would be the appropriate time to do so. If it is an answer to a question that she has taken as notice, it is not appropriate to do so.

The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** It is the clarification of a question asked and an expansion of the answer I gave; therefore, I need your help as to whether that's appropriate now or tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I believe that would be more appropriate were it to arise tomorrow.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Thank you.

## HANSARD CORRECTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, on a matter that I believe is a privilege that I would like to have is that the Attorney-General on Friday - my colleagues informed me - was very excited about the statements I made in the House, and I have had the opportunity to peruse Hansard, his statements, and compare the

ones that I made on Tuesday the 12th at 8 o'clock; and I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say that the words "contract," I should have not used them, they are wrong. I have no reason to use that word in the context of this thing.

The comment in the Hansard where it came from: "A MEMBER: How much did they pay her, Frank? How much did they pay her?" I said: "I am not getting into that." - quite frankly, I don't want to get into that - and the wording, "It's there, in Public Accounts . . ." is wrong. I have the ability or I have the same opportunity to peruse Public Accounts as any other member, and as far as I'm concerned it shouldn't be, it's there. I could have said, if somebody wants to look, fine; but I must offer the member my apologies for the wrong wording which he took exception to on Friday.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the member for that personal explanation.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I would like to also point out a correction to Hansard, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

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

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

In Hansard, Thursday, March 14th at 8:00 p.m., on Page 138, about halfway down - it's in reply to the Throne Speech - I make mention of: "A special thank you to a Mr. Bud Udell." It is misspelled in Hansard and I would appreciate the correction being made; it's Mr. Bud Budel, B-u-d-e-l.

I would also like to apologize to the people who type Hansard for not enunciating more clearly, because it's not their fault, it was mine and I would like to have that correction noted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Duly noted. Anything else to come before the House prior to Orders of the Day?

## MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent public importance. I move:

THAT under Rule 27, the ordinary Business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance; namely, that the Government of Manitoba has provided funds to a number of publications that contain material that is sexually explicit, obscene and offensive to most Manitobans and has attempted to introduce these materials into the public school system.

Mr. Speaker, the key question in this . . .

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** . . . seconded by the Member for Brandon West.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. According to our Rule 27, the honourable member has given me notice that

he intended to raise this matter. The honourable member has five minutes to state why the matter is of urgent public importance. The honourable member should speak to importance of the urgency of the matter and not the matter itself.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, we know very well what the government will say. They'll say there's the Throne Speech, there's the Budget, there's the Estimates. Stick around, wait around a few days or a few weeks. Mr. Speaker, we have to debate this matter right now because right at this moment the government is continuing to fund and continuing to advertise in publications. I don't know how many months they have been funding and advertising in these publications. I don't know how many years they have been funding and advertising in these publications, but I have looked at these publications. Mr. Speaker, I must say in passing that I find it very hard and difficult to accept the statement of the Minister of Education who says she's unfamiliar with this particular publication which has been around for a couple of years, which has so much money now that they can go national, they can go monthly, they can hire extra staff, as an advertisement in their latest issue suggests.

Mr. Speaker, the government doesn't have money for Pharmacare. No, it doesn't have money for Medicare. It doesn't have money for chiropractors.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The honourable member, according to our Rule 27 — (Interjection) — Order please, order please. The honourable member has five minutes to explain the urgency of the matter and not the matter itself. Will the honourable member restrict his comments to the urgency of the matter?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, these publications on the advice of the government, the government took an action. It sent out information, it solicited orders. As a result of that - and I'm talking urgency - as a result of a letter sent out by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, supported by the Department of Education, orders were taken. Magazines have been sent out and distributed.

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Again the member, Mr. Speaker, is not addressing the question of urgency, but he's debating the matter itself.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood should restrict his remarks to the urgency of the matter.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I say that this is an urgent matter because as a result of government actions, pornographic and obscene material has been disseminated and distributed in the school system. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, there may be other publications of which we are not aware that the government is funding and promoting and I have raised one of those publications today, there may be others.

Mr. Speaker, we don't know what other magazines and books are being financed and I want to know, and I want to debate, and I want the government to tell us whether they're supporting certain groups in our society that are supporting views that are not shared by the vast bulk of Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to debate because I do not have any respect for the judgment of the government in this matter. They have demonstrated poor judgment. They are trying to wriggle out of a bad situation. Mr. Speaker, we are shortly going to get into associated topics. We are going to get into the question of the moral standards of our province, of the judgment of the government, of the cultural policies of this government. They have sent out a letter suggesting that magazines, which no self-respecting parent would have in their home, are cultural. That is their definition of cultural, Mr. Speaker, and we will very shortly also be debating the question of sex education.

So I want an opportunity, along with many other people in this Chamber and on this side of the Chamber - not on that side of the Chamber - to ask questions of the government and to get the government to withdraw this offensive material that they have supported financially and have attempted to introduce into the school system.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health also has five minutes.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, of course, the Rules of the House would only permit me to discuss the question of urgency. I think the rules of Beauchesne are very clear. The honourable member recognizes that himself, and I quote from Citation 285, "It must deal with a matter within the administrative competence of the Government and there must be no other reasonable opportunity for debate."

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all there was a complete discussion just a few minutes ago during the question period. There were statements made by two Ministers who said that the material was voluntarily removed, and there was also another statement by the Minister of Education yesterday also and she said she was certainly removing all support from those publications. The situation, Mr. Speaker, is that the Throne Speech will continue also, that the discussion could be discussed. — (Interjection) — If the honourable friend could just keep quiet a minute. He's free to get up after? Are you going to get up after?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** All right. I will speak. The situation — (Interjection) — I'll come to that but I'm not able to discuss that.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, is that we have the Throne Speech also that will continue immediately after this debate. There's also the Estimates that will be introduced soon, the Budget, and also as I said the question period. It's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that there will be other opportunities. Now, my honourable friend is trying to say that this statement wasn't made. The statement was made very clearly that in general there was a grant for some review and that was left to the

different school divisions to approve. That is the statement that the Minister made. I think we all know that we do not have censorship in this province, but classification.

Apparently the Minister also said that this was a system that was started by the former government when my honourable friends were sitting on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any doubt at all. I don't like this any more than any members on the other side and I don't think there are any members on this side that do but the point is, Mr. Speaker, that the correction is done immediately. There will be investigation, as was said by both Ministers, and we'll have plenty of occasion to discuss it again.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to represent our party in speaking to the urgency of the debate as put forward by the motion. Mr. Speaker, I, too, and our party shares in the urgency that this matter should be debated.

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the Minister's statement in the House today, the intent in her action, but however there is a broader issue. I think it's very urgent that we discuss and debate that issue very quickly. I sense, Mr. Speaker, no real outrage by the Minister as to, first of all, a government process that would allow this to take place and, of course, their responsibilities, the Minister's responsibilities, however indirect. To me, this is most disturbing and I feel should be debated at this time.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the Minister indicated in a CJOB interview that she thought it was up to the schools of the province. I consider this as a matter for urgent debate because I honestly believe that this is a matter of policy and one that has to be defended by the Minister in the form of debate.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Minister on CKY the other night. She indicated that this publication was an aberration, a one-at-a-time thing that this would occur. Mr. Speaker, we hear of another one just from the other member. That has to be debated, and it has to be debated immediately, now.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has shown to me that she is not really that concerned. I think to try and convince her how concerned we are, we have to debate it in this House right now.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules of the House indicate I must accept the Minister's statement of Friday and of today. The rules say that. But there is a broader issue in this, and to me this is why we have to debate the matter. As the member indicated, in a short period of time we'll probably be discussing the whole area of family life and sex education. The Minister has indicated that her underlying philosophy through this whole discussion are the three Rs: respect, responsibility and reason. Mr. Speaker, somebody in her department with that same underlying philosophy believes that they can make a decision in the Minister's absence and say that the department has recommended it and send out the material. That is urgent, Mr. Speaker, and has to be debated right this moment.

Mr. Speaker, what the main and even a greater broader issue, as far as I'm concerned, is the fact that

the Minister has totally betrayed the trust bestowed upon her by the parents of 195,000-plus students within this province. Mr. Speaker, as parents who send their children to school between the hours of nine to four under the trusteeship of that Minister, we have to know what is in the school.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** That is urgent.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Our children are involved.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member should be speaking of the urgency of debate, not of the issue itself.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I am being inundated with calls on this matter. All Manitobans from a major cross-section of this province want this issue debated today. Mr. Speaker, we have no other opportunity within the next number of days to debate this issue, and so I call upon you that we be able to debate it such that the trust within the Ministry of Education be restored.

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please. Beauchesne, in discussing this matter, says, in Citation 287: "'Urgency' within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion takes place immediately."

There are quite obviously numerous opportunities for members to discuss this matter. We are towards the end of a Throne Speech, and the Budget Speech is to commence a little later this week. Also there will be, of course, the Estimates when members will have numerous opportunities for the debate they wish.

The honourable member's motion is, therefore, not in order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, with regret, I feel compelled to challenge your ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have support?

Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? Those in favour, please say, aye; those opposed, please say, nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it, and I declare the motion carried.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has 22 minutes remaining.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On Friday, as the House adjourned, I was attempting to point out to this House and to Manitobans the different approach that this government has taken in dealing with agricultural issues, in dealing with the farmers in general, unlike the way they dealt with agriculture and the issues in the farm economy when they were government and unlike the way that their colleagues in Ottawa are now dealing with problems in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, we have consulted and discussed virtually every major issue facing agriculture, every measure that this Legislature was going to put into place, and received the views of the farm community, albeit on a number of issues there was not unanimity, and there were differences of opinion. Nevertheless, we took the approach that we would consult and we would have major discussions, Mr. Speaker.

Let's just look at the record, Mr. Speaker. The area, one of the first measures that we brought in, Sir, we dealt with the area of farmlands legislation. Mr. Speaker, we held meetings with the farm community, the Premier and myself, throughout rural Manitoba, a number of meetings in which we held discussions with the farm community, in fact, constituents from Portage la Prairie in the vegetable industry, one of the areas, Sir, that felt the highest impact of increased land prices due to speculation by non-farming interests. Mr. Speaker, one of their own party members, a member from Portage la Prairie who is well reputed in the vegetable industry - and I'm sure the Member for Portage knows of whom I speak - did get up in a public meeting in Portage la Prairie and said, and I paraphrase it, I may not be 100 percent correct, but he said: "We need this kind of legislation, but because it's an NDP Government bringing it in, we are somehow suspect that this legislation goes far beyond." Mr. Speaker, he agreed that the legislation was necessary. Mr. Speaker, the Conservative administration in Saskatchewan did not abandon the former government's legislation, which is virtually identical to the one in Manitoba.

So, Sir, we consulted with the farm community, and even the farm groups, Sir, that did not stand with us in terms of principle, they didn't want to go as far as we did, Sir, we worked with them in developing the regulations. We brought them in and said we don't want to have any undue impediment on land transfers in the farm community, Sir, and they helped us develop; they worked with us to develop the regulations that are running as smooth as they could be expected in the farm community dealing with farm lands.

Mr. Speaker, the other major program, the beef program. We consulted, we set up a committee who went around the Province of Manitoba talking to the farm sector, and they virtually developed their own program in consultations with beef producers. Sir, it is their program.

Mr. Speaker, crop insurance; the major changes in crop insurance that have been implemented this year were, in fact, as a result of proposals and consultations that we had with the farm community. We, in fact, went ahead and spoke to farmers and, Sir, I might say I'm very pleased. I did have some misgivings that the changes that we are putting in may not be accepted as readily as they have, and I am very pleased to say that the crop insurance changes are well accepted by

the farm community, in fact, all crops, in the main are taking a higher level of coverage, farmers are taking the program very seriously and going for the program, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of approach that we have had in Manitoba and this is the type of approach we are dealing with in the farm financing question, and proposals to deal with the income questions in agriculture, by virtue of the meetings that we have been holding and the meetings that we intend to hold throughout Manitoba to discuss how we deal with the farm financing problems that Manitoba farmers are facing.

Mr. Speaker, we have gone out, we have discussed it; in fact, we have gone to the agriculture critic's home area, the Member for Arthur's home area, we had a meeting in Souris, Sir, with approximately 300 farmers who attended the meeting. Did we see many Conservatives at these meetings? All but one, Sir, all but one Conservative attended the meeting, the Member for Minnedosa was the only member from the Conservative party who attended the meeting in Gladstone. Sir, I was very pleased to see the Member for Minnedosa at those meetings but, sir, obviously, the members opposite are not very concerned about the farm financial situation of Manitoba farmers, otherwise they would have attended these meetings and heard what farmers had to say; especially, sir, about the latest Federal Government policy and latest measures. They recognized, sir, that a province cannot do everything to solve the problems and the ills of agriculture, especially in the income side. They also understand, Sir, that we have put more money into agriculture than any government in the history of this province with our stabilization programs, all the other programs that have been shored up.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when it is necessary for governments to put in more to shore up the agricultural sector, what do we hear from members opposite? Absolutely nothing, Sir. In fact, every program that we brought in in the last three-and-a-half years was criticized and berated by members opposite - every program. Mr. Speaker, they said we wouldn't find any farmers who would benefit by the Interest Rate Relief Program. Mr. Speaker, most of those farmers are in the constituencies of the honourable members opposite, in the central and southwestern part of the province.

Mr. Speaker, the Loan Guarantee Program; they said that no one would take up the Loan Guarantee Program. Let's remind the honourable members that they had a loan guarantee program when they were in office; no one took advantage of it. We had to change the Loan Guarantee Program and make it more meaningful to the farmers of this province.

What have we gotten in terms of the farm financial crisis from our national government? What kind of leadership have we received from the national government in terms of the farm financing crisis? Mr. Speaker, what have we seen? We've seen a study on the financing of agricultural programs; by whom? Not one farmer on the program dealing with programs in the Department of Agriculture. In fact, Sir, the closest one I'm advised that has any relationship to agriculture is an agrolgist from one of the major banks, Mr. Speaker. They have been the greatest friends of the Canadian farmer, our financial institutions, and they

are the ones who are going to be telling the new Conservative Government how to deal with their agricultural programs, Sir. There hasn't been one farmer on that study team and apparently they have already made their recommendations.

But, Sir, what else is there? A party that came into office federally, that created, Sir, I would say the greatest expectations that agriculture and farmers of this country have in fact wanted and desired, that there would be this change in government, this change in direction at the national level that would in fact say to the farmers of Canada, there is a new direction as it relates to farm policy in this country; there is new direction as to how we will deal with the farmers in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers have been dismally disappointed. They have been totally disappointed as to the actions of the government because, Mr. Speaker, farmers were fed up. We agreed with them, that the former administration was insensitive to the needs of Western Canada and the needs of the farm population; but, Mr. Speaker, it appears that this group is even worse, Sir.

We have a Minister of Finance who puts out a report that calls the farmers of this country fat cats. And you know the Member for Arthur, when he raised the question in the House, said that we should not be criticizing the Minister of Finance, we should be criticizing the bureaucrats. Mr. Speaker, under whose name is this report printed, issued by the Honourable Michael Wilson, Minister of Finance? Mr. Speaker, who is running the show down there? Mr. Speaker, this report has set the relations between the farm community and our urban counterparts back a decade. They have done more harm to the farm population than anything that could have come out of Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, it appears, and I am pleased that the Honourable Member for Rhineland, who is a sugar beet farmer, raised the question of concern about the sugar beet industry in this province. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that he raised this concern but, in his remarks, Sir, he is putting forward a position that now all of a sudden in national, agricultural, stabilization programs dealing with sugar beets that somehow the province should get involved in financing a program. Mr. Speaker, that's the impression that he is leaving.

If that's the case, it appears that our federal-provincial relations dealing with agricultural stabilization are going to be taking a new course in this country. It will be a case it appears that the provinces will be called on to bail out the Federal Government in agricultural stabilization programs, as we have done in the past, Sir, in the cases of red meats stabilization where the provinces couldn't go it alone and the Federal Government was reluctant.

We now have the members opposite saying, now you should go ahead and bail out the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Government put in money previously to their canola industry and I venture to say, Sir, that they will likely not wait for the Federal Government and be prepared to put up money for the sugar beet industry - money. That's right, Mr. Speaker, that's what it will be, but let's just understand where this is heading.

The Alberta Government is asking Ottawa for a new deal on oil, on more revenues from oil, Mr. Speaker. The Alberta Government has a \$13 billion Heritage Fund, Mr. Speaker, they can deal with any problems.

What kind of message are we getting from members opposite? Instead of backing up Manitoba farmers and the industry and calling for action that the Federal Government has taken over many years in terms of stabilization of agricultural products, they are saying now, bail out the industry and bail out the Federal Government by putting money up. That's the action that they are taking, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** I just ask if the honourable member would permit questions.

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris asked me the other day whether I would entertain questions, I said, no. If there will be time remaining, I will be pleased to answer all questions at the end of my remarks.

Sir, there is a new trend appearing on federal-provincial relations, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to make sure that people know that the responsibility for agricultural stabilization, in most part, remains with our national government. The provinces have been called time and time again to bail them out because they weren't prepared to put their money where their mouth is, Mr. Speaker, where their responsibility is. It appears that this will also be happening as the issues unfold dealing with the sugar industry.

We have raised this matter. We raised this matter last November with the Minister of Agriculture when we were signing the drought agreement in Regina, Sir. We have again raised this matter with them and, in fact, I did have meetings with the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board last Thursday when I was in Ottawa in an endeavour to find out what kind of decisions they're going to make, because there is a lot of concern in the farm community and there is a lot of concern about not knowing what will happen, how matters will unfold. There is a lot of uncertainty as to whether farmers will receive contracts, whether they will be able to plant their crops.

There is a major investment in the industry by the farm community in this province, and this uncertainty should not continue, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government owes it to the farmers of this country to put in place a national sugar policy and a national stabilization plan that they, in fact, have paid out and carried forward and paid to other farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite in the last three-and-a-half years have basically not come up with one idea dealing with how to deal with the farm crisis in this province. In fact, the Member for Arthur, the agricultural critic of the party, basically when questioned by media as to what he would do, he said he'd consult with the bankers and farmers, Mr. Speaker, that's what he would do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been one concrete proposal other than criticisms of every program that we've put into place. Mr. Speaker, the one exception,

there was an informal suggestion, a proposal that was made by the Member for Morris about setting up an Ombudsman that he said he made to his federal counterparts. Mr. Speaker, that does certainly make some sense in terms of dealing with some of the farm problems, but it does not deal with the problems that farmers are in.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite, we'd like to hear where they stand, whether or not they are, in fact, in the pockets of the financial institutions as the donations federally state because, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party and the Liberal party both have received hundreds of thousands of dollars of donations over the last number of years from the banks. How can they now go against the ones who pay the piper? They really can't, Mr. Speaker, they cannot go against — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, one thing that the Conservative party might do to help some of the farmers in the Province of Manitoba is to return some of those monies that they receive from the financial institutions and give it to the farmers. That's one of the policies that the Conservative party can undertake; they can give back some of those donations that they've received from the banks, and assist some of the farm community in terms of the problems that they're having.

Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard a peep from the Conservative Party, Sir, about the federal cutbacks in agriculture. Last November, \$8 million away from the department's budget, and what do we hear? Nothing. What we've heard from the Conservatives, saying, look people of Canada, we only got cut \$8 million; the other cuts were far worse, we're doing just great in terms of our budget.

Mr. Speaker, this year there'll be another \$60 million cut, but that cut will be made up of \$33 million in terms of additional direct costs to the producers. I want the honourable members to know the seed producers will be one of the hardest-hit groups in this country. Manitoba's seed producers will be one of the hardest hit; not by a few cents, Mr. Speaker, but by hundreds of percents of increase. I want to give it, again, to the honourable members so they would know because we haven't heard anything from them; we haven't heard a thing as to what they intend to do and whether they're going to speak out, what kind of friends they are.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the seed producers will be the hardest hit. Sir, seed purity and germination tests, they were \$9 to \$28 for tests previously; they're going up from \$50 to \$150, Mr. Speaker, a 500 percent increase in terms of testing to producers.

Mr. Speaker, the acreage inspection was 10 cents an acre previously; it is now going up to \$1.10 an acre.

**A MEMBER:** When?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** April the 1st - 1,100 percent.

Sir, seed grain, the tagging and grading and sealing, Mr. Speaker, 1.5 cents for a 25 kilogram bag; 22 cents for a 25 kilogram bag, 1,500 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't penny ante stuff; these are major cost increases. What have we heard from

members opposite? Absolutely nothing. Mr. Speaker, we had heard complaints about our problems in the dairy industry. What are we having here, Mr. Speaker? R.O.P., the dairy industry, from \$9.90 per cow going up to \$19 per cow, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in terms of the hog industry, going up from \$65 per boar to \$125 per boar.

Mr. Speaker, they have followed the Wilson Report right down to a "T", that the farmers of this country are the fat cats; that they pay no taxes; and that they make huge profits from their investments. That's what was said in the report, Mr. Speaker, and don't let the members opposite try to fool anyone that it was a reporter who misrepresented the facts. Mr. Speaker it was not the reporter. Mr. Speaker, the reporters read, and if I had the time, Sir, I in fact would read what the Co-operator has said about that report and what the implications of those details are about that report in the Co-operator editorial.

Mr. Speaker, they are even now going to charge for meat grading. We have put the position forward time and time again that the benefits of the grading of meat benefits everyone in society, not only the producer. It benefits all the consumers vis-a-vis the quality of meat in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there will be a charge now levied; I am advised of 63 cents for every beef carcass, 25 cents for hog carcass and \$1.00 for every lamb carcass processed through the industry. These are the kinds of levies on the - Mr. Speaker, all these fees are being imposed at a time when we hear members opposite berating this government for not doing enough for agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, we have said that we have put more money into agriculture than any government in its history and it isn't enough. We acknowledge that. We have sent a message to Ottawa that it is time that they abandon their high interest rate policy that was supported by the Conservative Government of this province. Mr. Speaker, we have said it's time to write down the debts of the farmers in the only way that many of the farm communities can be saved and bring in adequate legislation in which negotiations and debt rescheduling can be put into place to assist the farm community in this country.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the Minister of Agriculture's speech is a good example as to why the agricultural community in this province is in the kind of situation that it is.

I looked over the notes of his speech from Friday and heard the repetition of it today and I thought we would hear some new initiatives, some of the directives that might come from the Throne Speech, but he is as bankrupt as is the farm industry, Mr. Speaker.

I, in opening my speech today, Mr. Speaker, would like to go through the normal congratulatory duties that members find themselves in, in congratulating the new members, of the new member, the new Cabinet appointees, the new assistants to the Chamber, and of course I pointed out how disappointed I am in the

current Minister of Agriculture and the fact that the Premier did not see fit to shuffle him in the last Cabinet shuffle that took place. I guess probably because it wasn't — (Interjection) — if the Member for Lac du Bonnet could only clean up one mess that was left by the Minister of Natural Resources and wasn't able to take over the job from the Minister of Agriculture. However, seeing that he is of the same left-wing ideology, I guess probably there wouldn't have been much improvement even in that kind of a shuffle.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a real farm crisis in this province and we have to deal with it, and we have to deal with it in a meaningful way because it isn't only financial but it has come to the point where many people are under extreme mental stress and are unable to cope with it. I will deal, Mr. Speaker, with that in more detail in a few minutes. But I, first of all, would like to point out a couple of other problems that I have with this current government and their incompetence and inability to deal in a statesmanlike way or in a way in which the people of Manitoba would be proud of their government.

I cannot help, Mr. Speaker, but put on the record the disappointment that I, and I am sure many of my colleagues in the western region of the province, had when we were not given the opportunity to meet with Her Majesty the Queen when she was in the western region of the province. The initial invitations came out in July that we would spend some time with her at the opening of which I thought was an extremely important event and that was the Dinsdale Park. But for some particular reason, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his Cabinet and whoever was organizing the tour saw fit not to apologize to the members of the Legislature, not to apologize to the Dinsdale family who were ready to have a great day bestowed upon them, and a great politician and a representative of the western region of the province. They ignored the Dinsdale family after having them all set up and prepared for the dedication of the Dinsdale Park, and what did they do, Mr. Speaker? It would appear as if they played politics with the use of Her Majesty's time when she was here and took her to the Brandon University to open the Music Centre with the Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but put that criticism on the record because it was not proper and it did hurt. It hurt deeply the people of western Manitoba who thought the Dinsdale Park should have been dedicated by Her Majesty, and this Minister, the First Minister and his Cabinet will not be forgiven for that action.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue as far as the people of Manitoba are concerned, and dealing in a way which I think is to be deplored and is not in the best interests of Manitobans, and that is the carrying on that this government has taken place between the Province of Manitoba and the State of North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the Minister of Natural Resources and his participation in the burning of the American flag - as well as the Deputy Premier. Mr. Speaker, we have seen the — (Interjection) — we have heard the comments . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos:** The Minister of Labour has a point of order. Please state your point of order.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Take my time down, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I have heard honourable members, and I heard this honourable member just now, indicating that this Minister participated in the burning of an American flag. I would like the honourable member to withdraw that. He knows what the facts are, that I was there - I gave full explanation in the House - I didn't know that that had occurred, and yet the honourable member continues to use that kind of thing. I want him to withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Arthur. Order please.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. I will continue on to point out what the Minister of Mines and Energy stated in reply, Mr. Speaker, to the State Legislature . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Member for Arthur made a statement . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The Minister was there when he burned it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** . . . and it is objectionable.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The honourable member said that the former Minister of Natural Resources participated in a flag burning ceremony. That is not so. There was full explanation given to this House, and for the honourable member to continue to distort what are the facts is a breach of my privileges in this House.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. Will the Member for Arthur withdraw the statement if the statement is not true?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, subject to the perusal of Hansard, I will again state the intention of what I said, that the Minister of Natural Resources participated in an event where the American flag was burnt.

Mr. Speaker, if it's anything different than that, then I would in fact withdraw.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order - I regret.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Honourable Member for Arthur say that we all witnessed the Minister of Natural Resources participate in a flag burning. Mr. Speaker, that allegation was denied. We asked the honourable member to withdraw that statement because what he is now saying is not what he said in his remarks earlier.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I cleared that matter up before I sat down and before the Minister of Agriculture interrupted. If you, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Will the Member for Arthur state what he had said before?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said that the Minister of Natural Resources had participated in an event where the American flag was burnt. And, Mr. Speaker, if it is any different than that, then I will withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker, I will as well, before I was rudely interrupted by the Minister of Natural Resources, want to place on the record the kind of statements made by this government and the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I quote from a Globe and Mail article, Mr. Speaker, where the Minister of Mines and Energy, who wants to put a MANDAN powerline across the State of North Dakota, and wants to do trade in tourism and all those kinds of activities, here's what he said and I quote: "North Dakota is being petty, childish, irresponsible," Manitoba Energy Minister Wilson Parasiuk fumed."

Mr. Speaker, I find that deplorable coming from a Minister of the Crown, saying that about their neighbours, neighbours who we have cherished and worked with and looked towards to do trade with over the past many years. Mr. Speaker, I would expect the Minister of Mines and Energy should have apologized for that statement. But even one worse, Mr. Speaker, and I don't have it before me but I'm sure the members of the NDP Party that went to their NDP Convention are aware of the resolution that the First Minister took to that particular convention, asking those people at an NDP Convention to condemn the people of North Dakota for disallowing the transporting of that powerline or the transferring of that line.

Mr. Speaker, that's no place to take a resolution of that nature to a political convention. He was invited, Mr. Speaker, to participate in an across-the-borders committee with Saskatchewan, North Dakota and Manitoba, and refused to do so, to discuss concerns of mutual concern, not to take it to a political convention to politicize it, because we do cherish and we do appreciate those good neighbours in North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, how can we continue to see a government who are prepared to carry on and show the kind of disrespect that they're showing for people that we expect to do business with? I'll again relate to that a little further when I talk about some of the difficulties the farm community are having, particularly when it comes to the exportation of hogs out of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I find this government have embarrassed the people of Manitoba. They've embarrassed them in many ways, and I would hope they would either clean up their act or call an election so that the people of this province could put in office who they feel proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal in a fairly major way today with the problems that the farm community are facing. The Minister of Agriculture, I would have thought, would have given us some indication and some direction as to what future plans he has because, to date, it appears

as if all he has been trying to do is cover his own political ground and try to regain some support within the farm community. But, Mr. Speaker, according to what is happening in his own riding, he is possibly too late, because the information that I have received is that there are six people running for the Progressive Conservative nomination in the Interlake riding, six people wanting to challenge the Minister of Agriculture, that there were in excess of 2,000 Progressive Conservative memberships sold in that riding.

Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Agriculture go around espousing the kind of policies he's espousing in this province without the support of the Manitoba farm community, let alone the support of his own home riding? I would expect to have heard in this speech today his swan song because, Mr. Speaker, it looks like the Minister of Agriculture is on his last political legs as far as representing the Interlake is concerned. Mr. Speaker, we look forward to that day when he is finished in this Chamber, because of the irreparable damage that he has done not only to the farm community, but to the total of this province, being a member of the kind of Cabinet that he is.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the farm community and the farm crisis? Let's just look back at some of the events and some of the work carried out by the Progressive Conservative Opposition over the past few years. I make reference to a study that was made available, and this was reported in the July 15th Press of 1982, Mr. Speaker, when the Progressive Conservative Government had hired an independent person to review the difficulties that the farmers were having at that particular time. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we reminded the Minister - not only reminded him, we pleaded with him to do something about it.

The figures at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, pointed out that there were some 3,000 people who were having some extremely difficult times with their financing in farming. But you know what the Minister of Agriculture and his Department of Agriculture told the public and told the people of Manitoba? Oh, he said, the Conservative survey differs sharply from an estimate by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture. They said there were between 300 and 500 farmers in trouble, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that's the problem with the Minister of Agriculture. He listens, but he doesn't hear. That was in 1982, Mr. Speaker. Some 3,000 farmers were identified as being in severe financial trouble, and what did he do about it, Mr. Speaker? What did he do about it? Yes, Mr. Speaker, he went on a bit of a campaign to try and again let the farm community know what he was trying to do, but in an effective way he did absolutely nothing. So we are - the spring of 1985 upon us, and a real crisis upon us in the farm community.

How does he go about dealing with it? Well, Mr. Speaker, he said there was no reference made by the members of the opposition in this last while as to what some of the positive solutions were. Mr. Speaker, we weren't given the opportunity, because this Legislative Assembly wasn't called. We didn't have the opportunity to have the agricultural community called or this Assembly called to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, we wanted to deal with it in the middle of winter before the farmers went to the field. Mr. Speaker, within two weeks time last year, farmers were



going out to cultivate the land. They had their finances put together; they had their plans made. They have to have a little bit of lead time, Mr. Speaker. It can't be done in the middle of March for the 1st of April. That's the point we have to make with this Minister. If he had been dealing with it in the middle of January, Mr. Speaker, the middle of December, when he should have been, then we could have given him some ideas. But what is he trying to do? He's now trying to regain political credibility with the farm community.

He makes reference to a meeting that he had called of the national farm community. Who did he call, Mr. Speaker? He called the governments; he called the financial institutions; he called the credit union, the banks, to a meeting to be held on the 4th and 5th of February in Winnipeg. He says we won't ask the farmers, we don't need any farmers' representatives at that meeting.

When did he announce it? He went to the two-day calf meeting in Winnipeg. He went to the meeting of a new farm organization that is working hard to try and represent the farm community. He didn't even talk to them about it. He didn't even talk about the proposal the day before, but he came in and had a big press conference in the building, warning national exposure for this great meeting, but he didn't even suggest to the farm community the day before that he was considering it. So much for his consultation with the farm community. So much political bafflelegab, Mr. Speaker, so much of it. That's all it is, Mr. Speaker.

He calls on Saskatchewan and Alberta and all the other provinces to introduce an eight-percent lending program. Saskatchewan already had an eight-percent lending program. It wasn't for one year, it was for the lifetime of a farm loan for young people. That's what Saskatchewan had, and I'm sure that's why they didn't come. He makes reference to the fact that, Mr. Speaker, we had some great ability to stop this meeting from taking place. It was his own incompetence and his own ability to attract people, Mr. Speaker, because of the way in which he handled it. They had just had a meeting in November and had laid out a plan of strategy, but he thought he would upstage them, Mr. Speaker, and then run for sympathy within the farm community.

Well, you know, I can't put it any better than the Brandon Sun did in an editorial, and I have to quote this editorial because it states very plainly what we have for a Minister of Agriculture.

"Manitoba's Minister of Agriculture has just put his reputation through the office shredder." This is February 2, 1985. "With a great fanfare of publicity, Bill Uruski called a national conference of financiers and Agriculture Ministers, only to learn a week later that he need book only a small hall indeed. The solitary individual who accepted this invitation was from Newfoundland.

"Undaunted, Mr. Uruski launched a second publicity campaign, this time to announce he would present at the next Session of the Legislature a bill which would protect farmers from bailiffs and bankruptcies. For the second time in as many weeks he has had to sound the retreat, again for lack of support.

"Surely by now, the point has been reached where Premier Pawley should intervene. It is necessary that he point out to his Cabinet colleague that Ministers who make themselves look silly usually do the same

for the administration they represent." End of editorial. That summed it up pretty well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let us go a little bit further. His announcement in the Throne Speech of reducing the interest rates to 8 percent for one year was again somewhat misleading. Mr. Speaker, there are many farmers out there today that still could use the financing support of MACC, and what are they doing? They're going to the MACC offices asking for 8 percent loans, and they're getting the answer that; I'm sorry, it's the individuals who had loans for last year, they will get 8 percent money for one year. They're getting a few thousand dollar cheque, Mr. Speaker, as a political handout by this Minister.

As far as real and meaningful help for those people who are in financial difficulties, they're getting absolutely nothing; and why didn't this Minister of Agriculture stand and put in the Throne Speech that he was making changes to MACC like he announced today? Does he want to keep the ball rolling and keep some form of false hope out there? What is he doing with the money that we did, in fact, tell him he had, the \$250 million? Is he going to make it available through MACC at 8 percent, 10 percent? Is that what his plans are? Well it's time he let the people know because we are two weeks away from being in the fields and producing the next year's crop. Mr. Speaker, it is time this Minister quits flip-flopping and comes straight forward and tells the people of Manitoba the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Agriculture, how many farm bankruptcies have taken place under the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation? How many foreclosures has he participated in with the MACC? Mr. Speaker, has he deterred, or has he deferred farm bankruptcies? Has he foreclosed on many farmers? And I want that answer, Mr. Speaker, in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I have some other important issues I want to deal with, particularly dealing with the farm community. The main one is, of course, the mental strain that the farmers are going under, and I think there has to be a mechanism, there has to be some forum set up for those people to discuss and try and give them some kind of direction and to allow them to vent their concerns.

He makes reference to the meeting that he had in Souris. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister conveniently called it for the same night that I had my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, speaking at my nomination meeting in Melita to run in the next election. How convenient, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister to pick such an evening.

**A MEMBER:** And to say we weren't there.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. And I'm pleased there were 3,000 people there because, for four years now, we've been telling him the plight of the farmer in the western region.

**A MEMBER:** Three hundred.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Three hundred people at his meeting.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased there were 300 people there, and I'm as well pleased there were 100 at my meeting.

Monday, 18 March, 1985

Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Agriculture finally heard from an area that's under extreme financial pressure, but he hasn't given them much hope so far. Yes, he was a big man to some of them because he went out and heard them, but his response is not overly accepted. They haven't heard anything other than a small move for 4,000 farmers. As far as the outlook is concerned, and what he is going to do, they haven't heard very much, and they're anxiously waiting because the next meeting might be a little less than friendly with the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I hope he does go out again, and I'm sure it will during an election campaign, and I welcome him to come and lay before the people of that area exactly what he has done, because that leads me to the next area of my concern. All last summer, Mr. Speaker, we pleaded to the Minister of Agriculture to implement a program to help control the grasshoppers in the southwest region of the province, grasshoppers that were taking all the needed feed supplies, Mr. Speaker, killing the grasses, getting rid of all the crops. What did he do, Mr. Speaker? He did absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, he did absolutely nothing. — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Speaker, he says look at the map.

What else, Mr. Speaker? The people of southwest Manitoba have said to the Minister of Agriculture, you have implemented a feed security program under the Crop Insurance Program and we, because of the grasshopper infestation and the maps pointing out that we are going to be in a difficult time again this year, we plead with you to give us the opportunity to buy a feed security program through crop insurance - the municipalities of Arthur, Brenda, Edward, all those municipalities that need it. But what did he do, Mr. Speaker? He took the program up to the Interlake, Mr. Speaker, where our farmers have had to pay \$100 a ton this year to buy feed and haul down into the southwest corner. He didn't give it to the people that needed it, Mr. Speaker, he tried to cover his own political butt with the program. He transferred it from the southwest, Mr. Speaker, to the Interlake area. That's what he did as Minister of this province.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the honourable member's comments. He should check the record that it was his own federal colleagues who did not support the additional cost of putting that program in his own area, Mr. Speaker. We put that forward, and they would not put it forward, so, Mr. Speaker, he should be aware of that.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I still challenge the Minister to go and put that program in the southwest corner as well as all of the rest of the province because, as an election platform, I am pledging to the farm community right now that under a Progressive Conservative Government that we would put it all throughout the province, that it just wouldn't be picked here and picked there, that all farmers who are in need throughout the province could avail themselves of that program, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable member knows that that program is

now going to be put in through the whole province, but it isn't in his area, Mr. Speaker, because it was his colleagues that would not finance it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That's not a point of order, it's a point of clarification.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Would the Minister back his words up, that it is not going to be in my area this year? I want it there this year, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge him to put it there because he took it from there to his own backyard for his own political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I made reference to the Beef Security Program. As well, I want to make reference to the fact that the drought and flood program, again, was handled in a way which was less than competent.

Mr. Speaker, we have many farmers in the western region who are being forced to buy hay from people who got the drought program; people who didn't get support are now having to buy from their neighbours - and I know my colleague from Minnedosa has some constituents who he is going to put on the record in that same situation. Mr. Speaker, we look at a Minister's record who has not been able to handle the daily events or affairs of his department.

We talk about the fuel contamination problem. I got an article from the Department of Agriculture today, Mr. Speaker, that was absolutely disgusting. If his department can't take more leadership, and he can't take more leadership, to clean up a mess that's costing farmers millions of dollars, and give them some assurance that the fuel they're buying is clean and pure, then I, Mr. Speaker, would think that this Minister should be able to give a better explanation than he has. It's an insult to the farmers to say that they don't know how to clean up their fuel tanks, and how to check their machines. He's six months behind, Mr. Speaker, and so is the engineer he's had doing it. I ask him to get involved in the real world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make some reference to other areas. The Minister of Agriculture who pretends to be the great helper of the farm community raised the the Crown land . . . , reimplemented the dug-out filling charges that were waived by our administration. And let's talk for a few minutes about a crisis in the hog industry, Mr. Speaker, and I would wish the Minister of Agriculture would have dealt with a real crisis in the farm community.

Mr. Speaker, we now have approximately 1 million hogs leaving Canada a year going to the United States; that's a tremendous increase from last year. The hog producers are enjoying the strength of the U.S. dollar, and they're marketing into the U.S. and it's given additional money to the farm communities, particularly the hog producers, and we've enjoyed that market. But, Mr. Speaker, because of concern in the United States and the plight of the U.S. farmer, which we're all equally concerned about, we're seeing activity down there where the hog producers are saying they don't want any more hogs from Canada or, in fact, they're prepared to implement a tariff, a tariff on those hogs going south.

Well, the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is such a small percentage of Canadian pork going south, as a total of their production and consumption,

that it really doesn't impact or affect the prices in a big way, but it is perceived as doing that. What has this Minister done, Mr. Speaker, other than throw mud at the people in the United States, and his colleagues? What has he done to improve the trade relationships with the United States? Has he written any of the Senators in the United States saying, this is the case that Manitoba puts forward, this is the situation we find ourselves in and remember, at the same time that you and the United States are thinking of imposing some form of penalties on our hogs going south, that a lot of those hogs are being fed on corn that is imported from the United States. The barley's been coming into the feed mills of Western Manitoba and Western Canada all year. In fact, it is keeping the corn price and the barley price down in our province, Mr. Speaker. It's a two-way street, Mr. Speaker, but what has this Minister of Agriculture done to speak out on behalf of the farm community? He's done absolutely nothing but allow his Premier, his Minister of Energy and Mines, his former Minister of Natural Resources, to do nothing but throw mud in the face of the people of the United States and the farm community in this country, by the way, depends fairly heavily upon for a lot of their markets, a lot of our markets, Mr. Speaker.

I could speak about beef cattle that goes out, about the dollars that come into this province because of the export beef trade — (Interjection) — yes, stocker cattle, beef cows. The Member for Ste. Rose, I'm sure his constituents have a tremendous support coming from the buyers of cattle who ship cattle into the United States. But he allows his colleagues, like the former Minister of Natural Resources, to throw mud at the people of the United States and then still . . . you know, Mr. Speaker, they just don't understand what being a good neighbor is.

I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, that there was mention by my colleague for Rhineland about the concerns in the sugar beet industry. Well, I again have to point out to the Minister of Agriculture that if the sugar farmers in the Province of Manitoba are depending very heavily on strong representation from their Minister of Agriculture, they've got to think a little differently. Mr. Speaker, I have only heard that he has sent a letter to the Federal Government telling them or requesting that they implement a stabilization program for this year. I haven't heard of them calling the sugar industry to Manitoba. I haven't heard of them calling the sugar producers to a meeting of which they can all explain to one another what the situation is and so the public can understand. The people of Winnipeg and Fort Garry had better start paying attention because there is extreme danger of the sugar refinery in the Province of Manitoba being closed down, if this Minister and his government don't start showing a little care and concern for them and get involved and show them that there's support there. But there has been very little coming forward so far. Again he runs off and he says to the Federal Government, it's up to you to do something. Well, those jobs are here in Manitoba, they're here in Winnipeg. Those 400-and-some sugar beet farmers need the protection of a government. They need to show that they're needed.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, look what they're doing for Flyer. This Minister gets totally out of touch with the needs of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. This Minister is totally out

of touch with the hog industry and then let us talk briefly about the recent action in the dairy industry and the poultry industry. I don't blame the registered producers of eggs for being a little upset. You know, there were other options that the Minister of Agriculture could have looked at. There is a cost of removal of surplus eggs in the province. There's a cost of removal of surplus eggs, and the registered producers are bearing all of that cost, 6.5 cents a dozen. I think there could have been consideration given to charge all the producers of eggs some of that removal charge, another option that could have been looked at. But what did the Minister of Agriculture do? He said, ah ha, we'll move the unregistered production quantities from 499 to 99. Well, I have a letter on my desk today, Mr. Speaker, that points out that a producer had 100 birds last year and he was going to go to 499 this year and it would have made him \$3,000 this summer. His plans are blown, Mr. Speaker. That income is gone by this Minister.

The numbers of unregistered producers, and it's caused the egg producers some concern, has increased from 1981, from 500 to over 1,000 last year. That tells you just how tough the farm community is, Mr. Speaker. People are looking for other ways to make an income and this Minister of Agriculture sees fit the only way to move is to cut them off, cut them back to 99. That's what he's done, Mr. Speaker, cut them back to 99.

I want to talk to about the dairy industry for a few minutes because again we have a Minister of Agriculture under an NDP government who has totally put the dairy industry in disarray. Not only a few years ago did we see the dumping of milk, but now, Mr. Speaker, we're seeing a Minister wanting to say that you're going to be controlled by me and my government as to what you can sell and what you can't sell. — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister of Agriculture who says that he will not allow a partial sale of a dairy herd or a dairy quota, unless it's within family or unless you sell your total farm. Mr. Speaker, that's not what the dairy producers of this province want.

I'm surprised that he didn't stand today - rather than go through the tirade in question period - and tell us about what his dairy policy is. How is he going to work the impasse that he is in? You see, he has our good friend from the western region of the province, our good friend, Maude Lelond on the Natural Products Marketing Council, you know, good person. But you know she's pretty left-wing bent and he's got a few others accompanying her on that particular board. Is he going to challenge them or is he going to be pushed around by the board? Is he going to be pushed around by the Natural Products Marketing Council, or is he going to say to them, look, we can't tolerate the kind of policies that you're imposing on our dairy industry, that I see that we've got to deal with this? Is he going to call the agricultural committee and say this is what we, the government, we, the producers, see as the best way to go? You know, he talks about our policies. I think, Mr. Speaker, our policies worked fairly well for the dairy industry, and I don't think we'll have any trouble when it comes to campaigning in the next general election in any part of the province where it comes to dealing with the farm community and particularly the dairy producers.

I challenge the Minister of Agriculture to clean up his act, to go to the dairy producers, to call the

agricultural committee and have them come before that committee and say, Mr. Minister and the members of the Legislature, this is what we think is best for the dairy producers in this province, if you want us to stay viable. If you want to stay viable, don't call the Natural Products Marketing Council, have them make a presentation if they want, but let's get the facts out on the table. He's been fumbling with it since July and now it's turned into totally a mess. He's got chaos in the chicken industry. He's got chaos in the dairy industry. The hog producers don't know where they stand, and there's one other one - and I should have brought it up when I was talking about the hog industry. One of the concerns of the American hog producers is that some of the production that's going into the U.S. markets is subsidized by government in Canada, either by the Federal Government or by the Provincial Government. Is he prepared to tell the people of Manitoba or work out with them that this is a problem, that they're going to take off some stabilization or they're prepared to look at that particular angle? If it means keeping the market in the United States, I'm asking the Minister what his policies are, is he going to deal with it? Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wants to hear my policies, then he should resign; he, as government, resign, and we would form government and we would tell him what our policies are. That's the way he'll find out what are policies are.

Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty in going to the farm community and espousing what our policies are because I can tell you, they'll be in the best interests of the producers and the consumers in this province. This Minister and this government only think of No. 1 first, that's themselves and their re-election, Mr. Speaker. They give a damn about the farmers! They give a damn about the consumers! They don't care about Manitobans, all they care about is their re-election, Mr. Speaker. That's all they care about. And I can tell you, I'll speculate right now, Mr. Speaker, there'll be very few of them back after the general election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's one other area that I have to deal with and that relates to what the Minister centered most of his speech around and that of course is the difficulty that he's having with the Federal Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, for 16 years the farm community of Manitoba have been waiting for a government in Ottawa to pay some attention to them. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are well on the way. I think that the Federal Government, first of all, in dealing with the problems with the Agribond or their interest in developing an Agribond program, where they can allow investors to invest in a bond system where their interest rates are lower but they pay less tax, is an important principle and one which will remove some of the cost of taxpayers in helping the farm community. That, Mr. Speaker, would encourage private investment into a bond system that would take some of the responsibility away from the taxpayer directly.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a person doesn't have to a 100-watt bulb burning to see that principle. The Minister of Agriculture may have, but the principle that I'm suggesting is that if a private person wants to invest in an Agribond, for a lower rate of return on their interest, that they aren't taxed at such a high rate as a normal investment would be, that they would in fact

be getting private investment into the industry and it wouldn't be a handout from government. That's a principle that I stand for and I think it's an important one. It is not a handout.

Look, for years, Mr. Speaker, the housing industry in this country - they can use the word "MURB" if they want - but there was a tax incentive, there was a tax incentive for a private investor to invest in the housing industry and, in return, they had to pay less income tax on that investment. The same principle would apply to the farm community, and I don't see what's wrong with that, and the government is offering that kind - in fact, the Department of Finance is sitting now studying that kind of a proposal. The capital gain one is another important issue because we find . . .

**A MEMBER:** Right.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, sir. We find that in the farm community today, because of the continued depression, that many farmers have had to sell off parcels of land, some of their assets, to liquidate and pay off some of their debts that have accumulated in the past two or three years. It's unfair that if, from the sale of that property, they have to pay a capital gain on it. I'll give this government a little credit, they removed the provincial share, but this present Federal Government is considering the removal of the capital gains on such a sale. That would take the pressure off some of those individuals that may be taxed on the money that they would take to pay a debt off to the bank or some other institute. That again is a good principle.

There is another reason on the capital gains. There are many of our retiring farmers who may want to take some of their money and invest it in agriculture in an agribond, or whatever. I don't believe that it's a just society when a farmer puts all his lifetime savings into a farm, into farm land, and when he or she sells it, Mr. Speaker, is penalized. Because any other citizen living in society, if they put that money into a savings account, they wouldn't be taxed at the same rate as what they would be in the capital gains. I think we've got to move in that direction, and again, the Federal Government is looking at it.

Mr. Speaker, that's more than the Trudeau Liberals did in 16 years for the farm community. The Trudeau Liberals, supported by our current government and our current Minister of Agriculture, continually said why should we give a darn about the farmers. Trudeau himself said why should we care about the farmers; why should we sell your wheat? That's the kind of government that this NDP Government supported, the Trudeau Liberals. — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Speaker, they ran hand in hand.

The point I want to make here is that we have a government today that needs the help of the Federal Government to help our farm community. They need the help of the Federal Government apparently to give us \$72 million of an equalization payment, but to hear the First Minister, when you ask him how the unemployment is in Manitoba and how the conditions are in Manitoba, he says to the public everything is great in Manitoba. Isn't everything great? He stands up and puffs right up and he says things are great.

Monday, 18 March, 1985

Then, Mr. Speaker, as one of my colleagues, a former leader, said, and then he takes his tin cup and he runs to Ottawa and says we are a have-not province, Mr. Speaker, we need \$72 million.

You can't have it both ways; you can't have it both ways and you are not going to fool the people of Manitoba. And with you as a government we are becoming to be a lot more of a have-not province. I don't think 72 million would anywhere near bail you out the way you spend your money and try to advertise your image. The point is, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways.

In my conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel very disappointed that this government has let the farm community down. I make reference again to the pledge of 1981, and I am going to table this because I have never seen it tabled in this Legislature. Here is a page where the First Minister promised, signed a guarantee that no one would lose their homes or farms due to high interest rates, and we now have a record bankruptcy in the province, Mr. Speaker, 62 — (Interjection) — yes, the Member for Inkster is laughing that some 62 farmers have gone broke last year. The Member for Inkster finds humour in that.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am going to table that message from Howard Pawley and make sure that the public knows what he said in 1981. But I would hope that in the coming days and weeks that the Minister of Agriculture would come forward and follow up on one of the positive recommendations that we made, and that was to provide some of the \$250 million at a lower interest rate, a positive suggestion, something that he said that he hadn't received from us. He said he hadn't heard anything but from the Member for Morris.

I am going to table, as well, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was asked for by the Member for Ste. Rose. He asked a question of the Minister the other day: Had he received any correspondence from the members opposite? I am going to table a letter and an attached documentation of Hansard that I sent the Minister on January 31st with some positive recommendations, Mr. Speaker. The Minister just stood here and said the only correspondence he had was from the Member for Morris.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Agriculture has been playing political games with the farm community. He has been trying to play political games with us; it won't wash. All we need, Mr. Speaker, is an election so that we can clear this government from office and get Manitoba back on the right track.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to extend congratulations to you, once again, in the office of the Speaker of this House. It's a very difficult office; it's an office that is judged by the judgment of the Speaker's capacity to undertake decisions, tough decisions, when there are disputes within the House. It's that judgment that makes

the difference between truly great Speakers and Speakers who have, perhaps, not really developed quite the reputation of others in history.

I would like to express my congratulations to the appointment of both the new Deputy Clerk and the Clerk of Committees. Both these individuals are filling the shoes of predecessors who did excellent jobs, and they both gave me a great deal of guidance both in the House and in committee. I certainly wish both of them well in their new respective careers. For the replacements, the new Deputy Clerk and Clerk of Committees, I equally wish them well in their endeavours.

For the Member for Fort Garry, welcome into the House. I think and I hope that he will bring some ration and some reason to the desks opposite and that we will hear fewer flares of the great rhetorical response that we just did a minute ago, and that he will give the members on his benches that he shares perhaps an example to move away from their style of debate and toward a style of debate of greater reason which he certainly very well gave us last week in his inaugural speech in this House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the congratulatory items, I am very very happy to see the elevation of my colleague, the Member for The Pas, to the Minister of Northern Affairs. In the three-and-a-half years I have known the Member for The Pas, he has always been at a very high level of esteem from myself personally. He has gained and his reputation has spread, not only in this House, but whoever has met him. I think one has to go a long way to find a finer character than in the person of the Minister for Northern Affairs. I wish him well in his new endeavours; I know he shall do well. He is a person both of great competence and also a person who is able to deal with other people very very satisfactorily and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, this year is the Year of the Youth, the International Year of Youth, 1985. One of the key items in the Year of the Youth, the youth are working toward, throughout the world, the Issue of peace. I intend to give a good part of my presentation today on our responsibility as legislators and as citizens, as individuals, to both further enlighten ourselves as to the issues involved in conflicts that are both percolating, have broken out and have potentials to break out around the world; and for us to dedicate ourselves even stronger to making the world a peaceful place for us and our children to grow.

On New Year's, the Prime Minister, Prime Minister Mulroney, gave a very sincere, a very solemn expression of his commitment to peace. We wish, and I personally wish, that the sincerity and the tone of voice that he expressed in that New Year's Day message will be carried out in his actions in his term of office. I am very disappointed to report that I personally have not seen a similarity between his rhetoric and his actions. I must unfortunately question his sincerity when he speaks so glowingly of peace as the most important issue of our times, the one that preoccupies him most and, yet, we continue on a path which goes in exactly the opposite direction, and I feel is going to jeopardize significantly Canada's potential and Canada's role in the world community.

We have had, since the election of a Federal Conservative Government, two Pentagon roadshows

into Winnipeg. The first one I went to and listened to was our then Minister of National Defence, Robert Coates, condemn members of the peace movement on the one hand, and turn around and talk about the great potential for us in Canada to participate more fully in the arms race which is growing at an unprecedented rate in the United States of America.

His very words were: "The possibilities are just unbelievable." He made those words in reference to the capacity of Canada to tie our industrial network even stronger into the United States military complex.

We see no difference with the replacement of the Minister Robert Coates with Eric Nielsen as the Minister for National Defence. As a matter of fact, his appointment worries me even more, because he is a much smoother individual. He does not tend to be quite as frank and outwardly open and, may I say, honest as Robert Coates, because I do believe that Robert Coates believed very strongly in his unfortunate bent of mind. He spoke his mind. He did not hide his inner opinions. He let the people know where he wanted to take this country in defence policy. I believe the current Minister and the Prime Minister hold those same beliefs, but will not enunciate them anywhere near as clearly.

The testing of the Cruise Missile is, once again, another example. We've had, I believe, two more tests — (Interjection) — the Member for Minnedosa says they were very successful. Yes, they were very successful. They were very successful in showing the Canadian lack of sovereignty. They were very successful in showing that we will be a lapdog to a superpower for the testing of their armaments, that we will talk peace in a world community, and we will participate in the enhancement and the expansion of the arms race around the world.

Mr. Speaker, their current Summit that is just concluding today, some 24 hours of Summit with about 16 hours of partying and public events and about two hours, I believe, of real meetings, and one questions even whether the meetings are necessary because all the i's were dotted and the t's crossed long before they came into the Summit. It is far more a PR exercise for Mr. Reagan.

I don't know how successful the PR exercise is going to be for Mr. Mulroney, because he does not govern in a system where he has the isolation that a President of the United States does in their congressional system of government. Our Prime Minister has to stand in the House daily when the House is in Session and respond to opposition questions. You cannot stand by and hide constantly and manipulate, as we saw so greatly this tremendous communicator, the President of the United States today, his presentation this afternoon. I got a chance to watch the very carefully crafted, teleprompter President. He certainly is a very, very effective communicator, thanks to the teleprompter set up in front of his podium.

It is odd in a way, I suppose, that one of the focuses of their attention in this so-called Summit, which people have appropriately nicknamed the "Blarney" Summit, that it is being held in a town - and I understand this afternoon they were going to go out for some photo opportunities - in front of the fortifications that were built, not by the French against the British, but by the Lower Canadians against the Americans. They were built just after the war of 1812-14 when there was still

considerable threat to Canada from a military perspective from the United States. There is no longer, at least I would hope there is no longer the military threat for it has been replaced and supplanted by the economic control of Canada and the other pressures, both on external and internal policies of the government.

What really started to worry me was when they both started talking about Canadian sovereignty. When the President of the United States starts talking, as he did today, about the great independence of Canada, when I see the actions of the Government of Canada, I get very worried. I have never heard - and I don't hear an awful lot of their speeches - any Leader of the Soviet Union going into one of the East Block countries and not talking about their great independence, of their sovereignty. One hears that constantly. I do not want Canada to become another Poland. I am afraid that we are very rapidly becoming more and more of a Poland as far as international affairs.

**MR. H. ENNS:** No chance of that, because United States isn't Russia.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** The Member for Lakeside shows his lack of perception in the whole area of the superpowers and superpower relations between small powers such as Canada, countries with a strong history of neutrality and tying themselves in too tightly and too closely with a superpower, because they lose in the independence of their own.

We had, for instance, the acid rain scenario. In Friday and Saturday's paper, there were reports of a potential joint effort, some sort of board to be set up to review the situation of acid rain and acid rain pollution within our continent. But what did they do? The Prime Minister denies any such kind of accord is there. A spokesman for the Prime Minister said: "The talks are still going on, and the final chapter of this story will not be written until the two leaders have met in Quebec City.

"The United States and Canada," he goes on to say, "have decided on a new joint effort to examine acid rain, sidestepping a politically sensitive dispute at the Summit this weekend between President Reagan and Prime Minister Mulroney."

What did we get the next day? One of the first things they deal with - all of a sudden in a 45-minute meeting where they touch on the subject to some degree of acid rain, all of a sudden they have this new accord and we have a pact. What are we going to do with this pact on acid rain?

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Bill Davis will look after it.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** The Member for Minnedosa says that Bill Davis will look after it. That's one of the things I'm worried about. Bill Davis was responsible as a Premier for almost 15 years for one of the largest polluters in the country which is Ontario Hydro, and he refused, Mr. Speaker, to ever even contemplate adding scrubbers to the coal fire electric generating plants owned by Ontario Hydro. Now we have that individual set up to negotiate with the Americans who we know are intransigent in the area and who, Mr. Reagan's press secretary, Larry Speakes tells reporters as soon as the pact is written that the President has not changed his basic views on acid rain.

Monday, 18 March, 1985

So what is the purpose? What are we going to accomplish with this new pact on acid rain, I ask, Mr. Speaker?

**A MEMBER:** Let's wait and see, maybe.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Well, we will have to wait and see. I'll give you some reactions from some of the Americans who are following the issue as well.

The National Audubon Society, a very good friend of this government to say the very least, worked very closely with us on the Garrison issue, and we have successfully come, not quite to a conclusion yet, but it looks as if we are going to be at a stage where we are going to have an accord between Canada and the United States for the development of a water project in North Dakota, which does not and cannot impact upon Manitoba and Canada's waters. The Audubon Society says, this booklet says, "This isn't progress, this is a continuation of an unacceptable status quo. The Canadians have acted themselves, and the time for research has passed. President Reagan has found a way to package a do-nothing policy." It sounds like the policies of the previous Conservative Government here, of a do-nothing policy, since their policy on almost everything was do nothing.

r. Speaker, the co-ordinator for the Clean Air Coalition in the United States, which represents more than 24 environmental groups, states that it is less a commitment to enforce the current U.S. law, and it continues a pattern of far less on the U.S. side than the Canadian side.

Being a little more polite, and perhaps like the Member for Minnedosa, David Hawkins of the Natural Resources Defence Council, said he's willing to give the envoys two or three months to prove that this isn't a sham.

Well, given that the President's known and unchanged attitude towards acid precipitation, I really wonder if it will be anything but a sham, and if it is anything but a sham, Mr. Speaker, we, in this country, will be the first to suffer.

We have areas in La Beauce, not even 100 miles from where they were having this summit meeting yesterday and today, where their Maple trees - great producers of Maple syrup - are dying because of excess acid precipitation. We have lakes dying in Ontario, Quebec, throughout the northeastern United States and also in the Maritime Provinces because of acid precipitation. It has been proven in Europe, and Europe was starting to react - the Germans like President Reagan refused to accept that their dirty industries were causing the degradation, the environment, by acid deposition. They now accept it, and they are working day and night committing hundreds of millions of dollars to cleaning up the acid rain problem in Europe, and Germany, instead of being one of the hold-back nations, is now one of the nations at the forefront, finally. But we have the United States of America, today, giving the same arguments on acid rain as the Germans gave ten years ago. Whereas the Americans have gone backwards, the Germans have gone forward, and they have advanced dramatically.

Now we have some American States who have made great progress, but that is not an indication of the U.S.

administration in Washington. That is the result of very progressive administrations within those States, and I speak in particular of Minnesota and Wisconsin, two of the wiser states, two of the states that have recognized the problems of acid precipitation.

We have the same with the State of Vermont and the State of New Hampshire and some of the more far eastern states in the northeast, who also recognize the terrible dangers of acid precipitation. They are taking actions, but unfortunately, they are not getting a heck of a lot of support from their national government.

If I could refer, Mr. Speaker, to today's statement - I don't know who else listened to it - at the Blarney Summit. They had the luncheon today, and both, with the aid of Teleprompters, got up to make their little speeches. I would like to go through a couple of different areas of what the Prime Minister had said and what President Reagan had said.

In the area of trade, the Prime Minister made a commitment to extending trade obligations and previous trade arrangements arranged by a previous government that he condemned, condemned, condemned all the time for all of his years in opposition. He says they're going to have some sort of a new joint declaration towards extending and towards, I would expect, what he has been pushing, which is broader free trade in the United States. The Prime Minister stated - and this I find really quite difficult to understand, how he can put so much trust - in the election campaign he said, we must give the Americans the benefit of the doubt, but does he have to sacrifice Canadian, either economic interest or international interest so strongly when he comes off with statements like: "Mr. Reagan, your policies are good for America, and all your allies all around the world."

What was Mr. Reagan's response, Mr. Reagan's little presentation today? First off, he gave us a lecture in relation to trade. He never mentioned free trade, in particular, I don't believe, but he gave us a very lecture on Reaganomics. He starts off everything talking about freedom. Of course, freedom is his key clinch word, and it means very different things to different people. He even had the gall today to get into Nicaragua, for heaven's sake - two days after they withdraw the U.S. orders 14 of their mercenaries out of the country, he has the gall to get up and talk about freedom in that country, as is indicated by the Contras and their expressed goals.

He calls for less government on the economic side. He congratulates the Mulroney Government for - and these are almost the exact words, the terminology is the same anyway - moving away from creeping socialism. He said, we have moved away from creeping socialism in the States, and you are doing the same thing here. It has proved successful for us in the States, he said. Let Canada march onward, and he gave great praise to our Prime Minister, with full support, obviously, from the Member for Minnedosa, to move away from so-called creeping socialism.

But what is creeping socialism in this country? Is creeping socialism an education system where people do not have to worry about the amount of income that they earned to be able to go on to gain secondary education? Does it mean a system where everyone has the right to medical care, to all degrees of medical care, or does it mean, Mr. Speaker, that we have a

social assistance program in this nation, which is supported federally-provincially, to assist the people who fall down to the so-called safety nets? It's a downright disappointment that we even have to have safety nets, but they do have to be there. The U.S. people are falling out totally. Yet, he calls these kinds of programs that we have here creeping socialism.

What they actually are is protection of the common man and common woman in the country, and he is against that in the U.S., he's shown that with his policies there, and he is now urging the government of Brian Mulroney to move in that same way here.

He urges us to cut taxes. He uses his examples as a success of cutting taxes. He uses Japan as an example of cutting taxes. He ignores the part of the burgeoning deficits in both of those lands, partially because of cutting taxes as much as they have. He says that taxes and incentives are the only form for industrial growth. Well, I maintain they are not the only forms of industrial growth, and we have many other nations - the Scandinavian nations now have a higher growth rate than Japan or the U.S., and they, Mr. Speaker, are anything but low tax nations, because they tie everything. If an enterprise wants to do something, it's the efforts that we're attempting to make in this province as well, that we're not just going to throw money at you, you're not going to push strings as the Tories continually want to do through taxation policies, pushing strings which you cannot push towards certain economic development initiatives. They are working through agreements as we are trying to work through here now with agreements with various industries called development agreements.

Then, perhaps more scary on the economic front, the President says, "We will put our new partnership to work." What is our new partnership? What stand is there for Canadian sovereignty? What independence do we have in this new partnership? It may well be the DEW Line. In the DEW Line, we're certainly working a partnership there, and lose once more or gain sovereignty for this country.

In the areas of peace, Prime Minister Mulroney, as in his New Year's Day Address, gave us great lip service again to peace. He made a commitment to a new northern warning system, to mutual defence with the United States. He also made a commitment which he has been denying vociferously in the House of Commons. He stated, "We will do more in space." What does that mean, we will do more in space? He commits us to a new northern warning system. Is that to be tied into the new Star Wars or SDI as they call it in the U.S., or tries to attempt to call it, anyway, when really the Star Wars is a far more descriptive example of it.

What does that mean for our country's sovereignty? We now have a situation where the Prime Minister is decrying, or the Minister of National Defence last week, was decrying in the House that for the present the Distant Early Warning System or the DEW Line, that is so antiquated - the electronics system, the old vacuum tube types - we don't make them anymore - that we are getting these tubes from the Soviet Union. Now the Soviet Union is producing tubes for us to protect ourselves against a nuclear attack from the Soviet Union. Does that make sense?

**A MEMBER:** No.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Does that make this imminent danger of Soviet aggression coming into this land, is that our greatest danger before us in this land today? Are we faced with the imminent danger of an invasion across the North? We often say that we have the longest undefended border in the world. We have that with the United States, it is always said. What kind of defence do we have in the North which is a far larger border running across the Northern Hemisphere where we have absolutely no defences at all other than a few radar stations?

As a matter of fact, under the previous administration, the Liberal administration, when the U.S. tanker, Manhattan, went through the Northwest Passage, Canada all of a sudden scurried to get some presence in the North. That was one of the reasons for the exploration and other initiatives in the North 30 years earlier to try and lay more claim to the North because internationally and particularly on behalf of the U.S. they were questioning whether we had full jurisdiction over our northern territories or not.

They then started moving Native settlements of the Inuit people around, and one of them ended up starving the people out because you can't just take people from one area where they are used to and move them into another totally new habitat where they live off the land and they very quickly starved to death with the disastrous policy. Part of that was to enunciate Canadian sovereignty in the North. Now I don't think it's ever really been that strongly questioned by the Soviets and we certainly have not felt any threat in the North to arm the North.

Now we have a situation where we want to protect ourselves with some new technology that's going to cost billions of dollars to put in, which is very questionable whether we can afford or not, to replace a system which we are now protecting ourselves against this so-called enemy by buying supplies from countries under the control of that imminent enemy. So one really questions the whole basis of this. I mean, it's nice to have an enemy to run off to build up this great anxiety against . . .

**A MEMBER:** Who's the enemy, by the way?

**MR. D. SCOTT:** That's what I would like to know. What is our enemy? Who is coming in? Who is a threat that we have to spend \$1.5 or \$2 billion on to protect ourselves? Where is this enemy? I don't see one. I don't see any nation in this world right now wanting to invade Canada. We have only had two nations that ever attempted to invade Canada. The United States did it a couple of times over 100 years ago. We don't have to worry about that anymore, I'm sure. And the other one was during the Second World War when we had German U-boats up as far as Quebec City in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. As a matter of fact, 40 miles from my home town there was a crew deserted their ship and beached their U-boat and they walked into town and went to the local cinema and were all arrested there and spent the rest of the war in Shelburne, Nova Scotia. But that was virtually the extent of foreign incursions into our land.

During the Second World War they wreaked complete havoc in the seas within our territory and that's what



Monday, 18 March, 1985

our minesweepers were all about. That's why there are little ports like Liverpool and other small ports throughout the Maritimes were refitting ships and building minesweepers galore to try and patrol our waters and also provide assistance in the great convoys that went across from Halifax to England in particular and to some of the Scandinavian countries as well.

Mr. Reagan expressed today that we should not worry about the deficit. He said that although Canada's deficit per capita was higher than that of United States, we should not be concerned about our deficit when it comes to matters of defence, that we should not be concerned about our deficit as long as we spend our money on defence. That, Mr. Speaker, as far as Canadian values go, as far as what we in this country have built up over 118 years, the values that we have built up in this country which respect humanity, which respect individualism . . .

**A MEMBER:** Freedom.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** . . . and respect freedom, yes. Don't we respect freedom. And what is freedom? What is freedom? What is your definition of freedom? For us, freedom is where the citizens of a country are free to roam and go where they wish, where citizens of a country are free and not inhibited in the terms of a good system of public education, in terms of health care. Those are the basic freedoms of this country, individual freedoms, freedom of speech, freedom and the liberties that we enjoy that we have in effect inherited from Great Britain more than anywhere else by far to set up the basis of our country and we owe a tremendous debt to the nations of Great Britain that set us on our course. We have evolved into our own culture quite independent both of Great Britain and of the United States and this institution itself is a description and a definition of that difference and how this system works compared to how their system works as far as government goes.

Mr. Speaker, this nation respects human rights; it respects civil rights. And we wonder when we have a president coming to us, to our land, talking about human rights and talking about Nicaragua and the need to support the Contras, who are nothing but a bunch of ruddy fascists who go into little villages in that land and destroy the whole village, burn the crops, burn the houses, burn the schools, murder any persons there that have medical experience, murder teachers, murder the workers in the fields in the most cold-blooded fashion - and yet the President of the United States has the gall to come into this country and talk about human rights. We do not need that kind of lecture in this country, Mr. Speaker.

We get into Star Wars once again. Mr. Mulroney says we will do more in space. He says we will build a new Northern Early Warning system. Mr. Reagan talked of mutual defence. He talks of Star Wars, that they will share the technology of the Strategic Defence Initiative with Canada. Now we all last week had our government say no, no, no, Canada has no part in Star Wars and the President today says and confirms a news reports that have been coming out ever since this issue has arisen that Canada is very much involved in the whole Star Wars concept.

**A MEMBER:** Who are your friends?

**MR. D. SCOTT:** My friends are Canadian, my friend. My friends are other neutral nations. My friends are nations that wish to stand up as independent nations and express themselves freely, to be able to question the superpowers, to condemn actions by the superpowers but not to be their lackeys, not to say "uncle" whenever Uncle demands that he says "uncle." That is who our friends are.

We, I believe, are the only NATO country right now to come out and support Star Wars. Just last week his staunchest supporter, Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain, said it is dangerous, that it is dangerous, that it will provoke another mass escalation in the arms race. That's Margaret Thatcher. So he doesn't have Margaret Thatcher's support; he doesn't have the German's support; he doesn't have other NATO countries' support; he doesn't have the Netherlands' support; he doesn't have Spain's support. The only support he has is Canada.

I ask you, who is saying "uncle?" What kind of pressure are they putting on us, or is this just the giving of the benefit of the doubt as we heard so often in the election campaign of the Conservative ideology and many of those individuals in the Conservative Party, I firmly believe, would much prefer to be American citizens than Canadian citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber, we have heard - how many times now? - the members opposite getting mad about something and singing American patriotic songs as they leave this Chamber instead of singing Canadian patriotic songs. Perhaps that is an indication of where their strongest loyalties lie. I don't hear them singing, "God Save the Queen;" I don't hear them singing, "Oh Canada!;" I don't hear them singing, "Mon Pays." I would never hear them singing, "Mon Pays," I'm sure - (Interjection) - yes.

Mr. Speaker, today when they also talked of sovereignty, and I mentioned how nervous I am when the United States and when Mulroney have to get up and start talking about Canadian sovereignty. Canadian sovereignty is something we have grown and at least worked towards accepting as something that was status quo in this society, but when we had a superpower talking about our sovereignty, I wonder really how much sovereignty we have left. What direction are we going in? Are we going to be able to enunciate greater Canadian sovereignty or less Canadian sovereignty?

We have a report that was reported back in February in the Globe and Mail by a retired Major General, L.V. Johnson. He's a former Commandant of the National Defence College in Kingston, and he was questioning Canadian sovereignty and our expression of that sovereignty through NATO. He was wondering why we have taken the line we have in NATO, in particular. He says: "There is a role for Canada as a sovereign, as an independent nation within NATO quite different than the role we are playing today."

Back in 1974, John Holmes, a widely-respected former Canadian diplomat and head of the Canadian Institute for International Affairs, said and I quote: "Military arguments for the stationing of Canadian forces in Europe are hard to support. They were sent there as a temporary gesture when Europe was weak.

They are trapped there now, not because they are needed but because of the symbolism which would be attached to their withdrawal."

Retired Major General Johnson gives us two different options. He states that: "NATO does not obligate Canada to maintain forces in Europe. Canada could bring home its forces, transferring them to another NATO region perhaps within Canada itself without leaving their alliance." As an example, like France, we have the capacity to withdraw our forces and put them on our own land, and stay within NATO. France did it in 1966.

Armed neutrality is another option. He states that: "Armed neutrality in co-operation with the United States and Regional Defence is feasible and should be considered." He makes reference to: "Switzerland and Sweden, both of which maintain strong self-defence forces, have chosen armed neutrality." Sweden, Mr. Speaker, has not been involved in a war since 1815, and Switzerland since 1500. So we definitely have other options that we can follow.

We see something happening in the South Pacific today that really really bothers me, and that is the kind of pressure that the United States is trying to put on tiny New Zealand, because New Zealand is, in effect, doing the same thing that Norway has done for years, saying they do not want ships or aircraft of any kind in their country with nuclear weapons. Norway has had this for years, and the United States has been able to go along with it. They have an agreement, in essence, that Norway assumes there is no nuclear weapon on any ships that dock in Norway's ports. When New Zealand tries it, you have all kinds of pressure tactics made against the Government of New Zealand.

Prime Minister Lang deserves a great deal of respect and support from other nations, other middle powers such as Canada for his efforts. He states very clearly in an article on March 1st, speaking in London, England that the United States wants to drive him from office because of his anti-nuclear policy, and is using tactics ". . . akin to the very totalitarianism we're supposed to be fighting against."

The superpowers, the United States being the superpower that we have alliance with, are going to have to recognize that nations have a right to independence, that we have a right to decide what defence is greatest for us.

In New Zealand once again, Prime Minister Lang in an article that was published that he wrote in February 24th of the Free Press: " 'We don't have enemies,' he declared. 'We aren't threatened. Nobody's pointing nuclear weapons at us, and we don't see the logic of asking the United States to defend us with nuclear weapons. The bottom line for New Zealand is simple,' he states. 'If New Zealand was ever under threat of attack, we would not ask the United States to defend us by threatening to use U.S. nuclear forces against the attacker. We will never ask any ally to defend us by annihilating the planet.' "

It's odd in a way, Mr. Speaker, very odd that the United States refuses to accept the neutrality of the smaller nations within its alliances. ANZUS itself was started not to stop Soviet aggression, but because of fear from what was back then called the great yellow peril of Japan and of China. That is now no longer the case. They have good relations with both of those

countries. There is no longer a threat there. Dialogue over the years has replaced rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to urge that Canada's position be one of expanding dialogue and less participation in the arms race. That is our . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

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

I just can't believe, Mr. Speaker, what I have just listened to for the last 40 minutes, especially when the member said that we would be interested in what he had to say.

Everyone was so proud of the Throne Speech, I felt, on that side; I didn't hear him mention it once. All he did was bash our good American neighbours and a little bit of the Federal Government bashing, and embrace some of his kooky peacenik friends that have been wandering the streets of this country for some time and their numbers are diminishing again and again, not that I have anything against peace or those that want to espouse their feelings on it, but I'm certainly not an advocate of wandering through the streets with great placards.

I didn't hear the Member for Inkster once mention Afghanistan in his tirade against the Americans and the other nations that he is not aligned with, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear one word of the terror and savagery and butchery that's going on in Afghanistan by the other superpowers. All he could do was rally against the one that happens to be one of our best friends which we do a tremendous amount of trading with . . .

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Will you entertain a question?

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I'll entertain a question when I'm finished, gladly. And he's so deadly opposed to the DEW line, the Distant Early Warning line. Well, if we're going to have that line, Mr. Speaker, and there is no doubt that we are, I would suggest that this government jump on the bandwagon and try and retain some of the jobs or get in on some of the supplies that that's going to generate. It is going to be billions of dollars spent up there, and let's get in on it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get carried away on that, because it's such a beautiful spring day. The crows are back. The geese are back into our land once again. The Native people tell me that the sturgeon are full of roe, and that means that it is at least two weeks early, and we're going to have an early spring. It can only augur well, Mr. Speaker, for this Session.

Mr. Speaker, again the usual congratulations to you, and I know other members who have spoken before me have pledged that they will try not to make your job any more difficult than it is normally. I know that's the customary thing to say, so I will say that I will also try and maintain a little more decorum. I, for one, mean it. I'm not too sure the other ones have all meant it, Mr. Speaker, but I know that you will govern this conference of ours over the next few months with the usual wise and guiding counsel that you have always given to us.

Customary congratulations to the Mover and the Seconder for the Throne Speech because as normal,

Monday, 18 March, 1985

they had an extremely difficult task before them trying to defend the government's actions and the government's Throne Speech which really was lengthy and without much substance.

The Member for Kildonan - we, of course, on this side of the House, wish her well in her fight, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that she's back in this Chamber before too long.

The Member for Riel, of course, has been getting many questions in. She's looking towards the next election, I'm sure, and brushing up her profile somewhat, so we wish her well, of course, in that venture.

Congratulations to the new Minister of Northern Affairs. The Member for The Pas has always been considered a fairly decent chap and we wish him well. He got off to an excellent start with his first question and properly caught himself. When he originally got into the problem, he took advice from the First Minister, but then he realized what a bad move that was and came in the next day like the gentleman that he is and admitted that he had been wrong, and apologized to the House for it.

Also, welcome the new Member for Fort Garry, Mr. Speaker. We're delighted to have him join our ranks and after the next election, of course, we'll have a great number to congratulate on this side of the House, or on the other side, that side, just switch it around.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood did quite a number on the members from that side and I won't attempt to go into it, but he missed out the Member for Thompson because there are not very many on that side with business experience, Mr. Speaker, but I venture to say that after the next election the Member for Thompson will be entering a new career that will give him the business education that he so richly deserves. He'll have a paper route in Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, there were 17 dull pages of Throne Speech as I say that were very difficult for them to defend and really when they have that little to say, I don't know why they subject the Lieutenant-Governor into the ordeal of going through it, to say nothing of the Clerks who have to stand and endure such a dull speech as that.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused by members on that side of the House of being negative to everything. Mr. Speaker, I just can't accept that. I think we have a positive attitude on this side of the House and referring to the Throne Speech, I want you to know that as far as the Throne Speech goes, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that we are proud and happy and honoured that Her Majesty the Queen visited our province; we are proud that His Holiness the Pope came to visit us; we're proud of the Blue Bombers for winning the Grey Cup; and we're happy and pleased that we had so many curlers that have done so well and we just have another rink that won another championship today. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that's not being positive, I don't know what is.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, we have had some days of debate on it and I will spend some time on it, because that's what this debate's all about, although it's very difficult to stick to too many minutes on it.

We touched on building and economic future, where we're going to put thousands of Manitobans to work; well, that remains to be seen, Mr. Speaker, because we haven't seen much evidence of it to date, other

than the great advertising and "apple polishing" job that's being done with \$4 million of taxpayers' money or however amount of millions that may bring.

We have heard an awful lot on energy and I know we're going to hear more on that, Mr. Speaker, because in spite of the enormous profit that they're projecting for the people of Manitoba, the people of Manitoba just aren't buying it - bull is bull - like the Minister would like them to. There's many, many people out there questioning it and this government would do well to take a long look at the consequences of starting Limestone too soon and the subsequent debt that's going to be placed on the Hydro users of Manitoba.

The Manitoba Jobs Fund comes in for a paragraph or two. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that it's a "Fraud Fund." That's about the best word we can use to describe it, because they just take money out of other programs and put into the Jobs Fund, and then if we're going to build a bridge or something, we say this is announced and it's all from the Jobs Fund. Well, we know a great number of those projects had to be done anyway, Mr. Speaker, and to say they're coming from the Jobs Fund is just a facade and a sham and they're trying to hoodwink the people a little bit more.

Mr. Speaker, the Labour Management and Co-operation section of the Throne Speech comes in for a paragraph or two. We all know what the new Labour Minister's attitude is. He is shown on television disposing of his Eaton's credit card and obviously he's in the — (Interjection) — The Member for Thompson says, "Good for him", so we know where the members from there stand. In spite of all the shouts and cries of derision that we get over there about the donations we get from the bank, other people, these people are in the hands or the pockets of labour, Mr. Speaker, so let's not get carried away and deride the free enterprise system and marry up with labour, because we know exactly where they stand.

Trade development took about four or five lines of the Throne Speech. There wasn't a word mentioned about participation in the World Fair or Exposition that's going to take place in Vancouver. We've got \$4 million to advertise the funds; we can open an office in Hong Kong, but here we're going to have buyers from all over the world, especially the Pacific Rim countries, surely, Mr. Speaker, we could have some presence at that great exposition that Manitoba and Manitobans might be allowed to show their wares and what this province and the country has to offer.

There have been some reports that the Native people have taken the initiative upon themselves to have a spot in that trade fair to display some of the Native products that can be sold, and we give them some credit for that; but this government hasn't mentioned it and is apparently not prepared to even have a peanut stand there, which might be kind of nice, because that's about all they can run. In fact, they're accused of not being able to run that by our former leader.

Mr. Speaker, on agriculture, I want to say a word about that and I know I can't use the word "hypocrite" to describe the members opposite, so I won't use that word, but I'm just at a loss for a word to describe the flip-flop that they have been doing on business. They carve out the corporate welfare bums and the ripoff artists, soak the rich and lift up the poor.

We've done so many flip-flops now on this government that hates multi-national corporations, here

hand-in-glove with Alcoa and a few more of them, and pumping money into industries to attract some type of industry to this province and try to get something going, Mr. Speaker. It's just a complete reversal to the positions they had when they were over on this side of the House. Now, lo and behold, we find that they're doing a poll to find out if lotteries money should be used for education.

What part of education are they going to use it for? Maybe for a few more books or something, I don't know.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture got a shade more attention and my colleague, the Member for Arthur, has just covered it pretty well. Mr. Speaker, we know well on this side of the House the problems in agriculture. We know very well that high interest rates have been disastrous but, to hear members on that side and especially the Minister of Agriculture, stand up and cry that we've got to get off this insane high interest policy, we've got to get back to a lower interest rate. Really when you get right down to it, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what effect they feel that Manitoba is going to have on the interest rates that affect this nation and other nations.

It would be like the mouse kicking the elephant in the knee, Mr. Speaker, because we would have little impact, if any. I don't think we would have any impact on the interest rates of this nation. It is governed by forces beyond the control of little old Manitoba, much as we might not like it, but it's beyond our control and there is not too much we can do about it. We can cry about a made-in-Canada interest rate, but I think he well knows the effects that outside forces have on our economy and on our interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture went to great lengths about this so-called paper that came out, saying the farmers are "fat cats" and all of that. I just want to put one or two things on the record. I certainly didn't agree with it. I disassociated myself from the report, the way the article was written in the *Globe and Mail*. There are House of Commons Hansards from February 25th of this year, Monday, saying that this was a discussion paper. If they will look at it closely, they'll find that the paper provides information for an analysis that the committee was going to undertake regarding agribonds and various other forms of trying to assist the farm community. So it was a study paper, Mr. Speaker.

Just to reinforce it, the CBC ran a radio program on February 26th, and they had taken the article. It was a front-page story in the *Globe and Mail*, written by Mark Côté, saying that farmers earn twice as much as the average Canadian and so on, we've all heard that. But he goes on to say who's right. So we asked an economist to undertake a study of the Department of Finance Report on which the *Globe and Mail* story was based, and he asked her what she found out. Diane Cohen, the economist that they'd hired, said: "I found that if I were Oliver Burton, who wrote the story in the *Globe and Mail*, I would think that he should have his little hand slapped."

Now there are a great number of articles that were brought into question, Mr. Speaker, called tax issues. They go on at some length to discredit the *Globe and Mail* article, because the average Canadian that they compare the average farmer with, has maybe a very

small investment in his home and is earning a salaried income which can't be compared with the investment that a farmer has even though his assets might total a few hundred thousand dollars, because his return on those assets is ridiculously small.

Now the comparisons, Mr. Speaker, whoever wrote that article, they picked out one or two years that were good years. They didn't go to the second portion. They said the average income for the average farm was 17,000, where all tax filers was 15,000.00. That was one year they picked out. If they went back to a few other years or if they took a 10-year average, they would find that that wasn't true at all, because farming is a risk business. We know that. This article, when it's had time to see the light of day and be examined, is just a ridiculous article.

She goes on to close, Mr. Speaker, and I'll quote: "So altogether, I would say either this is a very young reporter or he wanted to have a story that had a really sensational headline." So much for that, Mr. Speaker, but, as I say, that was a discussion paper. They grab it with glee over there and clutch it to their breasts on that side of the House.

Well, here's another discussion paper that came to their convention, Mr. Speaker, a few months back. It said, "For instance, the Manitoba Government is the only one with a social conscience and concerned with peace, so the province should open a world peace office in Moscow to prove the oneness of the working people wanting peace in east and west." This motion is by the Minnedosa NDP Association, Mr. Speaker. But is just a working paper, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear any great discussion of it. We didn't get too upset on this side of the House because we know where it comes from.

To jump on a working paper that was put out, such as the working paper on the net farm income of farmers, to make such a big thing out of it, I think, Mr. Speaker, by the press playing it up, it did a lot more damage than it would have done good.

Mr. Speaker, there's something about housing and tax reform and co-op development - my government is encouraged by the strengthening of the credit union system the past year. Well, some of the credit unions that I've talked to aren't really sure that there has been that great a strengthening in their position — (Interjection) — well, maybe overall. The Minister responsible said there may be overall.

On education, Mr. Speaker, we have heard something of what's going on in the education department the past few days. We know what the average person out there thinks of the sex education program and I know what my constituents think of it. When this little article on the pornography that's being pushed into the schools, the government financed in more ways than one, Mr. Speaker, I know what they're going to think of that.

The Manitoba seniors came in for a little bit of coverage. There was a committee set up under this government when we were in power, Mr. Speaker, that made several recommendations to the government. That committee has since been scrapped by this regime that's presently, temporarily, in power, and a new committee was formed. I don't think the new committee has met, but there have been many names requested for a conference coming up in May. Members on this

side were given the opportunity to put in names, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that that is a successful conference.

Mr. Speaker, urban development, Northern development; the Minister, of course, is not in the office to see his wilderness park developed. They moved him out of there before the Natural Resources department became a complete and utter disaster. They brought in one of their old war horses to try and straighten it up . . . The former Minister, I don't think, would know a muskrat from a muskox, Mr. Speaker. The tell me, they got concerned in so many of the areas with hunting regulations, people were coming in wanting a hunting licence and the clerks were saying, do you want it for an elk or a moose, and they kept saying no, Mackling. I know I should have referred to him as the Minister, Mr. Speaker, I've got to retract that. I'll refer to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I have to go back to the former Speaker's tirade against our good neighbour, the United States, because we don't want to lose the confidence of those good people down there; 75 percent of our trade is with them. We spend thousands of dollars a year to encourage them to come up here as tourists, and then we charge them twice as much for their liquor, their food, and their hotels, as they have to pay at home. Nevertheless, we try and get them up here because with the dollar value being a little different, there is some attraction for them to come up here. We don't want to lose the confidence of them.

The Minister of Agriculture has lost the confidence of the farmers. He goes out and holds meetings and does a big of handwringing and whatnot with them, but that's not really confidence building, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Arthur touched on it with the Minister, he's probably going to be spending a lot of time in his constituency talking to his people and shaking hands for the next while, Mr. Speaker, because it was mentioned there are six of his constituents vying for the privilege and honour of getting the Conservative nomination to run against him, and with the membership burgeoning the way it is - something over 2,000 members - and when you there were about 7,000 or 7,100 votes cast in that constituency last election, Mr. Speaker, he's got to be a worried man.

But some of his people are telling me they are seeing quite a bit of him out there now, but they said where was he last year when the French language issue debate was on. Where was the Member for Dauphin when that was on? They are seeing quite a bit of him now, but they didn't see him then. These people are pretty astute, Mr. Speaker. They are not going to forget. They didn't see him then, but they are seeing a little bit of him now and they are not going to be taken in. The First Minister says he has the confidence of the people, Mr. Speaker, but the people don't have any confidence in him or his government. That's just the difference.

Mr. Speaker, before I leave agriculture, I wanted to say something about the Drought Assistance Relief Program, because I have several people in my constituency, there were boundaries drawn and they took two wards of Daly Municipality and the other wards were not included. Now, you can't tell me that a dividing line which is a road, that the people on that side of the road are not entitled to drought assistance while the people on this side are. They have come to me with their problem; I have had them file applications

which were rejected out of hand. They are having to buy feed to sustain their breeding stock, Mr. Speaker, over the next month or two. Some of them - and it can be documented for the Minister - there are people there that are buying hay from farmers who have received drought funds under the Drought Assistance Program. It may be legitimate, they might find that they have a little surplus that they weren't expecting and they are able to sell, but we know where prices have gone from last fall till this spring. How the Minister could just make an arbitrary decision and cut off relief on an imaginary boundary line, Mr. Speaker, just defies imagination. There are people in the area though of those wards of the Daly Municipality that aren't included. They went to the Minister, made representation to try and become included in it, and were given a pretty short shrift. Now they're having to buy hay, Mr. Speaker, to sustain those herds at a fairly substantial cost, because we know what's happened to prices.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two also about the CRISP program that this government altered dramatically, cut off something like 1,000 families that were receiving assistance, because they brought in a figure of assets of \$50,000.00. Well, we all know that a farmer today might have \$50,000 in assets, including farm land in this, Mr. Speaker, but their cash flow is next to nothing and there's been over 1,000 families cut off the CRISP program that was brought in by the former government and well received. It provided assistance to people that were desperately in need of some assistance and with one stroke of the pen, the Member for Brandon East comes in and says, oh well, these people have some assets, so they obviously don't need help, so bang, he just cuts off about 1,000 families without any thought or consideration of the consequences, Mr. Speaker, of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about highways because there was absolutely nothing in the Throne Speech about our highway system. Mr. Speaker, we know that highways are deteriorating. There has to be a large program of maintenance and reconstruction brought in immediately or our highway system is going to go to rack and ruin - I wasn't going to say to to pot because the pot holes will just be showing up now - but we have got some work in my particular area, Mr. Speaker, and I speak fondly of Highway 250, which the Minister is very familiar with. We are getting that done slowly, not as quickly as they would like in that area, but hopefully in the next year we can have it finished right up to Highway 45, but it's going to take an effort on behalf of the Minister and his colleagues that money has to go into this area because it's an area that was extremely hard hit with rail line abandonment. And speaking of rail line abandonment, I don't know where the road beds sit now, Mr. Speaker, that was all supposed to have been turned back to the municipalities and the farmers. Their farmers are coming to me; they can't find out what's happening. One member says, well, that wasn't under the gifting arrangement and the other one was under the gifting arrangement, and they don't really know where it stands, but that's something we can get into when the Minister brings down his Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to highways, we talk about the Jobs Fund and creating jobs. Well, there's no project better suited to creating jobs than highway construction,

**Monday, 18 March, 1985**

---

Mr. Speaker, and it indicates that the government is trying to do something to improve the system, rather than just sitting back to patch and to makeshift and try and get by. We need some more twinning on the Trans-Canada Highway and I know we're trying to twin No. 75 to the south of us, but as far as creating jobs, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. When this matter is next before the House, the honourable member will have 10 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.