

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 14 May, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. H. PAWLEY: I have a statement, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, as members are aware, I met late yesterday afternoon with the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark. My colleagues, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, and the Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health also attended the meeting.

The main purpose of Mr. Clark's visit was to discuss with us how best to ensure that there will be "full provincial participation" in the Canada-U.S. trade negotiations, as agreed to at last November's First Ministers' Conference in Halifax.

I understand Mr. Clark characterized our discussion yesterday as "positive"; I certainly agree.

During the meeting I reiterated Manitoba's position that a special meeting of First Ministers should be held in the near future to work out satisfactory agreements for ongoing provincial participation. Mr. Clark undertook to advise the Prime Minister of our position — which is shared by most other provinces — when Mr. Mulroney returns from the Far East tomorrow.

I explained to Mr. Clark that we feel it is imperative that substantive negotiations with the U.S. administration not proceed until the mandate for Canada's negotiators has been clearly worked out, with full provincial involvement. The mandate must be articulated and understood as clearly as possible by the Federal Government and by the provinces, before negotiations commence.

It is also essential that we have an "up-front" agreement on a satisfactory mechanism for federal/provincial ratification of any new arrangements at the conclusion of the negotiations.

Mr. Clark acknowledged the importance of a provincial consensus on these issues, particularly since several key areas of negotiation may relate to matters which are fully or partly within provincial jurisdiction.

During our discussions, I emphasized some of the province's specific concerns about the continuation of regional development and social programming, the maintenance of agricultural stabilization programs, the need for safeguards for key services, such as transportation, and the likelihood that Canada could require different adjustment mechanisms for those required in the U.S., after new agreement, because our two economies differ in important respects.

I can advise the House as well that this morning I had occasion to brief the other Premiers on the general nature of my discussions with Mr. Clark. I'm expecting that when Mr. Mulroney has reached a decision on whether or not to convene a First Ministers' meeting, he will convey that decision to Premier Getty of Alberta, who is chairing this year's Annual Premiers' Conference in Edmonton.

Other matters were discussed at yesterday's meeting with Mr. Clark as well.

On the issue of possible U.S. nuclear waste dumps in Minnesota, Mr. Clark and I agreed strongly on the importance of our governments to work closely together, just as we did on the Garrison issue.

Mr. Clark said he will be meeting in the next few weeks with the U.S. Secretary of State, George Schultz, and that he expects to be discussing the nuclear waste issue with him at that time.

Also, he said that the Federal Environment Minister, the Honourable Tom McMillan, raised the matter in the last few days in a meeting with his U.S. counterpart.

We agreed to have further discussions after Mr. Clark's meeting with Mr. Schultz on how best to proceed in our dealings with the U.S. Administration over the next several months.

Finally, I advised Mr. Clark of our support for a proposal by the Governor of the State of North Dakota to invite President Reagan, Secretary Gorbachev and Prime Minister Mulroney to the International Peace Garden for a meeting this fall in commemoration of 1986 as the International Year of Peace. Again, Mr. Clark undertook to transmit this idea to the Prime Minister and to the U.S. Federal Government.

I want to commend Governor Sinner of North Dakota for his initiative. As I said, it has the wholehearted support of our government and, I would hope, of all members of this Assembly.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I thank the First Minister for that report on his meeting with the Right Honourable Mr. Clark yesterday.

In thanking him for the information, Madam Speaker, I'm delighted that Clark has indicated how well versed the Federal Government is about the concerns of Manitoba and the other provinces, not only with respect to free trade and their willingness to cooperate and seek consensus but, as well, with respect to the issue of the nuclear waste dump in Minnesota and the meetings of the Honourable Tom McMillan.

Madam Speaker, with respect, particularly to the issue of free trade, I want to reiterate the comment that I made on Friday morning, in response to a similar statement by the Premier, that as important as it is for all of the provinces and Manitoba to be consulted and to participate in arriving at consensus as to the position of the Federal Government on free trade, it is equally important for this Premier and his administration to

consult and to seek consensus of the various different groups in Manitoba's economy as to the position that this administration takes with respect to free trade when it goes to the table with the other provinces and the Federal Government.

I believe that it is absolutely essential that the Premier inform the House as quickly as possible as to whether or not he is willing to comply with our suggestion that he strike an all-party committee of this Legislature to go out and to meet with and seek the advice of all of the various different groups in our economy today in Manitoba, the people in manufacturing, the people in our agriculture sector and, of course, the cultural community, because they are the ones who obviously will know best what effects the free trade issue might have, adverse or positive, on their communities and on their aspects of the economy. Only by seeking consensus and by going out throughout the province to hear their views and concerns will we know that the Government of Manitoba is indeed representing the people of Manitoba and the major players in our economy when they take their position on free trade in these federal-provincial talks.

So I ask the Premier as quickly as possible to notify the House whether he will indeed strike an all-party committee and set about to obtain a consensus within the province before he goes outside the province to put forward our views.

Thank you very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to provide the House with the most recent information relating to the concerns about possible radiation fallout from the Chernobyl nuclear reactor accident in the USSR.

As you are aware, the Federal Government has assumed jurisdiction over matters relating to radiation and nuclear power and has built up a substantial infrastructure to deal with these matters. The provinces rely heavily upon this infrastructure to provide them with information respecting radiation in the environment under both normal conditions and when abnormal circumstances, such as the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons or the recent Chernobyl accident, occur.

Air and rain water samples from the Winnipeg International Airport have been analyzed for radiation for several years. The published long-term average for Winnipeg in air is approximately .001 becquerels/cubic meter, and for rain water, approximately 1.0 becquerel/litre. By way of explanation, a becquerel is a unit which represents one nuclear disintegration per second. These values are much much less than federal guidelines which mark the point at which there would begin to be concern about effects on human health. The guideline for ambient air is 20 becquerels/cubic metre. There is no guideline for rain water, but for drinking water consumed daily, over an extended period, the guideline is 10 becquerels/litre. It is this value that was exceeded in a precipitation sample in Ottawa on May 8th that prompted Health and Welfare Canada to issue a recommendation that the public refrain from using

undiluted rain water as a drinking water source for the time being. This recommendation is still in effect.

Rain water from the Winnipeg Airport for the period of May 1-7 was analyzed and no iodine 131, the main radiation source from the Chernobyl fallout, was detected. A precipitation sample from the Winnipeg Airport for the period May 8-14 period has been sent to Ottawa for analysis and the results, we have been told, will be available either Friday, May 16 or Tuesday, May 19.

Daily air samples are being taken at 28 stations across Canada, including Churchill and Winnipeg, Manitoba. A composite analysis is performed on all of these samples and the result for the 24-hour period of May 7-8 is .003 becquerels/cubic metre; and for the 24-hour period of May 8-9 is .1 becquerels/cubic metre, a slight increase. Further data is being released by Health and Welfare Canada today and is being made available to us. Only in cases where high radiation levels are detected in rain water (which is so far not the case in Manitoba) is the Department of Health performing daily site specific air analysis as the precipitation would reach values of concern long before air. Daily precipitation sampling has been instituted at Pinawa, Manitoba, as well.

The City of Winnipeg water supply has been sampled as a precautionary measure, even though there's no reason to believe that a radiation concern exists. Results should be available on May 15.

Milk samples have been taken on May 7-8 by Agriculture Canada and the results revealed no radiation concern, although I have to add, Madam Speaker, that the specific numbers have not yet been provided to us. Again, there is no reason to believe that a problem exists, but precautionary monitoring is proceeding anyway.

A question was raised in the House a few days ago about radiation levels during the St. Helen's volcanic explosion a few years ago. I have been advised, Madam Speaker, that in fact there was increased radiation fallout associated with this event, although there is not any good data available, so I have no specific numbers, but can only add that it would not have been of the iodine 131 type of radiation.

I will continue to provide information on this situation as further information is available.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to thank the Minister for the information that he has just revealed to us through the process of making an announcement in the House. The only concern that I have at this time — and you have put the minds of all Manitobans at rest with the fear of radiation in Manitoba — but there has been some great fears for the last two weeks as to whether we have had any problems here. I would like to thank the Minister, albeit two weeks late, for advising as to the dangers not being in existence here.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I have some reports to table, Madam Speaker.

First of all, the Report of the 66th Annual Meeting of the Uniform Law Conference of Canada; secondly, a Return under The Controverted Elections Act for the period January 1, 1985 to December 31, 1985, from the Court of Appeal and from the Court of Queen's Bench — clean slate.

Report under The Fatality Inquiries Act for the year 1985. This deals with death in provincial institutions and the cause thereof.

Finally, the Annual Report of the Public Trustee for '84-85. With respect to that document, my apologies to the House. This was not tabled by me yesterday, but was distributed by the House staff before I formally tabled it. That was an oversight on the House staff's part, but the tabling has now been made.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we go into Oral Questions, I would like to draw members' attention to the gallery where there are 50 students of Grade 9 standing from the St. George School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Clint Harvey and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

There are also 50 students of Grade 9 standing from the Ken Seaford High School under the direction of Mr. Zuk; this school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. There are 53 students of Grade 5 standing from the Dieppe School under the direction of Mr. E. Ridi. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

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

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: Also, before Oral Questions, I would like to draw members' attention to our Rule 41(1) which says, "No member shall use offensive words against the House or any member"; and also Beauchesne Citation 359(7) which also deals with casting aspersions on another member.

As I said yesterday, I would review Hansard. I have reviewed the draft printout from yesterday's question period and I see where some members have come perilously close to contravening those particular rules, in particular, the statements from the Minister of Health. Where some members certainly did raise some objections, I would hope that all members, including the Minister of Health, would hereon in choose their words very carefully and give all members the due respect that all honourable members in the House so rightly deserve.

Oral Questions . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: A point of order.
The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Madam Speaker. In your announcements today, I believe there were another class of students of Grade 5 from the Arthur constituency, and I would like to make that announcement to the House as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, but we certainly welcome your constituents.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hydro export agreements - status of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I begin by thanking you for your admonition and say that I have a question for the Premier.

In the Throne Speech, Madam Speaker, there was a reference to the planned and orderly development of our natural resources which, and I'll quote, "has resulted in three more export agreements with six utilities operating in the United States." My question to the Premier is: how many new hydro export agreements have actually been signed?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: One agreement has been signed.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, then I would ask the second question. Is the one agreement which has been signed a final binding commitment on the part of both sides for the export sale of our hydro-electric energy and, if so, what is the status of the other agreements?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Minister of Energy and Mines will provide that detail, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be tabling the agreement before Manitoba Hydro goes before the Public Utilities Committee, so that will be tabled in the Legislature. That is an agreement for a sale over four years. The other two are longer-term agreements and the legal work — work is still being done on them. We expect that legal work will be done by sometime in September or October at which point those agreements would be made public, as was done in the past with the Northern States Power Agreement where the preliminary arrangement was arrived at, that was announced in the Legislature, or publicly announced, and when the final agreement was finally signed, Madam Speaker, that agreement was made public for everyone to review.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier then is: if there is only one agreement, why does the Throne Speech refer to three agreements?

HON. W. PARASIUK: The Throne Speech deals with the Session. We think that those agreements are in place; there has been preliminary agreement reached on them. It is a matter of the final agreement being reached and made public. That has been known for some time to the public of Manitoba.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I'll try again to ask the Premier why he would put in the Throne Speech an indication that there are three agreements when, indeed, there is only one agreement? Why would he choose to misinform the public through such a sacred vehicle as the Throne Speech?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, those were announced to the public some time ago. It was included in the Throne Speech so that the public would be aware that it is the intention of the government to indeed make these public when they are finally signed, as we have always done. I would have thought that maybe the Opposition would have criticized us for not mentioning that we have reached a preliminary agreement with respect to three, and we have reached a final agreement with respect to one, and that will be tabled in due course.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I want to point out to the Premier that when those agreements were announced, initially, if that is the reference of the Minister of Energy and Mines, under his news release it says, "Three new Hydro export arrangements announced," and then it proceeded to say that these were not really quite agreements, but they were in some stages of negotiation and discussion. Madam Speaker, I want the Premier to indicate to us whether or not we have three agreements and, if not, what is the status of the other two? Are they Letters of Intent? Are they Memoranda of Understanding? Are they agreements in principle? What are they and why should we be told that we have agreements if we do not have agreements?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I thought the Minister of Energy and Mines had dealt with that quite fully just a few seconds ago. There have been preliminary agreements that have been arrived at with the utilities. What is taking place now is the finalization of those agreements in final form, the legal work and other necessary work in order to ensure the proper wording of the final agreements. The preliminary agreements have been arrived at as was announced. The Leader of the Opposition may have missed the announcement in February of this year in Thompson.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry if the Premier didn't listen to what I said. I acknowledged that indeed there was an announcement made, but the announcement did not refer to agreements. The announcement — and I have it in my hands, if he'd like a copy of it — refers to arrangements, not agreements. These are in some form that are not in

a final form that is legally binding on both parties and I'd like the Premier to tell us what is the status of these "arrangements." Not the agreement that has been signed, but are the people of Manitoba legally bound; are the utilities legally bound; and if not, what form are they in at the present time?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: When the processes — when the final agreement is signed by a government that has the mandate to negotiate those, they are made public. We have done that before with the Northern States Power Agreement. We have, what we consider to be, a business deal reached with respect to three of them.

One final agreement is signed; that will be tabled very shortly in the House. The other two have work to be done on them. The Opposition might want to quibble about whether this should say this or that, but the business deal hasn't even been done. We believe we have an agreement in principle but there is work to be done. We do concede that in terms of doing the final drafting a fair amount of work has to be done, but we expect that will be done by September or October and that will be made public for everyone to review at that time.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, if these are not agreements, and indeed, it appears from the confirmation from the Minister of Energy and Mines that two of them are not agreements; I would like the assurance from the Premier that we will no longer have to have false statements in the Throne Speech — (Interjection) — that we expect the Throne Speech to tell us the truth.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order. Is this a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's right, yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Will he give us that assurance?

MADAM SPEAKER: I would just like to remind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition of Citation 357(d) which says that a question should not repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I've had no assurance from the Premier that the Throne Speech in future will carry truthful statements and I am asking him if he can give us that assurance.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, it is always the intention of this government to ensure that truthful statements are included within the Throne Speech.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, just for further clarification to the Minister of Energy and Mines. The

details of the sale that was announced during the election is one that he was referring to that will be made available to us, the House, prior to the first meeting of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: There are three. One of them, dealing with one of the sales will be tabled in the House because that has been concluded. The other two still require further work. When they are formally signed and concluded those other two will be tabled in the House.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, surely the government — and I direct the question to the First Minister — will enable us to conduct our affairs with some degree of responsibility. The Standing Committee of Public Utilities ought to have the information before them considering these long-term energy sales agreements that we are making with the United States. I would ask the Minister to rethink the impossible position that he's putting the members of that committee, by having to sit to discuss Hydro matters, without having the details of these sales arrangements before us.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to deal with this. In 1977 the Conservative Government of the Day signed what they considered to be — or initialled what they considered to be a type of agreement. They made that public in an election campaign. They didn't make it public to anyone else.

We were elected as government and when we appeared before the Public Utilities Committee, the then Leader of the Conservative Party, the Premier of the province at the time that that agreement was announced, indicated that he certainly wouldn't want his side to be jeopardizing the conclusion of any type of agreement, and he believed that that should be kept private and confidential until such time as that agreement was concluded by the government that had the mandate to do so, and then it would be made public. I, in fact, concurred with them during those committee hearings. I see now that there is a change in policy on the part of the Conservative Party.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, let's go back to Square One, the questions that were just raised by my leader. If his memory is so good, I want him to review what was put in Throne Speeches in those days.

MADAM SPEAKER: Question.

MR. H. ENNS: We have a statement of fact in the Throne Speech that three Hydro sales are concluded.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Does the member have a question?

MR. H. ENNS: Yes.

MADAM SPEAKER: Question period is not a time for debate. Would you please put your question?

A MEMBER: I was trying to get some honesty out of these guys.

MR. H. ENNS: Impossible to do.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister of Energy and Mines is: which details of which sale will be available to the members of the Committee of Natural Resources and Public Utilities?

HON. W. PARASIUK: When I make the announcement in the House, Madam Speaker, the Minister (sic) will receive all that information and it will be made very shortly.

MR. H. ENNS: I'm pleased with the confidence my colleague shows that I indeed will be Minister very shortly responsible for . . .

Hydro Chief Executive Officer - status of position

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, I have a further question also relative to Hydro. Could the Minister confirm the present status of Hydro's chief executive officer? Has he requested early retirement? If so, who will be answering on behalf of Manitoba Hydro as the chief executive officer of that corporation during the committee hearings?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I think some almost three months ago, the present chief executive officer of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. John Arnason, took early retirement and he gave three months notice. His last formal day will be on May 28th. I believe that his last day in the office, because he has some time coming to him, will be May 20th. He will be at the committee to make a statement and he will be there for the two-and-one-half hours to answer questions.

Subsequent to that, the remaining management or senior management of Manitoba Hydro will indeed be there, along with the chairperson of Manitoba Hydro to answer questions that come before it.

Hydro Chief Executive Officers - number retired

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, I just wanted to put on the record and ask the First Minister a question: if he really feels satisfied that having the chief executive officer available to us for two-and-one-half hours, not having details of major agreements made available to that committee; if he thinks that is open and fair government and fair practice to members of the Opposition?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I think it should be known that we, on this side, offered to have the committee meet on Thursday. We were informed by the Opposition that they would like to meet on Tuesday. I think that we do have the chief executive officer there. But what we are talking about when we are talking about Hydro is a complete management structure; people who have served as dedicated people within Hydro for tens of years. The senior management there has probably 20, 30 years of experience in many

instances, and those people will be there to answer questions. We have done that before. It's not only been the chief executive officer that's been there to answer questions. The chairperson's been there; the chief executive officer; there's been vice-presidents there.

We have had many sessions of the public utilities committee, Madam Speaker, and I think that this government has been at least as open as any in the past, and I would think far more open than some in the past, in providing information to the public regarding Manitoba Hydro.

MR. H. ENNS: A final supplementary question, Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

Can the Minister indicate how many of these dedicated public servants, senior executives and competent executives of Manitoba Hydro have availed themselves of early retirement this year?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I will take that question as notice, Madam Speaker.

Equal pay for women

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

Given the fact that women still, on an average, are earning 66 cents for every man's dollar, could the Minister inform the House as to what efforts her department is making to combat this obnoxious and pressing situation that faces women today?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Member for Kildonan for this question and say how pleased I am that Status of Women issues are being raised so early in this Session.

I'm sure that members on all sides of the House are concerned about the wage gap and about the fact that women, especially older women, are among the poorest members in our society.

To answer the question, this government has made economic equality for women a priority and taken action in a number of areas, including major initiatives in child care, pension reform and pay equity, and we are diligently carrying on the work of our former friend and colleague, Mary Beth Dolin.

Specifically, members will be interested to know that good progress is being made with respect to the implementation of pay equity in the Civil Service Commission.

MADAM SPEAKER: As the member knows, a question should be brief — as well should be the answer.

MACC - loans to farmers

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In recent days we've heard numerous complaints from farmers that it is very difficult to receive a MACC loan at this time. In recent weeks have you directed, or has there been MACC policy changes that makes it more difficult for farmers to receive mortgage loans at this time through MACC?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I want to tell my honourable friend that in terms of lending in this province, it appears that, although MACC being one of the smallest lending agencies and having between 10 percent and 15 percent of the credit, handling about 10 percent to 15 percent of the credit of Manitoba farmers, has in fact been inundated by requests from farmers for consolidation and debt restructuring.

In fact, Madam Speaker, about 30 percent of the applicants to MACC are clients of FCC and, quite frankly, we find great difficulty in fact taking clients of a federal, another public lending institution, and trying to deal with them on our own.

That is not leadership, Madam Speaker, and we do find difficulty with that. We will be trying to deal with as many farmers as we can with the limited amount of staff that we have; but there is no doubt — I want to say there is no doubt — that there are delays and in fact one could say that, in terms of long-term credit, the only game in town, and we are deluged by applicants from producers, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FINDLAY: In preparing budgets, are MACC staff directed to use a figure of \$3.20 for wheat in preparing these budgets for loan applications?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I will take that question as notice, specifically.

I would want to tell the honourable member that in terms of the loan guarantees, which are aside from the restructuring loans that we do, we are trying to provide as much leeway as we can to at least give the benefit of the doubt that producers can in fact be able to meet their current commitments in terms of the loan guarantees. We've turned down very few in terms of the guarantee program and we are assessing our further needs as to whether we should be going further in that area, and that's an ongoing measure. The specific question, in terms of the calculations that the member raises, I will take as notice and try to provide him with that information.

MR. G. FINDLAY: My final question then is, with the state of the farm economy, is the level of collateral that a young farmer needs in order to obtain a loan from MACC, has that level of collateral increased in recent weeks?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I don't believe so. I have not given any directive as far as the level of collateral. The regulations, basically, are interpreted that MACC can loan up to 80 percent of the allowable limit. In most instances, in terms of the assessment being

made by MACC, and I'm sure most lenders, is that whether or not that farming operation can in fact can cash flow the loan based on the income there. Cash flow is being used primarily as the basis and criteria for lending by, not only MACC, but by all lending institutions.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I have a young farmer constituent who made an application to MACC and was backed by his father, in terms of buying 160 acres. The MACC field representative recommended to head office that the loan be approved and head office turned it down, indicating that the price of wheat had gone down. As a result of that, a whole raft of applications have been turned down.

I'm wondering if the Minister can indicate where do the MACC get the direction from to refuse these kind of loans.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I think my honourable friends — and I don't intend to be in the House discussing specific applications, but if the member wants to give me the information I'll certainly look into it — I want to tell my honourable friend, where does any lending institution get its direction, in terms of what it uses for cash flow? Precisely by his colleague, the Minister of State responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. He made an announcement across this country indicating that wheat prices will be lowered by anywhere from 19 percent to 24 percent, precisely the kind of calculations and the kind of pressure now being placed on the farming community right across Western Canada by his own colleagues in Ottawa.

Family Life curriculum - status of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Honourable Minister of Education. On June of 1984, the Family Life component, sex education component, of the Health curriculum was withdrawn because of the controversial nature of many of its provisions. We were told that those revisions would be ready for distribution in September of 1984. Again, because of the controversial nature, we are still waiting for those revisions.

Can the Minister inform the House when that revised curriculum will be available?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Madam Speaker, it certainly would be my hope to have an opportunity on my own to review the curriculum.

It has certainly undergone a number of revision and, I must say, rather thorough revisions, and once I have

an opportunity of satisfying myself that the concerns that were raised have been addressed, I will be making an announcement.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Will the Manitoba curriculum still be based on the Calgary Public School Board curriculum, despite the fact that the Calgary board has withdrawn that curriculum in favour of a more responsible one?

HON. J. STORIE: I can tell the honourable member that the new revised curriculum will not be based on the Calgary curriculum; I can say that categorically. There were a number of legitimate concerns raised about the appropriateness, particularly the level appropriateness, of some of the material. Those issue have been addressed, I understand, by the review committees and through input from various groups, and as I say, once I have satisfied myself that the concerns have been addressed, the policy of the government and any new curriculum in that area will be announced.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A final supplementary. Would the Minister guarantee to this House that members of this House will see the curriculum, as will parents, before it is put on the subject matter of classrooms?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, what I can offer the honourable member is the assurance that once the appropriate reviews of the curriculum have been made, the concerns have been addressed in an appropriate and forthright way, that every opportunity will be provided to the public, to interest groups, to come to grips with the material that we hope will address a very serious issue within the curriculum education, Manitoba curriculum, and that is the question of Family Life.

MACC - loans to farmers

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that there are numerous loans being turned down and refused by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, daily I am receiving calls from individuals who are unable to get operating credit, will the Minister of Agriculture call the Agricultural Committee so that we can review the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation policies and find out the numbers of farmers who are not able to get the operating credits so badly needed this spring?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

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

I want to assure the honourable member that there is no doubt that there will be loans turned down by MACC. As I have indicated to him, Madam Speaker, we have been deluged by applicants from right across this province and it appears to be the intent of the Opposition to say that MACC is the only lender in

Manitoba and they should be taking everyone who comes through the door. Madam Speaker, we are unable to handle all the credit; we have never professed that we would. We have tripled our budget in MACC to handle the amount of workload we have. But I want to tell my honourable friend that while our portfolio, in terms of number of loans, is going up the Federal Farm Credit Corporation is dropping from a loan portfolio of 500 loans a year down to 120 last year in the last three years. Is that leadership, Madam Speaker?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I have another question to the Minister. In view of the fact that the constituent of mine who made application to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation had ample security, had ample backing from his father, was refused, Madam Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture call the Agricultural Committee so that the evidence can be placed on the table and, further to that, Madam Speaker, so those people can tell the public that that individual left MACC and went to the Royal Bank and got the financing that he needed?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the honourable member's constituent was able to receive a loan from another lending institution. The honourable member is well aware, being a former Minister, that there is a process by which an applicant may appeal a decision of staff to the board of directors of the lending corporation and provide additional information, which may not have been there, and the application be then adjudicated. The honourable member is suggesting that the members of the House will now make the loans and handle all the loan applications of MACC. Madam Speaker, I find that suggestion highly extraordinary.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, rather than have every loan applicant go through . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Do you have a question?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, I have. Will he show leadership and allow the people of Manitoba to go before the Agricultural Committee and place their concerns there, rather than individually going before a bureaucratic board of NDP appointees?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I can assure you that with a portfolio, in all respects of MACC, of approximately 10,000 clients, there must be at least an additional 15,000, some of whom would have applied and been turned down. Obviously one . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I believe — (Interjection) — the honourable members don't appear to want a reply, Madam Speaker. I believe that the process that has been in place for a number of years has been a workable process and will in fact be in place and will be handled in that manner.

Churchill - grain shipping port

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Could the Minister outline to the House what measures he is taking to reassure the residents of Churchill that it will continue to be used as a major grain shipping terminal?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I want to thank the member for that question. I can assure this House that the Government of Manitoba has not wavered in its support to the Port of Churchill over the last four or five years. We have from time to time received contradicting statements from the Federal Government I have to say, but that has certainly not been the case with the province. We have been in communication with the members of the Chamber of Commerce and with other groups, the Port of Churchill Development Board, working with them closely on a number of areas; we are communicating with the Wheat Board. We are encouraged by the recent shipment of 75,000 tonnes of barley to the port facilities to ensure that they are now at full capacity and ready for the shipping season. We have worked with the insurance companies, particularly, Lloyds of London and we expect some rather significant developments in terms of the insurance rates at Churchill in the near future that will greatly assist in terms of the future of Churchill as a shipping port. We are also discussing with the CN and other federal agencies to ensure that various programs under the subagreements are being implemented, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I hope I don't have to remind every Minister to keep their answer brief.

Flooding - compensation for damages

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Premier. In view of the controversial statements made by the Minister of Natural Resources regarding possible assistance, or non-assistance, to farmers in municipalities yesterday in the press, can the First Minister indicate what kind of assistance can the farmers and residents in municipalities in the flood stricken areas of Ste. Rose and Portage and Southeast Manitoba expect from this government?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the Minister will deal with that question in quite a comprehensive manner.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the question has been raised because I was somewhat disturbed by the article that appeared. I felt that it did not adequately reflect the comments that were made. It is true, in responding, that I indicated that there were limitations on the financial resources of the province, but the question that was put to me was what can the Department of Natural Resources do to aid the farmers with their immediate problem? I said that there was, in fact, very little that could be done while the water was on the land, and it would be a question of waiting for waters to recede. When they had the opportunity to return to the land, I indicated that in some areas that were prone to flooding and erosion, that some consideration should be given to alternate cultural practices, meaning thereby that in some instances they should consider planting forages, rather than cereal crops. I think it was not intended to convey - and I'm glad the opportunity has been provided to me to clarify that - that for all the problems that are being faced in the area that forage crops are the solution.

Then further to that, I went on to indicate that, after the short-term questions had been addressed, to look at the long term, there would be consideration, as there is already, of establishment of a conservation district in the Overhill Drain. And let me remind the member opposite that my comments, as reported in the paper, were addressed specifically to the situation in Portage la Prairie that I had viewed and to some of the erosion problems in the McCreary and Ste. Rose district; and I went on further to say that there is discussion taking place and consideration will be given to financial support.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

After that long presentation by the Minister of Natural Resources, can he indicate right now to the House and to the people that are experiencing flood damage, what kind of assistance will be available to them and to the municipalities?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, I outlined clearly the other day when the question was asked that the Disaster Assistance Board was on top of the situation and was aware of all of the concerns and was working with the municipalities to ensure that the reports would be coming in, so that we could deal with the request for compensation. What we have today is the Cabinet has approved an inspection program, to begin the inspection immediately, rather than waiting till all the reports are in, as is usually the case, to begin an inspection program immediately, both for private damages and the public sector damages for the municipality. Once the inspection and the applications have been filled out, of course, these will then be sent on to Cabinet for the actual payment of compensation.

So this is being worked out, Madam Speaker. I can assure the residents that we are concerned about the occurrences in their area, a number of areas in the province, and the Disaster Assistance Board is working very closely in those areas to ensure that compensation will be received for those who have suffered damages.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister responsible for EMO. In view of the statement that he made, can he indicate how — when the process has just been set up — how come areas of Dauphin, Ochre River, Swan River, Ste. Rose, Arborg and Selkirk and Selkirk East have all been told that there will be assistance forthcoming, and other areas that have not got NDP representatives have been indicated that there might not be?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's not the case, Madam Speaker. All of the areas that were affected, including Portage la Prairie, the R.M. of McDonald, the R.M. of Grey, there are a number, the R.M. of De Salaberry, there are a number that have been included on the list that will be considered, will be inspected by the Disaster Assistance Board, both for the municipal damages and the private sector damages. That is contained in the information that will be released to the public today.

So, certainly, there has not been any official statement that there would be aid forthcoming. We have indicated, through the news media, that we would be taking this matter to Cabinet for consideration of an immediate inspection program so that the amount of damages could be determined.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, I hate to take advantage of having one more supplementary, but I would just like to ask the Minister, for the benefit of all the people that are being affected, why would the Minister not make a public statement to that effect so the people know what it's all about, instead of sitting back there wondering after the statements made by the Minister of Natural Resources?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, that's exactly what I'm doing is making a public statement, I would say. We have issued a news release containing this information. It has been given to the news media and the decision was made only two hours ago, so certainly, Madam Speaker, the information is available as quickly as possible to everyone.

Anstett, Andy - conditions of contract

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Last Friday I asked the Minister of Industry to provide me with a copy of the contract with one Andrué Anstett and he sent that over to me this afternoon. I would ask him, Madam Speaker, to explain to the House and members of the public why the amount of \$55,000 is paid in this manner: \$15,000 upon signing; \$20,000 upon presentation of interim reports; and \$20,000 upon presentation of mutually acceptable final reports? I've heard, Madam Speaker, of signing bonuses for professional hockey, baseball, and football players, but never for a defeated politician.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In the past few weeks, I have examined a number of these kinds of contracts. Going back a number of years, and looking at this one, because that thought crossed my mind after this had been negotiated by our staff, and I find that the Member for Sturgeon Creek and others have signed similar kinds of consulting contracts with people who have important work to do for the province, and there tends to be payment in a number — usually two or three times during the course of the contract depending on the length of that consulting contract. So it's not an unusual term with respect to consulting contracts.

MR. G. MERCIER: A supplementary, Madam Speaker. Hansard of Friday indicates that I asked the Minister whether Mr. Anstett would be paid expenses, provided with a car, an office, and secretarial space, and the Minister indicated that the contract does not include vehicle expenses or secretary or that sort of thing. However, the contract in Sections 4 and 5, provides for payment for expenses associated with this contract, reimbursement is provided for in the general Manual of Administration and office space and clerical support as may be agreed upon between the parties.

Could the Minister not acknowledge now that Mr. Anstett will be paid car and other expenses in accordance with the Manual of Administration, and provided with office space and clerical support?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, I can assure the members that Mr. Anstett will not be provided with a car, nor will he be provided with transportation costs, unless he is going from the City of Winnipeg to different parts of the province in the course of his activities as a consultant, because part of the consulting role, Madam Speaker, was a request . . .

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

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I think it's conventional that we normally make inquiries about Hansard at this time and I'm wondering if I can - this isn't a criticism, it's simply a clarification. In reading the Votes and Proceedings, which are now printed in both languages in the House, for Thursday, I note that in presenting the Throne Speech, the sections that were read by the Lieutenant-Governor in French appear in French in the English section and they appear in French again in the French version of Votes and Proceedings. I'm just wondering, is there an explanation as to this, or will it be that should anyone speak in the House in French that there will never be an English version appear in Hansard? Is that part of the rules or how will it be?

MADAM SPEAKER: I'll check into that and return with an answer at a subsequent sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ellice, and the amendment

thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Finance who has 25 minutes remaining.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm pleased to continue my involvement in the Speech from the Throne and to indicate that I am proud of the speech that was delivered by Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. I believe that it is a very significant document, a very significant blueprint for the future of our province. I think it indicates the mandate and is indicative of the support that this government, our political party, received from the people of the province during the last political election campaign.

As I indicated in my remarks last night, I would just like to reinforce the fact that we did receive a significant mandate from the people of the province. As was indicated by previous speakers, four out of the last five provincial elections, people have chosen the New Democratic Party.

I note that the Member for Lakeside is now here and he referenced the fact last night in debate that he was one of the Class of 1966; and when members opposite talk about the fact that this government doesn't have a mandate, that this government has only the support of 41 percent of the population, he will recall the time when he was part of a government that had 39 percent of the popular vote of the people of this province but nobody at that time questioned their mandate or his mandate to govern.

So I think that this whole approach of members opposite to suggest somehow that we are not the government of the people of this province is false.

I'd also like to spend a couple of moments talking about the economic direction that this speech provides for the people of the province because I think that is still the critical issue facing the people of our province. I believe the Throne Speech does indicate further economic direction, further economic growth for our province, further economic and job opportunities for the young people of our province.

If one looks at not only what's in the Throne Speech but what others are saying about the economic future of our province under an NDP administration, you will see that the future does indeed look very bright.

I would just like to quote, Madam Speaker, the recent report from the Royal Bank of Canada, one that is not the usual source of glowing reports of an NDP social democratic government, but let me quote to you that the Royal Bank predicts Manitoba's economy will grow faster than any other Canadian province in 1986 and 1987. They say that the real GDP growth is expected to be 3.8 percent in 1986 and 4 percent in 1987, which is well above the growth rate that's forecast for the rest of Canada.

Also, the Royal Bank has looked at the longer term economic forecasts and predicts that Manitoba is going to lead the nation in terms of real growth during the decade all the way through to 1994.

I can also talk about the Bank of Montreal and their projections for our province. It's even more significant, I think, and this was reported in the Winnipeg Free

Press at the end of January of this year, where the Royal Bank said — and I quote, this is a specific quote — that the Pawley's government's policies have played a significant role in the province's relatively good fortune over 1984-1985.

So there are many that have indicated that our province is projecting good economic growth over the next number of years and I think this Throne Speech indicates further directions, further opportunities that we're going to provide for the young people in our province, Madam Speaker.

There's one other point that I just want to touch on briefly in regard to debate that has taken place to date, in the Throne Speech, before I resume my seat and let others have the opportunity of entering into the debate, and that is this big lie that the Progressive Conservative Opposition is attempting to perpetrate with respect to the last election, again saying that somehow we stole the election and that we won the election on false pretences. They've indicated a number of areas that fall into this general line of thinking.

One is the tabling of the third quarter financial statement, suggesting somehow because these statements were tabled subsequent to the election that if they were tabled before the election that somehow the results of the election would have been somewhat different.

Yet they take these contradictory positions with respect to the deficit. We heard very clearly from the Member for Lakeside last night where he took a position opposite to his leader with respect to deficits and government spending. If you look at what was said during the election campaign by his party, by his leader, you would see a deficit in this province that would increase by \$300 million to \$400 million because of the kind of things they talked about in the election; and his leader also said that the deficit was not of major concern to them and they would see a reduction over one to two terms of the government.

Yet we see again a contradiction with the Member for Lakeside suggesting that his leader was wrong in the election campaign and that now the deficit was a major issue and could have been a major issue in the election campaign that would have changed the voters' intentions when they voted. I think that somehow defies any kind of reasonable logic.

The other issue that they've raised in this context in that same line of thinking is with respect to the sale of Flyer Industries. That one I even find a bit more difficult to understand.

On one hand they criticize the agreement that was entered into with respect to Flyer and the divestiture to den Oudsten of Holland, saying the agreement is not good for the Province of Manitoba; and yet one of the reasons it took so long to consummate that agreement was because the province continued negotiations, attempting to get the best deal possible and it would have been much easier — in fact, some would even argue it would have been even more politically expedient for us to conclude that agreement prior to the election at a time when we would have had to agree to an agreement that would be not as good as the one the government entered into and could have taken the credit, saying that we've brought an end to this prior to an election campaign.

If we would have done that, I'm sure as I am standing here facing you, Madam Speaker, those same members

opposite would have said that they're rushing to get this deal signed before the election so that they can say Flyer is sold prior to the election. Those same members would have switched their tune, did a flip-flop, as Conservatives are apt to do, and would have said the government is selling it just so that it could be sold prior to an election campaign. What took place, Madam Speaker, was a conclusion of a sale under the best arrangements possible, given the situation that existed with that company.

I just want to add one further word with respect to what was said by the Leader of the Opposition. Before I say what I'm going to say, I just want to point out that our government recognizes that Flyer Industries has been a very difficult situation, that successive governments, including a couple of terms of our government, have had to wrestle with the long-term future with Flyer Industries; and there has, Madam Speaker, been mistakes made with respect to Flyer Industries.

We heard the Leader of the Opposition suggest to this House and suggest to the people of the province that for the four years they ran Flyer Industries they ran it as a good company, that it had a good product, that they ran it efficiently and business-like and all of that.

Let me tell you a little bit about that business-like approach of that government. During the years that they were in government, they set aside \$500,000 for warranty claims for Flyer buses. Do you know what we had to do, Madam Speaker? Set aside \$7 million to \$8 million for warranty claims for buses that were built during their time in government, when they set aside their appointees, their management of Flyer Industries set aside \$500,000 for warranty claims.

Some of the buses that are being repaired now, with the extraordinary warranty claims we've put in place, was during their term in government; but the Leader of the Opposition gets up and says, "Well we managed it good for four years." Five hundred thousand dollars for warranty claims. You ask anyone in manufacturing if they set aside those kinds of funds for warranty claims. It was a bit of quick shift bookkeeping to make the balance statement appear that the company was making a profit, but we've had to pay the price for that because that product was inferior; there were problems with it and we had to put extraordinary warranty claims in, all of the last four years, to make up for those Tory mistakes.

There were mistakes, as I said, Madam Speaker, made during our term in government, with respect to Flyer Industries, ones that we have to face, but for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that for those four years everything ran good and they ran it efficiently and they were such good businessmen does damage to the truth, Madam Speaker.

Let me just add one other thing with respect to Flyer Industries. They had the opportunity when they were in government to divest of Flyer Industries. They did not, even though they spent over \$1 million on consultants specifically trying to find a buyer for Flyer and other Crowns. They spent over \$1 million of the taxpayers' money trying to find a buyer, and they didn't. Yet now they criticize us when we brought about an end to the very serious situation that has existed with respect to Flyer Industry for over 12 years, at the same

time providing some future for that important industry in the Province of Manitoba.

I know, Madam Speaker, that we'll have other opportunities to discuss Flyer Industries once we get into the Economic Committee and have the report of the development corporation with respect to Flyer Industries, and I look forward to a good discussion and full disclosure of the facts regarding Flyer Industries and the present situation and its long-term future.

With that, I would like to just conclude my remarks by saying that I look forward to the further debate on the Throne Speech. I look forward to further debate and action by this government during this legislative Session, action that we will be commencing in continuing to implement programs that are of concern and meeting the real needs of Manitobans, particularly in the area of economic development and social programs.

So I conclude by saying I look forward to continued debate here and to continuing to have the opportunity to represent the constituents of the Seven Oaks constituency, and to implement the policies of the New Democratic Party in government.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Firstly, Madam Speaker, I would wish you well in your position that you have undertaken at this Session of the Legislature. I know other members have reminded you of your important responsibilities and to treat the Assembly and the members in a fair and equitable and impartial manner.

I know how difficult it must have been for you to accept the position, Madam Speaker, particularly in view of the manner in which the previous Speaker was treated by this Premier and this government. I'm sure you're well aware, if you watched during the last Session of the House, the pressure that was on the former Speaker as he in fact challenged the Premier and his government in a very difficult matter that was before the House, and how the Premier and members of this government berated him in the position he took, and then went so far, Madam Speaker, as to send someone out from the Premier's Office to challenge the former Speaker for the nomination in his constituency because they weren't happy with the way he had conducted himself.

So all of those things, Madam Speaker, I'm sure, were on your mind as you considered accepting these important responsibilities. We hope that you will, in the same manner as the previous Speaker, Madam Speaker, carry out your responsibilities with the same integrity and honesty that he did.

Madam Speaker, I would certainly extend my own personal welcome and congratulations to all members of the House, particularly those on this side of the House and also to the members on the government side of the House.

One particular member, Madam Speaker, I would welcome to the House, the new Minister of Urban Affairs. He spoke with great gusto and enthusiasm in the Throne Speech the other day. Perhaps it's time, Madam Speaker, that he was reminded of some of the

positions he took in his former role as President of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, where he, in his study of that association, found that senior management ranks had been steadily swelling during the four years the Pawley Government had been in power.

He said in September, 1985 — that's not so long ago either, Madam Speaker — that there is just a wholesale creation of Assistant Deputy Minister positions consistently. He went on, Madam Speaker — he has made numerous comments and perhaps fortunately for him, I haven't brought them all with me today. But back in March of 1985 — and that's not so long ago either — he acknowledged that the increase of over 10 percent that the Premier's staff had received was an extremely bad example in times of restraint, an increase in the Executive Council office when they are supposed to be providing the leadership is totally inappropriate. That was the adding of some \$260,000 in last year's Budget to the Premier's Office for political aides and communicators, etc., Madam Speaker.

I wanted to remind the Minister of Urban Affairs of a few of these comments. He has made many more, many that I'm sure the former Minister of Finance will recall, in which he was extremely critical of his behaviour and his position and the government's position, Madam Speaker. I hope this will be a message that he will carry through with the government. I fully expect, with these kinds of statements on the record, Madam Speaker, that we will see a reduction in Assistant Deputy Ministers and senior political staff and a reduction in the Premier's Office, because I'm sure he is a man of conviction. He certainly spoke with great conviction the other day, Madam Speaker, and no doubt he will bring this influence and this position to bear in Cabinet deliberations. When we see the Budget next week, we will see these kinds of cuts in political staff that this government has brought in over the past four years, Madam Speaker.

Although, Madam Speaker, we find just today that it is highly unlikely. The Minister of Industry and Technology, in response to my questions last Friday, provided me with a copy of the contract for the former Member for Springfield. We find out that the \$55,000 salary is paid by way of a \$15,000 signing bonus, Madam Speaker. Incredible, absolutely incredible! Not a day's work, not a day's work, Madam Speaker, and he, in contradiction to the Minister's statement, will receive expenses and transportation expenses, contrary to the answer I was given on Friday, transportation expenses and other expenses. That will include meals, etc., as provided in the general manual of administration and, also contrary to the information I received the other day, will be provided with office space and clerical support as may be agreed upon between the parties.

So, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs is obviously going to have a great deal of difficulty in maintaining the positions and the principles which he enunciated as the President of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association in Cabinet deliberations. Being a man of such convictions and principles, he will, no doubt, resign if those positions he has taken are not upheld in the deliberations of Cabinet, Madam Speaker.

Again we find out today, Madam Speaker, incredibly the Throne Speech that we were presented with, Page

3, after talking about Limestone: ". . . that same commitment to the planned and orderly development of our natural resources to the benefit of all Manitobans that led to the success of Limestone and the Northern States Power sale has resulted in three more export agreements with six utilities operating in the United States."

That's a specific clear statement in the Throne Speech, and we find out today, Madam Speaker, that there is only one agreement, not three agreements. There is only one agreement. It is simply and absolutely astounding. Madam Speaker, can anyone believe anything that anyone in this government says?

Madam Speaker, I want to move on to another area that related to a matter that indicates once more the fact that this government deserves no credibility whatsoever, Madam Speaker.

Last November, last fall, in a series of statements and letters to the Minister of Community Services regarding the child protection policies of this government, Madam Speaker, I wrote a letter to the Minister on November 22, 1985 setting out 12 specific and detailed questions in regard to child protection policies because of very serious concerns in that area. The Minister did not respond at that time, and has not responded to date to my letter of November 22, 1985, Madam Speaker.

Then, in early January, I received an invitation from the inner core agency, a group of professional child care workers in the city — social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, interested in child abuse matters, child protection policies — to speak at a public debate, because they were extremely concerned with the inadequacies of the program of this government. I accepted that invitation, Madam Speaker, but the Minister didn't. She refused to attend, and she was not busy on that evening, Madam Speaker, something akin to the Minister of Health sending a Deputy Minister and saying he couldn't get a pair. She wasn't busy on that occasion, Madam Speaker.

They tried to set up another meeting for late February. I accepted the invitation to attend, Madam Speaker. She refused once more to discuss an extremely important issue, and during an election campaign. What better opportunity, Madam Speaker, than to have an occasion to defend the policies of this government on such an important question during the course of an election campaign? For the second time, Madam Speaker, she refused to debate that important public issue.

Now, Madam Speaker, she has not responded to my letter of November 22, 1985. She refused to debate on two occasions during the election. And now what is happening in this whole field, Madam Speaker? I have to say it is a very difficult field to try to get information from, because this Minister and her staff, and particularly one of her Assistant Deputy Ministers, has put the fear of God into social workers not to make any public statements about the inadequacies of the policies and the resources provided for this government in that field, Madam Speaker.

Now, Madam Speaker, what is happening? From the information I have obtained, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are still children, infants being sent and returned into very high-risk situations. If one reads the newspaper during the past two weeks, one will see that in two

particular cases — and I'm not in any way commenting on the guilt or innocence — children have been killed and murder charges have been laid. I can advise the Minister through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is presently a third baby in the hospital which I learned of today, who is brain dead, who is going to die, who is another victim of child abuse.

All of this is happening, Mr. Deputy Speaker, through inadequate resources, for one thing, inadequate resources in that area; for a second thing, the policy which this Minister and her Assistant Deputy Minister and her government have of trying to keep the family together at all costs. They are returning children to dangerous situations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we have seen the result in three particular cases that I have referred to, two that have been reported and one not yet reported; also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of their policy of making the social workers what they call generic social workers, dealing with all of the problems and doing away with the specific child abuse units.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, members on that side of the House stand up and say that they have a great socialist vision for our society, for Manitobans. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have the most helpless, indefensible situation occurring, infants and babies returned to high-risk situations as a result of the policy of this government and as a result of the lack of resources that this government has provided in that field. As a result, we have in the last few weeks two deaths and one baby lying in hospital brain dead, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I'm not saying and I'm not going to suggest for a moment that some of these situations will completely disappear. You simply can't prevent every one. I don't expect anyone to be perfect. But what I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that it is clear that there is a lack of resources in that field, and that the policies of this government are inadequate, and that the social workers are being muzzled by her and her Assistant Deputy Minister and her staff not to speak out. She won't even go and discuss it in a public forum before or during an election campaign, and she won't even respond to a letter of November 22, 1985.

Now to all those new members on the other side who have this great socialist vision for Manitobans, the Member for Thompson or the Member for Elmwood, he's more concerned about government going into the life insurance industry. What you had better start doing is dealing with the real needs of people, the real needs of these children who are being abused in our community and for which you are providing no resources. That's what needs the attention of this government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not the government going into the life insurance industry or Andy Anstett needing a \$55,000 contract with a \$15,000 signing bonus or with all due respect, in an unprecedented way, the Speaker of this House requiring an executive assistant which is completely unprecedented.

This type of behaviour of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, comes as no surprise to members of this side of the House who have watched this government, particularly since September, 1983 when they adopted that infamous Cabinet minute. I wonder, is it still applicable to the existing Cabinet. Avoid all controversial decisions; embark upon a massive advertising program; spend thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money to try to sell the government, like cornflakes or something else,

somebody doing a good job when actually nothing was happening. Now the chickens are coming home to roost, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Never in such a few weeks has the credibility of a government, if they had any, been destroyed so much. The election was March 18th. It's not even two months and in those few short weeks . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The members will have their chance to speak.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, they chose to embark upon an election campaign at an unprecedented time of the year, in March — the last one in March was in 1907 — a particularly inconvenient time for the public. But most importantly, they did it because they didn't have to come to this House to present a Throne Speech, present the Estimates and present a Budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no public information or as little information to the public as possible on what is going on.

We talked about The Freedom of Information Act, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But most important, and we can recall the Minister of Education, the now Minister of Business Development and Tourism, spending all her time last fall avoiding making public statements on any issue. She spent all her time avoiding saying anything about important public issues that were occurring.

But, most importantly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the most significant matters is this matter of the deliberate withholding of the Third Quarterly Financial Report. When we look back, Mr. Deputy Speaker — and I would expect you particularly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I reread your speech in the Throne Speech of 1982 when you talked about public morality, public decency and responsibility, and you repeated much of it the other day — I would like you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to particularly examine this record.

What were the dates that the Third Quarterly Financial Report were issued on in previous years? In 1978-79, it was February 9; in 1980, it was February 22; in 1980-81, it was February 20; in 1981-82, it was February 26; in 1982-83, it was February 25; in 1983-84, it was March 2; in 1985, it was March 22, but he deliberately withheld it then in order to present it at the same time as his Budget; this year, April 2.

When you examine those dates, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you particularly, Sir, as a responsible, moral, honest politician would clearly come to the conclusion that the figures to be used in the Third Quarterly Financial Report were available well before the end of February of this year. Anyone can see that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in looking at those figures. This government deliberately withheld that information, about the increase in the size of the deficit from the public, during the election campaign.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like you to respond one day and give the Assembly your view on how responsible and ethical and honest that was. It was clearly a case of deliberately holding that information from the public, just like they've done with so many things. But that was essential; that is absolutely irresponsible.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, obviously they hope that, for whatever length of term their government is, the public will have forgotten once again. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is totally irresponsible, unethical, dishonest, deliberate deceit and misleading of the public of Manitoba, and they can't deny it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, did they tell the people of Manitoba that they were going to have to pay — well before I leave that subject of the Third Quarterly Financial Report, I want to say to the former Minister, no doubt, he will agree with this. He says, no, we never did that. That's the position they've taken. The figures weren't available, etc. No doubt, he will agree with me and our leader and members on this side of the House when we present a Private Member's bill, which is No. 6 on the Order Paper, which will simply confirm the existing practice into legislation of providing for the Quarterly Reports and providing that they will, as they did up until the Second Quarterly Report, estimate the deficit, will simply legitimize that existing practice and procedure; only it will add one important item, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so that no government in the future — I know we wouldn't — but particularly no socialist government in the future, which is more interested in retaining power than in being honest with the public, will ever again be allowed to do that, because it would require that the Quarterly Financial Reports be released to the public within 60 days of the date of the end of the quarter. That's the position, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which our caucus has come to and we will be presenting in terms of a Private Member's bill.

Now how could they disagree with that? I'm sure they won't, would they, Mr. Deputy Speaker? But it will come up shortly and we look forward to the support of the former Minister of Finance and others on that particular issue.

There's another issue, there's another example of their misleading information, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Did they tell the public of Manitoba, or present the sale of Flyer to the public before or during the election? The Minister, who is now the Minister of Finance, said they were going to do it by the end of 1985. He gave committee and members of this Legislature solemn assurances that would be done before the end of 1985. Even though he didn't do it, did he tell them that the taxpayers were going to have to pay to get rid of it? Did he tell them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they opposed the sale of Flyer when we were in government, when it still had a significant value, when it was making a profit; that, through their opposition and their obstructionist tactics of that time this cost the taxpayers millions of dollars of money because it could have been sold for some value at that time instead of now having to pay someone to take it over after four years of their incompetence in managing the affairs of Flyer? No, they didn't, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Did they tell the public during the election campaign that they were going to eliminate 200 Civil Service positions? No, they had a great socialist vision of society, no equality, quality of life, unless of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you were a single parent or a low-income family or a rural family in financial crisis and you depended upon the home economics section to provide you with some assistance. Now isn't that a great priority? Hire an executive assistant for the Speaker in an unprecedented manner; hire a defeated politician

and give him a \$15,000 signing bonus; but get rid of six home economics positions, don't provide any resources in the child protection area. What priorities does this government have, Mr. Deputy Speaker? They never told the people of Manitoba anything about that prior to the election, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Did they tell the senior citizens of this province during the election campaign that they were going to increase their Pharmacare deductible by some 50 percent? They talked about this great concern about the increase in the supplement, and then they go, within a matter of days, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and announce the increase in the Pharmacare deductible for the senior citizens of this province.

Did they say that they were going to have the greatest, largest Cabinet that has ever been assembled in the Province of Manitoba just to keep everybody loyal, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Because we know that's the real reason for having, in an unprecedented way, the Legislative Counsel Office on the main floor that has been there for years and years to provide a service to members of this Assembly, and particularly members of the Opposition, moved out to provide room for yet another suite of ministerial or deputy ministerial offices. Twenty-one Ministers, absolutely incredible, Madam Speaker, at a time when resources are supposed to be in greatest need.

There is great need for social programs in the health field, services are deteriorating every day. We read about psychiatrists leaving the province because of inadequate programs; cancer specialists refusing to come to Manitoba because of a lack of adequate programs, a lack of CAT scans, North Dakota setting up programs to attract Manitobans. It is everywhere in the health field, people lined up outside of the emergency sections of hospitals on stretchers, Mr. Deputy Speakers. Yet we are going to have at the same time 21 Cabinet Ministers, 21 Deputy Ministers, 21 Cabinet Ministers' offices, and they're all going to have executive assistants and special assistants and communicators, and hire their defeated candidates as consultants, and hire an executive assistant for the Speaker. At the same time, there are all of these other needs in society. The Minister for Urban Affairs — I guess that's what he was talking about when he was President of the MGEA — about the lack of leadership in Cabinet.

Now surely we're going to again see him take some leadership in the Cabinet deliberations and, no doubt, when the Minister of Finance presents his Budget, we'll see those cuts, won't we, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Not likely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we've seen their record and they're not going to change. They're at the public trough and they're going to stay there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that's what is most important to them.

We've seen a government at the same time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a way of trying to assess the priorities of this government, we're going to invest \$5 million of the taxpayers' money in a potash mine. That's quite something — \$5 million or is it more than that? — (Interjection) — \$5 million? Just think of what that could do in health care. Think of what \$5 million could do in the way of child protection resources to avoid some of these terrible situations that are occurring, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Why should the taxpayers be risking their money in that venture? The market is down. It's just incredible

when there's a need, resources are rare, there's such a demand on them and we're investing in a potash mine. Leave that to the people who want to take those kinds of risks, leave that to the private sector. Do what you can to encourage them through legislation, or whatever, but leave that to the private sector, don't waste the taxpayers' money in that area. That's surely not a priority, but they're ignoring the true priorities of the people of Manitoba.

Then, Madam Speaker, we had, very interestingly, too, another issue - and there are so many of them. It's going to be interesting to have the Minister responsible for the telephone system before the committee with the officials of the Manitoba Telephone System, you know. It was an election year, for them power is everything, don't ever be honest with the people — that's not the way you get elected, that's not the way the socialists get elected. What you do is apply for a 3 percent increase in telephone rates, when actually what is required is an 11 percent increase, but you wouldn't want to do that in an election year. And then the embarrassing result is that the Public Utility Board orders an independent review of the telephone rate structure. That's amazing, Madam Speaker. Surely to goodness we have, in the telephone system, and I'm sure we do have in the Telephone System, confident, qualified administrators, but their bosses, this great NDP socialist government, tells them in an election year: don't apply for what is required, you limit it to 3 percent because this is an election year. That's dishonest, that's absolutely dishonest and they got away with it, the result came down after the election. Another instance, and obviously there are dozens of instances of this government supplying misinformation, no information, false information, to the public of Manitoba, and they did it, regrettably, for the people of Manitoba. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they got away with it. They obviously didn't listen to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1982 when you delivered that speech and you're too late in delivering this one during this Throne Speech. It should have been delivered to them a couple of years ago, about September 1983, when the Cabinet made all of those decisions to simply develop a public relations campaign in order to retain power.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are some of the issues that demonstrate that we will have to do everything we can in our power as an Opposition to try to maintain some form of honest and responsible and confident government. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it will be a difficult job to do because they have not performed in that way, but we will continue to bring out these messages, these errors, lack of information, the activities, the manner in which this government has handled the public affairs of Manitoba, and try to point out to them, once again, that it is their responsibility to act in the interests of Manitobans, not just in the interests of retaining socialists in power, and keeping information from the public, but in areas, for example, of child protection, to provide proper resources, establish the proper priorities. Fire Anstett, fire the executive assistant for the Speaker and put that money where it's supposed to be, in providing appropriate resources in that particular field and other fields, in the health field.

I would urge this government to examine its conscience, go over every one of these individual items which are examples of pure deceit and misleading

information or no information to the people of Manitoba. It is reprehensible conduct, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I find it very difficult to see how they can live with themselves after having conducted these kinds of activities, particularly for the last two-and-one-half years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the chickens again will come home to roost on May 22nd, when the Minister of Finance presents his Budget. This government has run up tremendous deficits over a period of four years. They have caught themselves in an extremely difficult position. They did not talk during the election, nor through the Throne Speech, about the financial crisis that is facing Manitobans. It's an extremely serious one, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The public debt increased nearly threefold in just four years; the credit rating reduced twice. We keep hearing some rumours, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we want to know the answers. In fact, is the deficit for 1985-86 just going to \$550 million, or is it going to be \$40 million or \$50 million higher? Have we indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, received all of the information, even at a late date? That will be an interesting point to receive.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, could you indicate how much time I have left?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. G. MERCIER: I have to make one comment in one final area, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the Member for Lakeside referred to it yesterday and I, once again, did the statistics, because I've done it the last four or five years and I'd like to do it once more, with respect to taxation in the City of Winnipeg on real property. When one examines the figures, one finds that in the four years — and this is a message I hope somebody will relay to the Minister of Urban Affairs — the 1977 to 1981 taxes in this city on an average home in the Member for Ellice's district in the Winnipeg School Division were increased a total of \$78.33. That's in four years; that is the total increase. In five years, under the New Democratic Party, that home and its taxes have been increased by some \$470.26.

I noticed last night on television a group of people appearing before the Winnipeg School Division. They were finally becoming extremely concerned about the increase in taxation. Hopefully they will know, these figures will indicate who to blame. You blame this government, these great socialists, because that is the comparison. That is what happened. That is because we supplied a great deal of money in those areas to keep those taxes down. Now you have senior citizens, people on low income, families having a great deal of difficulty in even maintaining their home.

What did this government do with its tremendous relationship with the city? The Member for Ellice must be very disappointed. This government never met with the City Council official delegation for — what? — eight months. Then at the very last moment, the day the Council was setting the mill rate, that's when they told them how much the province was going to contribute to the City of Winnipeg budget for this year. In fact, I think the meeting had to be delayed one day because of the lack of information. That's an incredibly poor relationship with the City of Winnipeg.

We always felt that information had to be supplied to the city, and it was always done in either late

December or early January so that the city could plan its budget. That's the way we handled it, and it gave the local government an opportunity to plan its affairs properly.

This is the way they were treated and this is the urban-dominated party with great urban interest. This is the party that has done nothing with regard to assessment, and we'll be dealing with that particular subject by way of resolution and through the Estimates. That's an area where this government has taken no reform whatsoever, even though they were presented with a report from former Premier, the late Walter Weir, back in 1981 or 1982, and no action has been taken.

So the people in the City of Winnipeg, particularly now as they have been getting their tax bills this week, should know — and we'll make sure that they know — the increases in taxation that have occurred under the New Democratic Party as compared to a party that was concerned about homeowners and about taxes and about financing for education and for the city.

Madam Speaker, I thank the members for their attention and the opportunity to discuss the Throne Speech. I look forward to the day, Madam Speaker, when the chickens are really going to come home to roost and that will be May 22 when the budget is brought in.

Madam Speaker, thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'd like to begin by congratulating you for having taken on a very difficult job, one that I have to admit occasionally in the past I have not made easier for Speakers. I will do my best in the upcoming Session and I wish you well.

I would like to welcome all the new members to the Legislature. There are a number of people on both sides whom I have met before, and I think they will certainly provide some positive improvements to this House. I am looking forward to their contributions and I hope they don't become too jaded too quickly.

I noticed one of the things they are doing is recognizing that just because we have a limit of 40 minutes on a speech doesn't mean you have to speak 40 minutes. I'm not sure that I will be able to keep my speech down to a reasonable level, but that's something that I think is to be commended of new members. I don't think there is anything necessarily good about going on when you have nothing to say, as the member just finishing before me did.

Just shortly after an election, one does want to reminisce a little bit. I want to say that I had my best election campaign ever. We had the best group of workers we have ever been able to assemble: volunteers, senior citizens, working people, small business people, in a very enthusiastic team which worked well together, and I'm very appreciative of that. It is certainly the best campaign I have been involved in and I have been involved in a number. I've won some and I have lost some, and it is obviously more fun to win than to lose, but this was a very good campaign.

We had many young people working on our campaign. We had more than several dozen people under 20 years

of age who worked hard. I think they learned something and we learned from them. I got a chance to campaign across the province. I got to see some other ridings — (Interjection) — Minnedosa. I rode through Morris. It's a great desert down there. I kept going. But it was enjoyable.

In fact, I was on the campaign trail, you might say, from even before the election was called. The day before it was called, I was in Winkler. And I'll be coming back to that a little bit later because, you know, one of the things that new members should be especially careful of is to not get an attack of sanctimony from the Member for St. Norbert. He tends to just make it appear that he and his party has some kind of monopoly on truth, justice and light. I give credit to the Member for Lakeside. At least when he puts forward his positions, he puts them forward in a somewhat more humorous, light-hearted fashion, not saying that everyone else who disagrees with him has to be immoral because they disagree with him. But that's the way that particular member tends to come across, and I would hope that new members especially look at issues rather than at personalities.

But having said that, I do have to follow on some of the statements made by the Member for Lakeside last evening, dealing with issues such as budgets. I'm not going to talk about that too long because the Minister of Finance has already taken that on, pointing out that here is a party suggesting we should have a lower deficit at the same time that they suggested during the campaign we increase expenditures on health and education by \$120 million. At the same time, they suggested we eliminate the health and education levy for more than \$100 million, and so on and so on. Incidentally, that health and education levy, for the benefit of the Member for River Heights, was recently increased in Quebec to 3.2 percent which is more than double the amount here in Manitoba.

As we're discussing deficits, I can't let pass the fact that we do not live in a vacuum. We're not all on our own in this country and one government moving up in terms of deficit. Let's just look one step west where, in early 1982, we had an NDP Government and very little provincial debt. We had a surplus in terms of the Budget for that year, a surplus, and had been running surpluses on the current account for many years. You know, in 1985-86, the deficit in Saskatchewan was close to \$600 million. They started out that year predicting somewhere around a \$300 million deficit. They are up to \$600 million, 595. For this coming year, they are predicting, as an example, something like a doubling of liquor revenues without increases in taxes in that area. Those are the expectations down there which drop them down a bit for '86-'87, in terms of the deficit. You go through every province in this country and they have all experienced those kinds of increases.

In Saskatchewan, by a much larger measure than in Manitoba, proportionally, they've gone to a higher deficit now than we have, and when we started off we had just under a \$300 million deficit from the previous Tories — and incidentally — for those who preach such sanctimony, you will recall that in the 1970's it was Sterling Lyon stumping this province saying that Ed Schreyer was spending us into bankruptcy and we have to cut deficits and in his last year in office, Sterling Lyon had a larger deficit than the last year of the

Schreyer Government, even with all the manipulations to change the numbers for the 1977-78 fiscal year. On their own basis, on the basis of their own judgments as to whether things are good or bad, the Tories had a larger deficit in their last year in office than in the last year of the NDP Government which they replaced on the basis that they would be fiscally responsible. So much for the deficit, Madam Speaker, and I'm sure we will be coming back to that time after time and after the Budget Address.

We can look in other countries — the Reagan deficits, and so on. They are not unique to Manitoba nor are they unique to social democratic governments.

The Member for Lakeside referred to Tory accomplishments and he mentioned that he was from the class of 1966, so he was in the House when the Progressive Conservatives brought in Medicare. There are some people who may not be up on their Manitoba history who might say, well, my goodness, the Manitoba Provincial Progressive Conservatives really were wonderful people; they are the parents of Medicare. They will forget entirely about the vicious, vicious fascist red baiting that was going on in Manitoba when the CCF were bringing in Medicare, who had the guts to bring in Medicare in Saskatchewan just a few years before that. They were led kicking and screaming, the Manitoba Tories, kicking and screaming into Medicare.

I have here the 1969 Budget Address of the Honourable Gurney Evans and I'm quoting from it. He's complaining a bit about Federal/Provincial relations and that just demonstrates those things go on over the years.

I'm quoting direct, "A parallel situation is found in the field of shared responsibilities. In the past year alone, after little or no prior warning or consultation, the Federal Government has announced its withdrawal from a long list of such undertakings. The obligations relinquished included the National Health Grants Program at the very moment when a universal federal Medicare scheme was being imposed."

I go further, "I have noted that Medicare, on federal terms, is now a fact in Manitoba." And he goes on to say, "The Prime Minister's recent assertion that there will be no more Medicare offers little comfort in respect of the problems we must now carry."

And of course there was a Premier's conference. It was forced on Manitoba. They were dragged kicking and screaming, and Premier Walter Weir, in his opening statement at the Federal/Provincial Constitutional Conference in Ottawa in February of that year, "We have now forced on the taxpayer a major new shared cost program, Medicare, although the terms were strenuously objected to by a majority of provinces, including Manitoba." That's how they got Medicare into Manitoba; and to revise history in any way that would suggest they are the fathers or mothers of Medicare is simply, not in one way, fair.

So I say, be careful about history lessons. When we listen to speeches about drainage ditches and the wonderful things the Conservatives do with drainage, we've heard about the Portage flood. When was that? '78, '79? And nothing happened between '79 and '81, and it's true, nothing has happened since then, apparently; but something did happen in '79.

I have the 1979 Manitoba Flood Recovery and Protection booklet — thousands of dollars spent by the

PC Government on red, blue and white pictures. Here's a picture of a combine in the water - efforts to save grain become extremely difficult. They have pictures.

Here's a picture - flooded farm at sunset. This is the kind of response the Conservative Government of Sterling Lyon had to serious flooding problems - flooded farm at sunset.

Remember, the Member for Lakeside referred to nursing homes. Madam Speaker, in 1977, the Leader of the Conservative Party stumped the province saying that the lineups for nursing homes are too large. I recall that very vividly and I in fact agreed with him, but I was shocked at his solution.

His solution was to stop building them so there was no point in being in the lineup. He froze construction for a considerable period of time. That was his solution - to cut down the nursing homes.

MR. H. ENNS: We not only doubled, we tripled what you did.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, the Minister of Health has indicated that he will be discussing that and that response again is

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I missed one item Medicare. I found a quote here from the leader of your national party when he was still on the other side of the House and sometimes we do change our minds when we get across the fences.

Fortunately, in Manitoba, four out of five vote for the NDP, four times out of five in the last five elections. Four of them, the NDP has won and that's an indication that over time they know whom they can trust to look after the interests of Manitobans.

This is what Mr. Mulroney said when he was the Leader of the Opposition. On Medicare, Mr. Mulroney enlarged on statements he made in British Columbia when he visited the West Coast recently to help Tory candidate, Gerry St. Germaine in the August 29 Mission-Port Moody by-election:

"The Conservative Government," he said, "would cover a portion of the shortfall provincial governments are experiencing in meeting rising health care costs. When a program starts out at 50-50 and five years later it's 60-40, with the provinces paying the greater share, there's obviously been a change in the rules. It just doesn't make sense to vilify the doctors. They are the motor of a quality system and when Mrs. Begin attacks them she's pouring sugar into the gas and it's going to frig up the motor."

That's what your Prime Minister said about assistance to the Medicare system; that's what Mr. Mulroney said. Of course, we know that he is currently, with Bill C-96, not only not extending the Liberal program which he criticized as being too little, he is cutting it back further. That's what your Prime Minister is doing after having said precisely the opposite when he was Leader of the Opposition.

We're going back into history. The Tories said, "We will bring our young people home," and the day they left office in 1981, the first government to have been defeated in Manitoba after one term in office, the day

they left office there were fewer people left in Manitoba than the day they took office. They voted with their feet. They got out of Lyon Manitoba. There were fewer people left in Manitoba when you people left office than when you had come in.

Since then we have had strong population growth. Under the NDP, our children are coming home; our brothers and sisters are coming home. There were good reasons for us winning four out of five, very good reasons. We'll be going over them, I'm sure, over the next 10 years fairly frequently.

I want to go back to Winkler. The Leader of the Opposition suggested the other day that I had used a slow news day to raise the SRTC business. I've got the quote here in case you want it, but that's what he said. What were we doing? The Minister of Agriculture and I had a news conference. When was that? It was in response to the federal Budget, and it was done after a Federal-Provincial Conference on Finance. I had come back home, and we had an opportunity to look at the effects, the impact of that Budget on Manitoba. I would hope especially that rural members, both new and old, would listen very carefully to the response we had, because there were some very serious implications in that Budget.

We'd had a chance to examine it. We pointed out — and there were a number of things not carried by the press, and that's something that I don't criticize them for. They sometimes pick out items that they get more excited about. We pointed out that the 6 percent variable mortgage which rural members would be familiar with, the commodity-based mortgage, was not, in the form it was at that time, working. Our Minister indicated that changes had been made because of our constructive criticisms, I'm sure. Our constructive criticisms work with the Federal Government. Occasionally, they do.

We also pointed out that farmers were going to lose, not all Canadian farmers but Manitoba farmers and Saskatchewan farmers, the 10 percent investment tax credit over a period of two or three years — I think it's three years. When that is in full effect, it will cost Manitoba farmers — and this is based on farm definition of \$10,000 or more income, farmers with a gross income of \$10,000 or more in 1981, and that's roughly 20,000 farmers. It's the same definition used previously by Provincial Conservative Governments. On that basis, the cost of that elimination on average will be \$2,000 per farmer in Manitoba per year, \$2,000 per farmer per year. It works out to about \$40 million a year.

We pointed out as well that this was being done at the same time that this was happening to sugar beet farmers. This was not happening to people who were doing some research — (Interjection) — at 20 percent. They were getting an investment tax credit of 20 percent, plus 100 percent write-off of the remainder. That's what we were talking about. We said that's not fair; that doesn't make sense. I think there isn't a member in this House who disagrees with me.

Yet that 20 percent is being retained, and the 10 percent is being eliminated here and in Saskatchewan, not in all parts of the country. It is not being eliminated in the Maritimes, and I don't criticize the Federal Government for that at all. We recognize that there are some very serious problems in the Maritimes, although we also believe that there are some serious problems

in Western Canada. It is not only in the farm sector, because that credit also means that farmers had the opportunity to purchase farm equipment, and that means jobs for urban workers. But we were not particularly pleased with that kind of a hit.

I should, just as we're talking about that hit, point out that there has been some amelioration of that, that the benefit of the Mulroney statement of April 30 on the same basis to Manitoba farmers would work out to roughly \$600 a year per farmer. However, the bulk of the benefits given back to farmers on that \$600 per year are of taxes which had not been in existence or had been raised after the Mulroney Government came into office.

That is, an example, all the excise taxes on fuel including farm fuel was rebated, as you know, prior to September of 1984. So now you were paying the tax for awhile. He took it off you for a short period of time so it feels good, but you're really only back to where you were in 1984 before he added stuff on to you. So your net result is you're still down \$2,000 per farmer as a result of that Budget and the previous Budgets of the Federal Conservative Government without calculating some of the other items the Minister of Agriculture could point out to you. There are a lot of user fees and so on.

Now, there have been suggestions by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, and I believe other Conservatives, that the SRTC's were being wiped out by the Mulroney Government, that shortly after they came into office they took them out. I want to point out to those people that's not quite correct. There was an attempt made; that's true. To the extent that it is going to cost us an awful lot of money, it is not correct.

They in fact — and if you read the prospectus of Organic Research Inc., you will find that they state in their prospectus that the Mulroney Government's change with respect to the capital gains tax sweetens the pot considerably. Rather than being something that wasn't as good under the Liberals — or it wasn't as good under the Conservatives as it had been under the Liberals — these people made it even worse. The first \$25,000 of the \$29,000 paid out in January of 1986 to those particular investors was tax free because of Michael Wilson's elimination of the capital gains tax — (Interjection) — \$25,000 for 1986, complete elimination of the first \$25,000 and, as it goes on, it continues and gets worse.

The point we were making at that conference was that there were approximately a dozen other companies with applications before the Securities Commission of Manitoba who have other great research ideas, things from jobba beans to taking oil out of sand. There was a total of several hundred million dollars worth of these kinds of research ideas before the Securities Commission. When I met with Mr. Wilson after his Budget which grandfathered those again — and keep in mind that these are companies that had not even been in existence when Marc Lalonde was Minister of Finance. These are companies that have been formed in the last number of months, six months, some of them. These companies are being grandfathered again past 1986.

So we said to Mr. Wilson, at least give us the option to prescreen for the Manitoba income tax portion. It's none of our business what you do with the federal

portion, but this is hurting us here provincially and we would like the opportunity to look at them. We're not saying that they're all bad.

A MEMBER: When? When did you say this to him?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I said this to him before the news conference. In fact, at the news conference, I said very specifically that we don't criticize them overall. We want the right to intervene on the basis of looking at them first to determine whether they make sense. Four times during that press conference I said I do not blame the investor, I criticized the system. I do not criticize the investor; I criticize the system.

I was asked, after the press conference, to name investors and I said that's not the game I'm in, I'm trying to fix the system. There is a group though who have called The Elections Finances Act pickpocketing. They have called it robbery, they have said it is offensive, and let's see what they will do when it comes time to collect on it. Robbery by the Leader of the Opposition, that's what he called it. He didn't say it was legalized, he said it was robbery. You had one of your members say it was pickpocketing. You had a former finance minister saying it was offensive, and you are now telling us . . . We've never criticized the investors; we have criticized the system. You or the people, Madam Speaker, as indicated — (Interjection) — oh, that's okay. You're going to pick people's pockets according to your definition. You're going to rob people, according to your definition. I've said all along — and we're consistent here — I've said all along that, Madam Speaker, that that kind of view of life is one we tend to expect from some of the older members, not the Member for Lakeside, I think he would be consistent. I don't think he would play that kind of a game, but some of them clearly do.

Madam Speaker, you did throw me off. Mr. Ransom, Monday, June 20, 1983: "Does the First Minister intend to withdraw such offensive bills as The Elections Finances Act?" The Leader of the Opposition: "They are willing at every turn to rob from the taxpayer for the good of themselves." That's the kind of thing they say, and the Member for Minnedosa referred to it as "pickpocketing." Well, quite frankly, you people have come along here and you've said to us, when we say that a system needs changing, that then we can't take advantage of that system. We've never said that; you're saying that, you people are saying that. We said the system should be changed but, as long as the system is the way it is, it should be the same for everyone, and I believe it should be the same for you with respect to The Elections Finances Act, but don't tell us that you can take advantage of that and we're supposed to sit back here and pretend that somehow you people — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, he says, "Do away with it."

We believe that The Elections Finances Act makes a lot of sense for the taxpayers of this province. We believe that it is good for the province that Hyundai does not finance our elections, or Inco, or the Royal Bank, or people like that; we do it directly. The taxpayers of this province have no problem with the notion of paying about \$2 or \$3 apiece to have clean elections that are not influenced by outside large corporate forces

who tend to finance the Opposition to serve the party. We believe strongly that The Elections Finances Act was a good piece of legislation and they couldn't take us off of that. In principle, we said it was right; we say it is right today. You said it was wrong; you said it was wrong then. — (Interjection) — You're going to steal. I see the Member for River Heights is here. I was pleased with the comments she made the other day, they make sense. I think they bear some reading by members of the Opposition.

It's true, as I say. I said in forceful terms what I believe, but as I have indicated other people have said in forceful terms what they believe. They're perfectly entitled to do that. We're perfectly entitled to disagree with each other as to which legislation is right and which legislation is wrong and those sorts of things.

One of the things that annoyed me with the speech of the Leader of the Opposition is the impression he left that I was naming investors. I'm quoting from his speech. He said, "The taxpayers were bilking the system and even led to the naming of some prominent Manitobans who had participated in the particular schemes that he identified." There were three different times during the particular press conference I held when I said I do not criticize the investors. I used one example where I said I talked with one investor who said, oh, I didn't invest in that particular one, I invested in organic research. He didn't even know what he had invested in and I didn't criticize him. — Why should he examine it when he's been told by his professional accountant to put the money in, get the money out the next day, no problem, the rest is owed to you by the Minister of Finance. That's not a criticism of the taxpayer, it's a criticism by me of the system.

What we had asked for was the right to prescreen. We weren't saying they were all wrong, we were saying we want the right to prescreen for the Manitoba tax portion. We still want that right and I would hope that members opposite would agree with us that that right should be there. We fight for days over decisions on development agreements to assist business in Manitoba, be it Heritage Foundaries, or Toro, or Westeel-Rosco, or dozens of them with much less money overall than is spent on one of these projects where we have no right to say anything or examine the project or determine whether our money is going to disappear. That was what we objected to. We said, let us look at them first and if they're okay for Manitoba, we're prepared to approve of them. I think that makes some sense; I'm prepared to support that.

But to suggest, as the members opposite do, that because we don't like something about the system that we have to get into the moralizing, that some members and some of the media — not most of the media, some of the media — something that really stretches it, and to suggest that the Conservatives closed the loophole simply is not accurate history. They, in fact, first of all opened it wider; they opened it wider, made it easier to do it. In fact they enlarged the definition of research and development which also assisted the particular project I was discussing. That's what they were doing. What we are now asking for is a system where we can prescreen, just like we do any other spending we do in the province.

Now I am looking forward to the next four to five years in the Legislature. I think that a couple of people

who have been somewhat feisty in the beginning will cool off and I'm sure we'll hear though from some of them that they will predict again they will win the next election; that we're dead in the water; that we'll never return.

I had the Member for Sturgeon Creek tell me a couple days after I arrived in this Legislature, in 1979, that I would not be here very long after the next election, it's too bad, I'd be gone. I've had many predictions of my demise, as had the Member for Lakeside. I tend to stay away from those kinds of predictions. They may very well come true sometime for all of us. The Member for Emerson has survived a number of those predictions. Who knows, maybe next time all my work in Emerson will pay off. We increased our support considerably in Rhineland. Madam Speaker, I spent quite a bit of time in Rhineland where we had an excellent candidate and we came up, believe it or not, in an area where we — when I was a child, if there was a vote for the CCF, people used to wonder whether it was a joke, a mistake or a Communist. You know, now, we had more than half as many votes as the Conservatives had in Rhineland. We're catching up to them and who knows maybe in the next election we'll get that seat. I would look forward to that very much because we do need more rural representation on this side. We've got some good new members and we could always use some more after the next one.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise to speak on the Throne Speech debate and, as is tradition, congratulate the new members in the Legislative Assembly. I think probably it is one of the most tremendous opportunities that people have, to come here, to bring forward their thoughts, their ideas about their constituencies, their provincial concerns and about matters of public importance.

It has also been tradition that the first speeches have given us some indication as to the backgrounds of themselves and of their constituencies. I compliment those people who have followed that tradition.

As well, I think that those who haven't followed it, I'm not going to condemn them because it is the first opportunity that they have had to speak, but it is somewhat setting the tone of their future days in the Legislature and what they can look forward to as treatment in the Assembly.

I can remember some of the activities and some of the ways in which some of the members have introduced themselves. I think when we talk about decorum in the Chamber as the Liberal leader has indicated and wants to improve it that one of the ways in which you add to the decorum in the Chamber is to act like statespersons, people, men and women. But I find it strange, Madam Speaker, that the Liberal leader would come to the Chamber and give us that great lecture, yet walk out of the Chamber as she has done, and I think I read the quote correctly in the Free Press, she called the Premier of the province a gutless wonder. Now I don't know whether that is setting a good example for decorum in the Chamber or whether that is truly what she believes. I just asked the question because

I think it is important that she clearly state, if her expression of the Premier was really meant or whether she was misquoted. Because I want to be fair. I think this Assembly has to provide for fairness as well. But I do find it somewhat strange that she would use that language outside and yet try and tell everyone here we have to improve the decorum of the Chamber which I don't disagree with by the way. But I think it is a matter of again

A MEMBER: . . . you've always added to the decorum.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you. I think it's important that we do follow the example that we tell other people that they should do and that is certainly important.

Madam Speaker, again, I think it is important to talk to the new members and I say to those who are elected on this side, the new members, that I look forward to working with them. I look forward to working with them in caucus, in the Assembly, as I do look forward to going to the other side of the House with them and a few more new members given the first opportunity which I think, Madam Speaker, will come far sooner than the government wish it to happen, not because we will cause the election or another election over some matter of unimportance, but I think probably that the government, particularly as demonstrated in the Throne Speech, do not have a lot to offer the people of Manitoba. There will be a tremendous amount of internal turmoil within the NDP Caucus and I'm not speaking as someone who hasn't seen that. I think they have certainly demonstrated over the past few years that there can be a tremendous amount of internal turmoil, the resignation of many of their members

A MEMBER: The defections.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . the defections, that's right. One cannot count on one hand the number that have left. I think probably that they aren't all going to be sheep and be led or be lemmings and be taken over the cliff. I think probably that they are going to start to think for themselves. In fact, I know some of them already are thinking for themselves and they are thinking they'd have been better off not to have won the election. I think that is going to be clearly evident as the next few weeks and months proceed.

I would be remiss as well, Madam Speaker, if I didn't say and acknowledge the comments in the Throne Speech by the Lieutenant-Governor that her term of office will end this year. I think probably that we have had some most interesting times during her term of office with a major constitutional challenge. In fact, I have in my office a picture of my colleague from Pembina, Lakeside, myself, standing at this end of the Assembly, the bench, when the Premier of the province and the Lieutenant-Governor walked in, when they were defeated on the major constitutional change that they were proposing for the people.

You know, probably there is more not being said in this document than is being said. That's why it is so scant; that's why it's so vague. You see the NDP Party in government are notorious for doing what they don't say because it just would cause them trouble. Let's look at this and I'll go through it because I think it all

ties to honesty and integrity. I think it all ties to what we've seen, as my colleague from St. Norbert has indicated earlier. In the short term that this office has started back to govern again, who would ever imagine the mess that they have themselves in, the mess that they have themselves in in just two short months.

You know, if we don't have the former Speaker causing problems for the Premier, we have the

A MEMBER: The present one.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That was said from the back bench, Madam Speaker. It did not come from me. It's no reflection on the Chair.

But there is a certain amount of turmoil which he has to deal with and, of course to try and overcome the turmoil, what he did was he expanded the Cabinet and gave a lot of people a Cabinet post. Then I have to say as well that in the end I don't think will do him a lot of good. As well, we have seen many Cabinet shuffles. It's like taking a deck of cards and shuffling it and coming up again and after we just heard the last speaker, we've got the same jokers in the deck. They just pop up in different places. That's really the essence of what we've got to look at, Madam Speaker.

Well they won the election of March 18, Madam Speaker. The New Democratic Party won the election. I guess probably we have to say that they won it because they got more seats. They didn't get it because they have more popular vote. As well, I think it is important to note that we didn't cause them near the kind of harm that we should have because I think we acted pretty much like statespeople, statesmen in the election campaign. We did not remind the people in a sufficient way and it is a criticism of us, Madam Speaker, of that major constitutional battle that we had in the province, of the disagreement of the people of Manitoba, 80 percent of the people of Manitoba not wanting the Government of Manitoba, the New Democrats, to impose on them what they wanted to impose. Yes, I do take some criticism from my constituents who say to me, why did you not use that issue more? Well, I don't think, Madam Speaker, it's unfair here to say today that if we, as a Progressive Conservative Party, had pressed harder, had reminded the people that it would have been a different result at the end of the March 18 election. I regret that somewhat, Madam Speaker, because I don't honestly look forward to sitting four years in opposition when in fact 80 percent of the people wanted a change some two years ago. I want that on the record because I think it's important not only for my constituents but for the rest of the people of Manitoba to be reminded again of the vagueness of what we have coming again from this government that we can look for almost anything. Again, we were vindicated, our position was vindicated by the highest court in the land. The highest court in the land again vindicated that we were right and they were wrong. So the record has to clearly point that out.

Well, Madam Speaker, I as well have to say that I have had the opportunity over the last many years as a legislator to be involved directly with the agricultural community. I have, as Minister and critic, enjoyed the role, but I look forward equally as well to a new critic role of Municipal Affairs, of Native affairs, of Manfor.

I think it's going to be an extremely important challenge to discuss the issues that are facing municipal governments that are discussing matters affecting the Native community. I'll touch on that somewhat after I have a more general speech dealing with the economics of the province.

I would be remiss however in not saying that I think the Legislature is going to miss the contribution of a former colleague of mine in the Member for Swan River, extremely disappointed that a man who had committed eight years and had provided, I think, excellent representation to that community, is not back in here. I will have a difficult job living up to the work which he did. He did an excellent job in his criticism of Manfor, in disclosing that here this great government of the NDP have hired some executive at a \$150,000, again, with the additional benefits to go to over \$200,000, with a golf course membership in Montreal, houses and cars. My goodness, to do what? To lose \$25 million for the people of Manitoba?

That was his reward for the losing of some \$25 million for the people of Manitoba. That I think, again, will be in the records and I compliment my former colleague from Swan River because I did appreciate him as a person, as a Legislator, and he was a committed Manitoban, born and raised in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I as well have had the privilege, and we have seen a major change in the number of new members and the retirement of many outstanding Canadians who I had the opportunity to serve with. I'm certainly pleased that I am a member of a government that, as I said, stopped a major constitutional change because of the wrongheadedness of the New Democratic Party.

I'm extremely proud of the fact that I was a Cabinet Minister under a Premier who was a Canadian leader as far as stopping Pierre Elliott Trudeau turning Canada completely upside down, and those are the kinds of things that one looks back on and reflects on with some degree of pride.

I would well be remiss if I didn't compliment my colleague from Lakeside. In the speech that he gave last night, it's one of the best speeches that I've heard him present to this House. I think he, again for the benefit of the new members, but as well for the members that have been here for some time, pointed out some of the basic principles and some of the basic things that we stand for and what the New Democratic Party stand for.

I have to tell you what the accomplishments of the New Democratic Party stand for and what they've accomplished are pretty small and pretty miniscule beside those of a Progressive Conservative Party, albeit those years they have served as government too short in this province. But that will change, Madam Speaker, that will change because I think the winds of change were with us. There were a few things that the people of Manitoba were not told and coming clean with them in the election campaign I think will eventually catch up on the New Democratic Party.

I think it's important to talk about and make an assessment of some of the election promises. One wonders — well, I guess you don't have to wonder — as to why we're not getting the Ministers of the Crown who have been part of something that I think is less than honourable in being part of a program which takes

the monies from the taxpayers of Manitoba for their own benefits. One does not have to compare it directly to a conflict, but I think it's one of question of morality, integrity and, as I've indicated, we saw the former Speaker got his reward for trying to do what was right. He got to the backbench and he will stay there, I'm sure, forever.

We hear the Member for Burrows who traditionally gets up and gives that great speech about integrity and the honesty and the need to carry on in such a way. Well I think every time he gives his speech like that he just assures himself that he will continue to sit in that capacity in the backbench.

The Member for Inkster, one has to look at him. I really can't put him in a category of honesty and integrity. I really haven't had a chance to judge him because it's not a personal thing, but I do think there's something wrong with him because he was challenged out of the party. He got no support from the Premier and I'm sure he's sitting there stewing in his concern for advancing his own self.

One of the main things that I think we had to look at during the campaign was every comment that the Premier made was not positive. It was something that he was going to do and he couldn't define it, so the aides would come along later and they would fill in the media as to what was going to happen.

The gasoline price reduction, you know, there's the Premier. He appreciated it; he was sensitive to what was on the minds of the consumers of Manitoba so he thought he would come out and deal with it. He said he would reduce the price of gasoline or see that it was done by 9.5 cents a litre by the 1st of April. Well, that was a commendable thing, but if he was really serious about it why didn't he proceed to do it immediately? It's because the natural reduction in the gas price wasn't going to take place until that particular time, and the people really thought he meant what he said. We've heard the follow-up to that, that really nothing is going to happen, that there is no commission of inquiry, or there was but we can't find out the results of it.

It's a sad comment to see the kind of carry on that went on during the campaign, and I'll talk to some of those issues more as I get into the part that I want to talk on dealing with agriculture.

The Throne Speech again is a document that I was led to believe, when I came to the Legislative Assembly, is one that laid out a platform of the government's programs, what they were going to carry out in the best interests of Manitobans. But again, the vagueness I think is again speaking for itself, that they don't intend to tell the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers, what their intentions are. As an example, again, our leader today asked the question as to how many hydro deals had been signed. When would we see the agreements? We find out that there's only been one, yet I'll read a line out of the Throne Speech Debate which I think is tremendously misleading and I think that's contempt of Parliament, Madam Speaker. I think it's contempt of Parliament when we hear the First Minister, and the Minister of Mines and Energy, stand up today and say that there is only one agreement, that the other two are in some stage of limbo.

Let me read the paragraph on it because I think it's important to the people of Manitoba and backs up

what every one of us have said about the integrity and honesty of this government.

"The same commitment to the planned and orderly development of natural resources to the benefit of all Manitobans led to the success of Limestone and the Northern States Power sale, has resulted in three more export agreements with six utilities operating in the United States."

Anyone picking that up and reading it would, I think, think that we now have three more export agreements. What else would one take from it? Do you read in there that there's two that aren't quite finalized yet, that there's some chance that we've got to make some fine tuning changes? Absolutely a contempt of this Legislative Assembly, Madam Speaker, and a contempt of this Legislative Assembly, and this government doesn't have whatever it takes . . .

A MEMBER: Intestinal fortitude.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's right, intestinal fortitude to come clean with the people of Manitoba. That's where it's at, Madam Speaker, that's where it's at and that's why the people of Manitoba, not the Conservative Party that think we should have the divine right to govern.

I think the people of Manitoba will make that decision and I think they'll make it far sooner than this government think they will. They didn't make it on the 18th with the clear kind of documentation and information that was needed.

Again, there were four words used to describe the Throne Speech by our leader the other day. I have four words, Madam Speaker, that I think sum it up as well. I would say it was government of "quick trickery" and "quick flip."

We've also heard the new colleague who has also brought in another new term, is "Flip Wilson" and I think that's probably a pretty appropriate name for one of the individuals who have been talked about in the last while. But it is what we faced during the election campaign. We've seen four years of it and I don't think the people of Manitoba will tolerate another four years.

Let's talk about the financial record of the New Democratic Party, because that's where it's at. That's where it's at right now, Madam Speaker. We're going to see the twisting and turning of the New Democratic Party trying to do things, trying to back up their philosophy with money that they haven't got. Why did they not come to the people of Manitoba, the Legislature of Manitoba, and tell them that we were in a virtually bankrupt situation? Why did they not tell the people that they have increased the deficit over the last four years of their term of office by \$2.2 billion? That's \$2,200 or \$2,000 and some-odd dollars more debt for every man, woman and child.

Madam Speaker, I asked the members of the government; I asked the Member for Burrows; I asked the constituents of the Member for Ellice to look around them and say, what have I got now that I'm in \$2,000 more debt for that I didn't have four years ago? Have they got lower gasoline prices? Have they got a lower sales tax? Have they got a penalty on their wages through payroll tax? Madam Speaker, I ask each and every Manitoban to look around them and say, how much better off am I because I am \$2,000 more dollars in debt.

Madam Speaker, there is no one that's better off because they are \$2,000 more in debt. Madam Speaker, it is a crime that they have been able to run rampant with the taxpayers' money the way in which they have, and then be so deceitful as to not show them before the election campaign just what they did with the taxpayers' money.

Madam Speaker, I think that Manitoba has probably the highest per capita debt of any province in Canada, very close to it if we're not. Our net annual debt is equal to 20 percent of our gross domestic product. We have 20 percent of that as our annual debt.

Our percentage of our deficit of revenue in 1981 was 4.5 percent. The last year, it was 16.8 percent and has been running that for about the last three years — 16.8 percent is our deficit off of our revenue. We have had an increase of tax revenues of 78 percent since 1981. Is it any wonder the taxes on those homes that these people talk about have gone up to \$1,200 in this government's term of office?

Talk about the increase in education taxes on farmland, Madam Speaker. Let's talk about that. Let's talk about the small business that's referred to in the Throne Speech. You know, let's talk about small business. During the campaign, there was a pretty good economic policy program announced for small business that was an incentive for them to hire more people. But what did the NDP policy say? We want to create a small business investment bond so they can go further in debt. We've got to start getting out of debt. Our taxpayers have to start getting out of debt, Madam Speaker, not deeper in debt. We are on an endless road if we continue to tax them and continue to waste their money, as has been done in the past.

Look at the bankruptcies still increasing in the farm community. Small business bankruptcies in the last four years of this administration are 1,371. Farm bankruptcies are 320 and still increasing. Yet we look around us and we have no money. We're in debt. We're in debt another \$2.2 billion in their four years. Yet we're falling down; we're sliding down. What are the answers? What have you got for answers for the people of Manitoba? Where are you going to get the money to do these things?

I heard the Premier on . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Where's the Minister of Natural Resources with some money to build some drainage ditches?

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's right. He said, the well is dry; there's no money. Well that's what you joined. When you made the decision to get into the NDP Party, you should have taken a little closer look.

Let's look at what some of the election promises were. I heard the Premier of Manitoba say on a CJOB action line that there would be no sales tax increase for two years, that there would be no payroll tax increase for two years. Where is the money going to come from? In fact, Madam Speaker, over four points of the 6 percent sales tax that each and every Manitoban pays goes to servicing the debt on the people of Manitoba that this government has imposed. Every time you buy an article, over four points out of the sales tax services the debt that these people have thrown the money

away for. But what have we got for it? That's the question. Oh yes, we've got 132 more apple polishers that were criticized by the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. H. ENNS: One hundred and thirty-three.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's right, we've got another apple polisher.

I find it strange that a man can go from the president of the MGEA Association, criticizing the dickens out of the government, and then what does he do but join them? Well that's what you call opportunism of the worst kind, and then come into the Legislature and try to trounce the PC's for their record. Well, Madam Speaker, he can't have it both ways, and I think that he won't be given the opportunity to have it both ways and the next few weeks will demonstrate that.

Let's look at some of the objective things that have to be done, Madam Speaker. We have to start addressing the debt that the province has, but yet we don't have a government that will come clean with what has to be done. They are now again trying to deceive the people of Manitoba, leaving them to dream that there is some kind of a fund going to come out of Hydro for a Heritage Fund for the people of Manitoba.

Can you tell me how you can get a profit out of Manitoba Hydro when you're basing the sale of that hydro on U.S. coal prices which are based on world oil prices which have fallen, fallen, fallen, that we are going to build some kind of a Heritage Fund out of that? I, for the life of me, can't do it.

Why wouldn't they have based the sale of our hydro on the cost of production here in Manitoba? Wouldn't that have made more sense? Wouldn't it have been better to sell your hydro at the cost of production and make the people of Manitoba the money they need to make it up? No but, Madam Speaker, we have this Minister of Mines and Energy with some airy-fairy idea that we're going to base it outside of this country, the costs of selling it. Oh, have we been snookered, let me tell you. Yet we're being told there's going to be some kind of a Heritage Fund. If there's one nickel of profit that comes in this government, let's start reducing the deficit, Madam Speaker. Let's start taking some of the weight off of the taxpayers, rather than pretending that there is some form of money. When times are good — you know, I heard the Premier keep saying times are so good in Manitoba. Well if times are so good, why are we still going deeper in debt? If times are good, you should start lifting out of debt.

Something else that I think is important to the record, Madam Speaker, over 50 percent of the debt that we owe as Manitobans through our government, through the NDP, is borrowed offshore. For every time the American dollar increases 1 cent over what ours is, that costs you and I as a Manitoba taxpayer \$20 million. That's right.

Madam Speaker, we are not in a very firm or very good financial situation with the government that we have in place today, and they still aren't trying to stop the hemorrhage. What are they doing? They're hiring a defeated NDP politician, Cabinet Minister, because why? Because he needed a job, but that's not the only job he's going to be doing is this rural development. You watch his campaign style as he goes throughout the province, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I think the bonuses that he's received will make good headline news tomorrow and, if the former Minister of Finance — and I guess that's why we're in such financial position — signed a kind of a sweetheart deal with his former Cabinet Minister, is that the kind of deal he's been making when he goes to New York and financing for the province? Is that the kind of consideration he has for the taxpayers' money? Not good, Madam Speaker, not good at all.

Madam Speaker, the Hydro issue, I think, is one which will continue to cause this government no end of problems. It has already, and I want to have the opportunity to discuss with the Minister who is responsible for Native Affairs how Hydro is dealing with himself and the band councils of the North in fairness of land settlements? Have they negotiated in good faith? Have the Manitoba Hydro negotiated in good faith? Have they looked after the environment of the North, or have they just said we'll monitor the environmental problems that are going on but we won't do any environmental assessments?

I think the Minister of Native Affairs is going to have to come to grips with these things, because he is sitting in Cabinet because — yes — I'm sure he's very qualified — I'm sure that the First Minister wanted to acknowledge his contribution and he looked forward to some positive input. I challenge the Minister responsible for Native Affairs though to stand up for his people before he stands up to the First Minister of this province, because look what the First Minister of this province will do to you if you don't. I will tell you, there are many examples. I challenge him.

I also find it somewhat inconsistent, Madam Speaker, that the Member for Rupertsland — and I have grown to respect him and his comments and his activities in the Legislature. I find it somewhat inconsistent for him to be a member of a New Democratic Party who are anti — yes — anti-hunters. They are against the harvesting of our resources, the majority of them. You would see them with the Greenpeace movement before you'd see them on the side of those people who are trying to make a living out of the natural elements. Yes, Madam Speaker, I find it somewhat inconsistent for a Minister to sit in the Cabinet who does not necessarily agree philosophically with them. Those are challenges that I will be putting to the Minister of Natural Resources.

I think the Hydro one is an extremely important question, because it seems that when it comes to the political well-being of the province they don't give a goldarn about the people who are affected. I can tell you there is an example of that in the southwest corner of the province. When it comes to the development of the oil industry, you know, it's been established over the last few weeks now that the surface rights decisions have favoured the oil companies. Do you know why, Madam Speaker? Because there is money in them there hills and the government needs it. So the rights of the people who own the surface rights don't get the same consideration.

I think the same example will hold true for the Native community in the North. When it comes to the political well-being of the government, they really won't care and don't care for those individuals who they are pretending that they do. I think it's an important thing to look for.

I want to spend a few minutes — possibly, Madam Speaker, you could indicate how much time I have left for my comments.

MADAM SPEAKER: There is seven minutes left to speak.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Isn't it something how time goes by when you're having fun? I thought likely you weren't enjoying this, Minister of Education.

Madam Speaker, again back to the election campaign, we hear — and I guess if I were a person who thought it was important to criticize the media I would do so, but I found the most misleading statement in the press when I looked at the headline following the Throne Speech, this great headline about all the support for agriculture. That was a good headline, I'll tell you. I don't know how you got it, Vic, because one really has to question the headline writers in the Free Press if they had read anything in the Throne Speech that was going to help.

But let me just deal with it, because during the campaign, Madam Speaker, I heard this announcement in Minnedosa, this Farm Aid. Well I thought maybe it was something that was really going to be helpful for the farm community. Three points in the Farm Aid Start, here's what he said.

"The NDP plans to expand the role of mediation panels between farmers and lenders." Well, you know, we've got a mediation panel already in place. The only way you can get to the mediation panel is if you go past one of the Minister of Agriculture's so-called farm advisors or economists or something. If they agree, then you can go to the farm panel. There is not going to be one of those people who are going to agree that they can't do the job, so that nobody is ever going to get to the Farm Review Panel. The farmer can't request it, no way. They don't get to the Farm Review Panel.

If you do get to the panel, where do you get. You get to a bunch of individuals who have never — you know, they aren't in farm financial trouble. They don't finance farms. They work for the government. They have got their war on poverty solved. So there are some good people there, but I'm not so sure that it's the right people.

Here's the other one. "We will use the courts to review the impending closure." My God! The Premier of Manitoba was going to turn the farm community over to the courts? Can you imagine turning the farm community over to the courts? Some of the decisions that you've seen, and that is what he cares about farmers. Oh, my goodness! Save the farm community — if you're going to turn farmers to the courts, because they don't have a lot of understanding about the way of life the farmers have enjoyed for the last many years and the hardships that they've gone through to save the little bit they have. But the Premier's going to turn it over to the courts. That's where they'll get their hard and final decision.

Then of course, they're going to do something if conditions warrant. My God, Madam Speaker, when have conditions been worse for the farm community? Who has to make the decision when conditions warrant it? Does it have to be the Minister of Agriculture? Well, Madam Speaker, cold comfort for the farm community, but it washed. They got some votes on it, Madam Speaker.

But here's the other one. This is again in the Throne Speech. Here's even a better one. Here is the Farm

Start, Madam Speaker. ". . . where \$200,000 will be available, if the farmer will sell his farm to his son or daughter." Yes, he's got to sell to his son or daughter, but what he has to do — the Premier said the farmer will be able to sell it for less money, or the farmer will buy it for less money. For the farmer to buy it for less money means the seller has to sell it for less money. Also, the other thing was that the interest rate will be lower. If the interest rate is lower, who takes lower interest? My goodness, the farmers are tired of carrying society on their back. It's time that he was able to sell his or her farm to maximize their returns, not to continue to carry the rest of society producing food on their backs.

He has to take less money for his farm. He has to take less interest for his farm to qualify for this great Farm Start Program, a real sham, Madam Speaker. Yet, we have more smoke and mirrors coming from the Minister of Agriculture.

Look at what's on the Order Paper again, Madam Speaker. We have got The Family Farm Protection Act. Look back at the Order Paper of Monday, March 25, 1985, the last Session. We had The Family Farm Protection Act, but never saw a bill, never saw a document to support it. Madam Speaker, talk about it.

Madam Speaker, I have got numerous things that I can talk about, but I think it's important to conclude with this. This is dual standards. The farm community are pleading for capital investment. There are people that would like to sell their farms, but they can't do it unless the people live in Manitoba. Yet, taxpayers of Manitoba, those same farmers, are expected to support the deal on the sale of Flyer. To whom? To Manitobans, people living in Manitoba? No, to people living in Holland, to people who want to come in here. We're paying them gobs of millions of dollars to take it off our back. Yet, if I'm a farmer and want to sell my farm to somebody from outside to get some cash to help me, I can't do it, Madam Speaker. Talk about dual standards! Yet, the same taxpayers are expected to subsidize people to come to build buses in Winnipeg, to lay off people.

Ladies and gentlemen of the people of the Province of Manitoba, I think it is time to jerk their chain. Madam Speaker, I think that it's time to stand up and be counted, and that is what I am doing. That's what I plan to do — (Interjection) — yes, stand up for the people of Manitoba and fritter their money away. That's how they did it.

Madam Speaker, I have been pleased to participate in the Throne Speech. I look forward to some of the members of the government side standing up and not just hammering the Opposition, but supporting this document. Tell us some of the things that aren't written in here. Tell us some of the things you're going to do. Just don't hammer us. Let's see some constructive ideas that you have come into this Legislature with to support your government, because the front bench are bankrupt of ideas. They are bankrupt of leadership. They are really, Madam Speaker, in a lot of trouble unless the new members come forward with some of those ideas. I look forward to debating them when they do.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I, too, feel honoured to stand in my place and take part in the Throne Speech. I feel a particular pride in paying my compliments to you, Madam Speaker, whose competence, wit and conscientiousness I'm sure will stand you in very good stead as you carry out the duties of your office, and I assure you of my cooperation.

I, too, would like to greet and congratulate the new members on both sides of the House and, I guess, call them to take part in the deliberations of this House in what I think is in the best tradition of the democratic process. That is to take very seriously the challenges, the problems that confront us, that not only confront us but confront Manitobans in all walks of life as they go about their daily lives, and to recognize that we here in this House are not here for our own aggrandizement and for our own fun and games.

We are here, Madam Speaker, to lend our best thoughts and effort to solving the problems that confront our constituents. I don't think anyone could have gone through an election campaign — certainly I know I experienced it in Osborne out on the streets at 20 below, knocking on doors and visiting with people. That was to absorb the hopes, the pain, the frustration and the everyday pressures that Manitobans feel as they go about their business, whether it is a question of a job or a lack of a job, whether it is a question of a particular family problem, a legal problem, a housing problem. The list goes on and on.

But I guess my hope is that, as new members take part in the deliberations in this House, they and we will never forget that what we are about is to find the best solutions to the problems of Manitobans. That means respect and due listening to the ideas and perspectives that one another brings.

I think one of the themes that I struck when I first spoke in this House four or five years ago was one that I would like to repeat today, and that is a recognition that a political party is a group of people who share a common philosophy and set of values. It is those hopes and those ideas about how the world operates that they bring to solving the problems and meeting the needs of Manitobans. It is a healthy and constructive thing that we don't all approach the problems in the same vein or with the same beliefs. In fact, there would be no need for political parties and this type of process if, in fact, we didn't hold very deep and different points of view.

I endorse very heartily the approach brought by the Liberal member, Sharon Carstairs, in her indication that she would like to play a very constructive role in addressing the problems and I think that is an approach which all of us could well emulate.

Carrying along with that, I would like to address most of my remarks to the social program aspects of the Throne Speech, indeed to outline the social strategy of my party. We have included a lot of comments about vision, Madam Speaker, in our Throne Speech, and people may laugh at that because they think it is a word that we just throw in — what? — for public relations effect. What they miss, Madam Speaker, and which I would like to address is that we have done our best in a concise form in the Throne Speech to say what we really believe and what we really hope for and then to outline, again in a concise form, how we expect

to get there. I think the onus is on us to explain what our economic strategy is and what our social strategy is, and then to demonstrate how the programs and policies that we bring forward fit into that picture.

Social programs don't exist in isolation, and any complete separation from the economic base and context is a delusion. There is an economic context within which we operate, and I think it is understanding what that is and what the capacity of the Province of Manitoba is to solve its economic problems and to build a more mature economy that gives us the base and in fact the rationale for putting in social programming that enable all the people to take part in that economic development. We're dealing with two processes that may have different names and different facets, but they are linked together and we cannot fairly look at one without looking at the other. However, it has become customary to separate discussion of economic from social.

What I would like to say on the economic side is that we are dealing with very rapidly changing times, not only here in Manitoba, but throughout Canada. Indeed, as studies such as the MacDonald Commission and others have attempted to point out — I don't agree in detail with all their assumptions or recommendations — but they have attempted to draw our attention to the fact that we are living in a changing world, and that what our aspirations are here in Manitoba must have some realistic link to what is really possible and desirable on an international plane.

It is true that we have been through what is the closest thing to an economic depression that Canada has known since the great depression. The fact that it wasn't a full-blown depression with people riding the rails and in extremely dire straits was because of the progress we've made in providing some social service supports and some unemployment insurance.

But, in spite of that great depression, we have in Manitoba, which is not one of the wealthiest provinces, kept our unemployment rates at or near the best in Canada. We have kept the income distribution pattern again one of the best. We have had a very minor increase in poor families at a time when normally the increase would go up and up. I think that is due, not just to what is being done in the private sector or by individuals working on their own behalf, but by the coming together of that effort with government policy. It has been a cooperative effort, and I think we all in Manitoba can take pride for having ridden through this real depression in relatively good shape.

But there are underlying problems in the economy of Manitoba, problems that are not going to go away and which don't seem to be the kind of problems which will be dealt with by every entrepreneur, every farmer, every small businessperson, every individual just working on their own. They cry out for some cooperative solutions. The farm crisis at the present is a severe crisis. It is not a crisis that we in Manitoba can address on our own. It's not a simple crisis. It is a crisis that is going to take concerted action here and nationally, and it is going to take a redefinition of what is possible for the agricultural economy in the decades to come.

Now I think each sector in our economy deserves a very realistic analysis and a realistic sense of what we can reasonably expect in the future in Manitoba. To get to the best we can get — it may never be super

good — in mining, in forestry, in fishing, in agriculture, in manufacturing and in the service industry is going to take business, labour and government working in concert.

Yes, we have to improve and have more secondary industry and more tertiary industry. Yes, we have to build our export capacity and reduce our imports. Yes, we have to work at better regional development and how to adapt the new technology so that we can all benefit from it, but those things are not thrusts that are going to be accomplished by any of us working in isolation or just nitpicking at one another. They are going to require a fresh understanding of the problems and a willingness to go forward and cooperate.

The plan that this government has put forward on the economic side is a plan that hangs together, Madam Speaker. I must say, when I listen to the Opposition talk about a plan, I can't help but remember the astonishment I felt during the election reading the major papers that they put out that they called a plan, because in reading them through all I could see was a promise to spend a great deal more on the social side, a promise to cut way back on the tax side and somehow, by crossing fingers and throwing salt over the left shoulder, to solve the problem of deficit and economic development, a blind faith, Madam Speaker, that if only they were in power, all good things would happen in the economy. Now I submit that is not a plan. It could not be a plan; it does not hang together and, if we're going to talk about integrity in this House, Madam Speaker, I for one don't believe that plan had integrity.

The implications for the future of where we're at economically — we are going to have very tough times economically. They're going to be aggravated by the Federal Government's approach to cost sharing. There is a deficit problem which must be dealt with but there are options, at the federal level, for how to deal with that deficit problem. A commitment to tax reform, a gradual building of the social programs to where they are mature and fully accessible to people and a better approach to economic development instead of using across-the-board tax cuts hoping that somehow the people who get the tax cuts make the investment in the right place, could be replaced by removing all those tax expenditures going to businesses and replacing them with a system of accountable grants.

That way we could get to a better balance at the federal level. But failing that, we at the provincial level, as we stabilize and build our economy, are going to have to deal with tight resources.

That leads me to the social programs side. There are those who think that when you have economic difficulty and you're not having rapid economic growth that you should just stop your social programs, stop people's expectations, say, you wait, you wait until the economy grows, until the pie gets bigger and then you can have your fair share.

Madam Speaker, that's a very persuasive argument, according to the old way of thinking and I don't know if it's according to the Opposition's way of thinking, because in the campaign they came out with a really contradictory set of proposals in this regard. I'm looking forward, in the ongoing debate, to hearing what they

precisely do think. Do they mean that we should put more money into the social programming, regardless of whether we have more fiscal strength or economic growth or did that only go into the election statement, Madam Speaker?

I for one believe that building fair shares for Manitoba within the Canadian context and for individual Manitobans within Manitoba is something that must go on, good times or bad, that we are a community and, as a community or a family, shares when times get tough and gives the hand to the person who's having a tougher time. So too must we, as the caring community and the responsible community, do that via our social programs.

What are our social programs? They really are the way that the misfortunate, the poor or the sick or the people who have some disability, whether they're immature as children, whether they're elderly and no longer able to fully care for themselves, where they need a helping hand, whether it's money, whether it's extra help with transportation, whether it's counselling, whether it's a special kind of residential arrangement, whether it's income support or housing, a whole variety of services so that they can have the basic securities of life.

Madam Speaker, it's a very tempting thing when times are tough to ignore those problems, to say that somehow we've come far enough on the social side. Just tell that to slow down and we'll get on with all sorts of tax cuts and stimulus to the economy. Of course, we have to balance the need for the stimulus, the building and the incentive with the redistribution in the building of the social programs on the side.

What it says to me, Madam Speaker, is not that we come out with individual criticisms on a piece of a program and say there should be more money here; there should be more professionals here. We look at the overall systems through which we're delivering our social programs and we start examining them in minute detail to see if we have the most efficient system available to us so that people do get what they need, but that we don't build a system that has very highly funded portions over here and over here and great gaps and inequities in here.

So it's developing those types of systems that this government is committed to in its social strategy and the highlights of which appear in the Throne Speech.

Madam Speaker, could you advise me on the timing?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has 25 minutes left. It is now two minutes to adjournment time.

HON. M. SMITH: Shall we call it 5:30 or do you want me to go on?

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed)

The hour being 5:30, we will interrupt proceedings. According to the rules, when the motion is again before the House, the Honourable Minister of Community Services has 25 minutes remaining.

The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).