

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 15 March, 1985.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Auditor's Report, Consolidated Financial Statements, for the year ended October 31, 1984, for A. E. McKenzie Company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce today that the Manitoba Jobs Fund will be providing \$45 million in low-interest mortgage financing under Manitoba Housing's RentalStart Program. It is estimated that the funds made available will support about 1,000 units.

The program will offer 11 percent open mortgage financing for seven year terms for the development of new rental housing or for the conversion of existing non-residential buildings to rental housing. At the end of the seven-year term, projects must be refinanced privately. The current call is being extended to the province as a whole including all areas of the City of Winnipeg with the exception of the North Portage Redevelopment Area, where some \$20 million in RentalStart financing for an estimated 400 units had previously been committed.

Financing for up to 80 percent of project costs will be provided for projects comprising a minimum of four units in Winnipeg and Brandon and two units for other communities. Rent supplements will be available for up to 25 percent of units in projects renting to low-income households who might otherwise have difficulty affording market rents. In addition, developers may be required to allocate a minimum of 5 percent of their units for the disabled. Proposals will also be received from non-profit groups. Deadlines for receipt of proposals will be April 30, 1985 for Brandon and Winnipeg, and May 7, 1985 for all other communities.

In making this statement, Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress my appreciation to the housing industry for its performance in rental housing production in recent years. CMHC statistics show that the production of rental housing is up 80 percent for the last three years compared to the 1979-81 period. The 80 percent increase becomes all the more remarkable when you take into account that national production of rental housing has declined by 30 percent over the last three years.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, the level of unsubsidized private rental housing development doubled in 1984

as compared to 1983, further suggesting in this area as in others, continued growth in investor confidence in the future of Manitoba.

Clearly, the industry is doing its part in the face of continued high interest rates to respond to the current tight rental situation. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I note that in the previous two years, annual levels of rental housing construction starts, at about 2,000 units each year, were on line with statistical projections of rental housing requirements for Manitoba made by both CMHC and the industry itself. However, these projections did not take into account the additional pressures created by continued high rates of immigration to the province in its present high economic growth phase. We are hopeful that the availability of low-interest RentalStart financing will serve to complement ongoing industry activity and our own direct development activity to significantly ease the tight vacancy situations in our communities.

On the matter of Manitoba Housing's own direct development activity, I should also like to take this opportunity to make a progress report to the House in respect of my announcement last spring of our 1,200 unit, three-year public non-profit housing program. In 1984, we committed some 477 units substantially exceeding our first year target of 405 units. This is in addition to some 150 units committed for low-income households under our Rural and Northern Housing Program. As well, some 226 units are, or will shortly be, coming under construction as a result of our first RentalStart proposal call, with other projects still under negotiation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: I want to thank the Minister for this statement. We, on this side, welcome any action that will be beneficial to those that require it. Positive action to upgrade the living conditions of our people can only be commended. I appreciate that we have had a very tight vacancy rate and I hope that this will tend to relieve some of the problem that we have in this area.

Again I want to thank the Minister for his comments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to advise the Legislative Assembly, on behalf of yourself, the Chairman of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission, that agreement has been reached respecting the establishment by this Assembly of a Legislative Internship Program.

This decision is the result of extensive consideration of proposals by the Management Commission and by representatives of each caucus. Members were assisted

Friday, 15 March, 1985

extensively in their deliberations by Professor Paul Thomas of the University of Manitoba, who will be academic director of the program.

The program will go into operation on September 1st next, and will, each year, provide six Manitoba university graduates with an opportunity to work and study in the Legislature for a ten-month period from September to June.

Several recent reports have called attention to the need for more staff support for members. The Internship Program will fulfill both legislative needs and academic goals. The program will supplement and complement, rather than substitute for, existing or future caucus research assistance. Interns will be selected primarily on the basis of their academic accomplishment, maturity and interest in the legislative process.

The academic goals of the program, Mr. Speaker, will be to provide students in a variety of disciplines with first-hand experience with the legislative process in Manitoba. This will complement their educational experience in the classroom and it will create a group of young people with a greater understanding and appreciation of the role of the Legislative Assembly and its members within the political system. The interns' education experience will be enhanced through their work for members. They will be given a unique opportunity to observe the governmental and legislative processes from the point of view of legislators themselves. In turn, members will benefit from the new ideas, research skills, and enthusiasm of each new group of interns. In addition to work on behalf of caucus and members, interns will participate in regular seminars on aspects of the legislative process and each one will prepare a research paper. The existence of successful programs elsewhere in Canada illustrates the value of such programs, both to the elected representatives and to the students.

An equal number of interns will be attached to each of the two caucuses. Over the course of their employment, they will undertake a variety of assignments: major research projects, information searches, speech writing, and constituency assignments. They will be engaged on a full-time basis and will be paid \$1,200 a month.

Posters and applications for the program will be placed in all Manitoba Universities and will also be available from the Academic Director, Professor Paul G. Thomas, St. John's College, University of Manitoba.

The deadline date for applications for next fall, that's September of 1985, will be April 19, 1985.

The budget for the program will be voted in the 1985-86 Estimates of the Legislative Assembly and efforts are under way to raise funds from the private sector to offset some of the public costs of the program.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Management Commission, I would like to thank members of both caucuses for their enthusiasm and support in the development of this program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, on behalf of the Official Opposition, would like to say that I have been working with the Government

House Leader on this matter for a number of months. The idea of having the Internship Program came to the Members of the Legislature some years ago. It is a program that is followed in a number of the other provinces and at the federal level.

We, on the opposition side, had some concerns about the program and our major concerns were that the Minister of Government Services would provide us with adequate space so that these three interns that would be assigned to the opposition caucus would be adequately housed.

Our other concern was that we would have some direct input into the selection of the students so that we would hopefully obtain a student who would work well with our particular caucus members, as would work with the government caucus members.

So, those were the two concerns that the official opposition had regarding the program. The Government House Leader has agreed to them as well as Professor Paul Thomas, and I can see this program being beneficial both to students and to members of the Legislature.

MR. H. CARROLL: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Brandon West state his point of privilege.

MR. H. CARROLL: It might have been courteous of the Government House Leader to consult with other members of the House that aren't caucus members in providing services to the Members of the House.

There was no consultation; there was no indication that this was happening. I think it was very discourteous to those of us that aren't in either caucus.

MR. R. DOERN: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member did not have a matter of privilege.

Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . .
Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced Bill No. 5, The Freedom of Information Act; Loi sur la liberté d'accès à l'information.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 70 visitors from the Applied Linguistics Centre under the direction of Mrs. Kalinowsky. The Centre is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

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

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin a series of questions, I wonder if I might table some information and send copies to the Premier, the Minister of Education and the Acting Minister of Culture.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Arts Council - grants

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: In light of the challenge offered the other day by the Minister of Culture that members on this side review the Annual Report of the Manitoba Arts Council, and I can tell him that we did, and found that on page 13, that during the 1983-84 fiscal year that the Arts Council provided grants of \$4,000 and 1,000 respectively to the publishers of the periodicals, Midcontinental and Horizons.

I would ask the Acting Minister of Culture to indicate how many funds have been allocated to these two periodicals in the 1984-85?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, of course, it is expected that I'll have to take this as notice.

Pornographic literature in schools

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the covering letter provided to the Minister of Education just a few moments ago, I ask her when did she review the publication, Midcontinental, and her reasons for allowing the publication to be distributed to Manitoba schools?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any recollection of seeing this material before, so I will take the question of when and under what circumstances it was distributed in the schools as notice.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Education, or any Minister, tell us how many public schools in Manitoba have ordered this publication in response to grants offered by the Minister of Culture for the purpose of introducing this so-called "culture" to our public schools?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Education tell us how this publication containing graphic descriptions of oral sex and gutter language and articles totally demeaning to all humans, can she tell us how she could allow the Minister of Culture to provide grants to public schools to attain this material, supposedly reviewed and recommended by her department?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the member opposite wants a full answer to the questions that he's

raising this morning. By his admission, he tabled this. I have seen it just a few minutes ago, have not had time to read it, have indicated that I do not have any recollection of seeing this material, but I would look into it and provide the information for him. I don't think it's reasonable, having said that, to expect answers to the specific questions he's asking.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, the covering letter indicates the book entitled "Cultural Periodical" has been assigned to recommended grade levels by, it says, the Manitoba Education - I believe it means the Manitoba Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Can he indicate whether his support was sought, and knowing acceptance given, to the institution of a program that offers this type of pornography to our public schools?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, it was not.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to review this publication. In the meantime, I am going to instruct that it not be distributed until I have had an opportunity to properly review it.

MR. C. MANNES: The final question, Mr. Speaker, in view of the comment offered within the Throne Speech that the government will continue to fight pornography, can the Premier tell us how, not one, but two of his Ministers could allow this disgusting material to find its way into our schools at public expense?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Honourable Member for Morris has not accepted the word of a Minister in this House, who indicated very clearly just a few moments ago, that she does not recall having seen the publication in question. I think there is a rule in this House that when a Minister does indeed give his or her word that that word must be accepted in this Chamber.

I've indicated my intent to investigate this and if indeed the allegations that have been made by the Honourable Member for Morris are substantiated, then the appropriate action will be taken.

McKenzie Seeds - progress of board

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

MR. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question I'd like to direct to the Minister of Finance, and ask him if he is satisfied with the progress being made by the board in the operations of McKenzie Seeds?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

Yes, I think the report tabled this morning is one that all Manitobans can take some delight out of; a corporation that was in very serious trouble paid Manitobans approximately \$1 million in interest costs in the last year, and on top of that made a profit. That's a corporation that has assets of about \$4 million and a corporation with those kinds of assets making that kind of pay-back to Manitobans is quite quite significant.

Manitoba Film Classification Board - Home-use Videos

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister.

In view of the announcement that was made by the Minister of Cultural Affairs on Tuesday that stated he wanted to protect our children from pornography, will the First Minister instruct the Minister to have his Classification Board monitor all literary publications supported by the department, to enable him to cut off the funding of the publications, so that this pornography cannot get into our school system and before our children?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite certain of the intent of the question by the member in question . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think at this point, in fairness to all parties, that this matter should be left, before there is any presumptions, with a full investigation that I've undertaken to fulfill. I think that the honourable member's question is in fact supercilious under the circumstances.

Child Abuse Program - Child Protection Centre

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services and it's with regard to the Child Protection Centre, which has operated out of Children's Hospital since September 1981 by Drs. Ferguson and McRae.

Can the Minister inform the House why her department has held up an application for a grant of \$65,000 to expand the Child Abuse Program operated by the Child Protection Centre since August of last year, even though the application, as I understand it, has the support of the Federal Government and the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go into more detail on that during the Estimate's discussion, but in general, in dealing with child abuse, the intention of the department has been to develop a network of services, but we can't centre them all in the immediate medical crisis response to child abuse, but indeed, must develop the capacity on a multi-disciplinary basis

throughout the child and family service system, the police system and indeed the school system where teachers are often the first to become aware of specific problems. Again, our attempt has been to operate at a time when money is scarce to ensure that what money we do spend has the greatest impact and greatest potential to prevent and, of course, treat cases where there is abuse on children.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the alleged concern by this government, stated in the Throne Speech, with respect to protecting victims of child abuse, would the Minister not acknowledge that the purpose of this grant is to hire two social workers to deal with third-party victims of sexual assaults, people who are not presently being treated within the current system? The Child and Family Services treat family members, but they don't treat third-party victims, and these people are going without any treatment whatsoever.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite jumps to the conclusion that the only way and only place for such treatment to occur is out of the hospital unit. As I said, we're interested in trying to build the capacity of the system right across the province to deal with the problem and, therefore, we funnelled most of our money into training and some reallocation of staff to deal with the problem in the general Child and Family Service. However, I do think a more detailed discussion of the role of this centre in the total program of child protection in relation to abuse can more appropriately be dealt with during the Estimates.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that this application by the Child Protection Centre and by Drs. Ferguson and McRae of the Children's Hospital, two internationally recognized experts on child care, that this government is going to turn down this application for \$65,000 to the Core Area Initiative to deal with this problem? Are they going to be turned down flatly and this grant is not going to be approved, even though the Federal Minister of Health, Mr. Epp, and the City of Winnipeg approved the awarding of this grant of \$65,000?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it's not always wise to respond in an ad hoc way to requests for grants. It's more important, particularly in a time of scarce resource - and I'm sure the members opposite would really approve - to attempt to spread the money in the most effective way. What we're trying to develop is a system-wide capacity to deal with the issue of child abuse; the crisis service, the prevention, and the long term follow-up. In that context, it does not always make sense to put the money into a medical clinic.

Chiropractors - fee structure

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

Friday, 15 March, 1985

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year - I believe in January - the Minister of Health broke an agreement with the Manitoba Chiropractic Association, retroactively changing their limit and their fee structure of billing. Can the Minister indicate whether any discussions or negotiations were undertaken by himself or his department with the Manitoba Chiropractic Association prior to that January announcement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Minister of Health never broke an agreement at all. The agreement was between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the chiropractors. I didn't even know about it to be exact. We wanted to stop the discrimination against single people and people of large families, and this inequity was changed.

I asked the Commission to inform the chiropractors; that was done. We waited. The president was notified. Then he informed the Commission that he would meet with his executive. Nothing was done until they met with the executive. He was phoned after the meeting with the executive. He said, fine, that some of them might not agree with it but they had no intention of criticizing or opposing it, because he didn't want to be seen as anti-government. A few days later, I got a letter from him asking me to meet with them within three days. At the time, we were looking at the Estimates, in fact, there was a three-day Cabinet meeting. I told him that I couldn't do it, and could he meet with the deputy minister. They refused.

I later met with them; I explained the situation to them; I invited them to discuss it. I felt that there was very little to discuss on that. It's correcting an anomaly, of course. There was no doubt that the group of chiropractors would not be in favour of something that might cut down on their revenue, there's no doubt about that, but that was something that the government had to do.

Later on, they were invited to present a brief. They reminded me that I was on record as saying that there should be no limit. I acknowledged that. I still feel the same. The situation is that we look at the situation today. They did not come back to negotiate with us, so we did it independently. We looked at what's happening in other provinces. Five of the provinces and two of the territories are not covered at all. Saskatchewan has no limit. The other provinces, Ontario, Alberta and B.C., were somewhat ahead of us. We increased the visits by 50 percent. It'll be — (Interjection) — You wanted an answer, you're getting it. If you don't want it, tell me. I don't have to be accused of breaking agreements with somebody that backed down.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have corrected this anomaly; that will stay. We're going to protect the individual and we are going in the direction of increasing it more. They've commented that we're supposed to cover all health; the dietiticians would like to be covered; the Canadian Nurses Association would have to be covered; the dentists would like to be covered; the physiotherapists would have to be covered. They have a responsibility of getting the best deal for the members of their association, and I have the responsibility of

looking at the complete health care of the people of Manitoba.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister skillfully avoided answering the question when negotiations took place.

I would simply ask the Minister, is the new definition of consultation and negotiation with himself and his government amount to the description of the way the government's action is going to be - take it or leave it?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Consultation is done for a purpose, not to play games. When it's obvious that somebody does not want to take a different route by going, which is their right, to the public, a public campaign, to achieve what they want, and it's obvious that they will, as you see in the newspaper. I could have told the members that, that they would not be satisfied until they get 100 percent. That's their job and their responsibility. I don't think that there's any purpose in negotiating under those kinds of conditions.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am sure that this is a first for a Minister of Health. I was successful in bringing members of the association of the chiropractors to the same table, a lunch that I hosted with some of the members of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and I think that's negotiating that might send us somewhere.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether the association was consulted prior to his announcement yesterday of this increase of five visits per individual?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They were invited to send a brief; that wasn't done. They chose to go a different route and they were consulted at a meeting that I had with them. I know exactly what they want - they want full coverage. You don't have to be a genius - even the Member for Pembina should know that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Can the Minister indicate what the saving will be to the Province of Manitoba of his announcement made yesterday on the new limit and fee schedule to the Manitoba Chiropractic Association?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think the honourable member thinks he's in court and he'll have a yes or no answer.

The situation is this. We've corrected an inequity; by correcting this inequity we saved approximately \$600,000.00. We put back \$300,000 to increase the visits and now we're in line with about the second, with a group of two or three other provinces, we're about second all across Canada in this service and we're proud of it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister indicates there will be a \$300,000 saving to the province in the new limit and fee schedule, can the Minister indicate how many families formerly able to avail themselves of more than 15 visits per individual member of that family, how many families will now have to pay extra money for needed chiropractic service under the newly-imposed limit schedule of the Minister?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Increased limits of visits - the correction should be noted, Mr. Speaker. I probably could get that information for the honourable member, but I won't bother. This is a situation, if we're going to do anything, we'll look on a question of needs, not necessarily because somebody is single that they should be penalized. There's one province that does it this way - of course in Saskatchewan there is no limit so they're out of it - so that leaves nine provinces and two territories. There's one province that does it this way and I think we're in step with all the other Conservative provinces in the Dominion.

Pollution control in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment, given that he hadn't read the report from the Canadian Nature Federation and that his colleague, the former Minister of Natural Resources, was boasting to the media that he was unaware of the Canadian Nature Federation and their 180,000 members. Mr. Speaker, the government was somewhat in the dark.

I wanted to ask the Minister whether he has now received and read the report which gave Manitoba the worst grade on pollution control in Canada and new statistics from Statistics Canada and data from the Canadian Forestry Service?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

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

Mr. Speaker, I haven't read the report in detail at this time, a report which is dated March 14th, which I, through a considerable effort, obtained this morning. From what I have seen of it, Mr. Speaker, I shall say to the author of the report, "E" for effort and I'm generous. The only information in spite of the fact that the author states in his report, on a number of instances, the difficulties he's had in obtaining information, the only request to my department for information came in October, 1984, where he says, "Dear Mr. Minister: Could you please provide information about the provincial legislation and policy governing returnable cans and bottles in Manitoba? Thank you very much. Yours sincerely, Gregg Sheehy." It was promptly responded to by my department at length, Mr. Speaker, and that is the only request received by my department for information in the preparation of his report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the author, the report says that it is in no way indicative of the province's environmental status. He states on Page 3, "All of the evaluation categories use measurable indicators of efforts, dollars, spent on environmental programs, areas of land designated for conservation purposes and presence or absence of environmental laws, etc. We did not attempt to determine the degree to which they were informed in each province, nor did we attempt to categorize them.

"The province's performance of this report card should not be taken as a measure of overall environmental quality."

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order Please, order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: "One cannot be assured of a healthier environment in Ontario and . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I don't believe that the reading of an outside report is the best use of question period. Does the Honourable Minister have a completion of an answer?

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, I did not intend to read the report, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to indicate, as part of my answer, that the report was far from being complete. Now I just want to make reference to two points that the report comments on.

The report makes its own judgment as to whether a province has legislation; whether it enforces it or not is not taken into consideration. Now, it doesn't reflect, in any way, any other approach that the province might have. For instance, in terms of pollution control, it gives credit to provinces who have a major pollution problem and hence have to address it, but gives no credit whatsoever to provinces who have a lesser problem and have to spend less money in that regard or have been spending money throughout the years and therefore don't have the problem.

Nor does it make any difference in per capita spending. If one province spends more money, it gets an "A", and if another province spends five times the per capita money, because that total amount is less, it gets an "F". The province that gets the highest mark for wildlife preservation, for expenditure, for fishing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

We expect questions to be brief, concise and to the point, and we expect answers to them to be also brief, concise and to the point.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, assuming the Minister hasn't taken up the entire question period, I'd just take one part of the report. Since Manitoba is littered with non-returnable bottles and cans every summer which are an eyesore, will the Minister be implementing a policy to clean up this chronic mess?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, as I told to the author of this report, there are a number of measures and policies in existence in Manitoba. There is no legislation, that is true. Perhaps Manitoba will have to consider going to that direction, but in order to do that, Mr. Speaker, we have to have more data than we have now. And currently this department . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: Currently my department, Mr. Speaker, has a study undergoing to obtain that very same information.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister whether he would be prepared to introduce a Returnable

Containers Act, which would clean up the environment, which would also save some of the jobs in the glass-bottle industry, and which would also put Manitoba in step with the other provinces, since there are only two provinces, Newfoundland and ourselves, who do not have such legislation. What's holding him up? All he has to do is go out, Mr. Speaker, and look with his eyes rather than wait for the collection of data.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, in that fuzzy remark and comments made, Sir, I believe there was one question indeed and that was, would he implement legislation? Mr. Speaker, in answer to the previous question, I said there is a report that will be shortly made available, especially in terms of the state of the environment in regards to returnable or non-returnable containers, especially in Northern Manitoba, where the problem seems to be the most pressing as a result, of not only a year's operation, as a result of years and years of neglect in that area. Even the local jurisdictions, frequently perhaps, could be responsible for addressing this issue; but we are indeed presently awaiting a report to tell us exactly what the status is and to give us an indication of possible alternatives in terms of resolving the existing problem.

CEDF Loans - Beef N Reef Restaurant

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's question period, the Member for Sturgeon Creek raised questions in regard to CEDF. I made a statement which I would like to correct.

I have gone back and checked the information on the Beef N Reef Restaurant in Lac du Bonnet and found that the application for the loan was made in October of 1981, although the application was not approved until February of '82. I erred in my statement in the House for this loan when I said that it was approved under the previous administration, and I apologize for that and want to correct that.

Mr. Speaker, in checking the practice of previous Ministers in dealing with questions with CEDF, I found that when there were questions raised that were of a technical nature, the questions were referred to the Standing Committee; and after yesterday's question period, I see the wisdom of that policy and I'll be following that practice.

Mr. Speaker, to answer the honourable member's specific question - his question was dealing with CEDF and when the policy was changed to go outside of Northern Affairs jurisdiction. At that time the policy of the CEDF was that, "The Fund shall consider applications for assistance to establish or expand small or medium-sized economic enterprises provided they are located in the areas which fall within the jurisdiction of Northern Affairs . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . even though they may fall within the latter due to geographic area, enterprises

which receive Special ARDA grant assistance may also be considered; and that policy was passed in August of 1980.

Chiropractors - fee structures

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

Can the Minister of Health indicate whether, under the new imposed limit structures of the Chiropractic Association, that family members will be restricted and not have available to them the number of visits they were accustomed to under the agreement signed by his Executive Director of the Manitoba Health Services Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary. Now a large family, the maximum that they would get, let's say five, six, seven in the family or ten, they would qualify for 306. Now the 10 of them, or the six or the five would qualify for roughly \$150 each.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister did not answer the question whether individual family members will be restricted under his new imposed limit structure.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I've missed the first part of it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, we'll discuss this in Estimates.

In light of the fact we can't get reasonable answers from the Minister of Health, could I ask the First Minister if other Manitobans and groups of Manitobans can be assured that agreements signed and in legal language or language used at the bottom of the letters, the agreements recorded in this letter shall be legally binding on the parties, can the First Minister assure that other groups of Manitobans with agreements with this government, signed in such fashion, will not have those agreements broken retroactively and unilaterally by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first I regret that the Honourable Member for Pembina is performing this way to the Minister of Health, because it's the Minister of Health's birthday today.

Mr. Speaker, the premise of the question from the Honourable Member for Pembina is incorrect. There was no agreement broken, as alleged by the Honourable Member for Pembina, and I would like the Minister of Health to further elaborate on that point to the Member for Pembina.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather unfair to insist in not accepting the explanation that I gave, that the association was contacted on two occasions. They repeated on the same two occasions

that they would go along with it and that was it, and they were informed of that. Furthermore, the agreement that is being referred to was an agreement between the Commission and the associations that I knew nothing about until I was informed later on; and I felt that this was not broken and we've tried - I met with them - and we've tried everything. We discussed this question with them, but the member is stuck on this thing. If he thinks, and especially with what is facing the health system in this province, that we're going to have every delivery of every health service, veto everything the government does - we'll never get anywhere and we'll lose the whole ball of wax if we do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I pose my question to the First Minister, following on the answer by the Minister of Health.

The Minister of Health has indicated he didn't know the existence of this agreement and I'm asking the First Minister if other organizations can expect to have agreements, signed by the government, to be broken unilaterally by members of his Cabinet?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is probably hypothetical, repetitive. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister.

Is the policy of this government, under his leadership, now to break agreements signed and in effect unilaterally?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's not now nor has it ever been the policy of this government.

Petrocan - bulk sales in Manitoba

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba Co-op shareholders, customers, and others are quite concerned today regarding Petrocan's, could I say, heavy-handed attempts to expand its bulk fuel sales into the co-ops in Saskatchewan and it's alleged that they're moving into this province now. I wonder if the Minister or his staff has any knowledge of Petrocan's decision to come in and try and move their bulk sales into this province.

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

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have heard the same rumours and allegations and are currently

checking them out to determine their validity and any impact they might have on the co-operative sector in Manitoba.

I can add to that, that if in fact they are true and if in fact there is a negative impact anticipated, that we would want to very quickly undertake discussions with the co-operative sector here to review this situation and determine what action might be appropriate and what support they might require, if in fact it is problematic for them.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can advise the House and the Co-op shareholders and customers in our province, have you got any meeting scheduled with Federated Co-op or with Petrocan to see what actually is going on.

HON. J. COWAN: I'm sorry, I have to apologize. I missed a portion of the member's question.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I've asked the Minister if he's scheduled any meetings with Federated Co-op or with Petrocan over the weekend or early next week to find out just actually what is taking place.

HON. J. COWAN: No, as I indicated, we've heard the suggestions; we've heard the rumours. We are determining their accuracy now and reviewing the matter and if, in fact, those meetings are necessary, they be called and held on an urgent basis.

Environment in Manitoba - evaluations of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Environment. This is in response to the Canadian Nature Federation's conservation report, A Report on Conservation.

I note that they conclude their report with a welcome and advice from the agencies and governments so that they can better reflect on the state of the environment in the various provinces. Is the Minister willing to respond in detail to their report and thus, as well, assist them in developing criteria so that their evaluations in future annual reports, which they are I understand undertaking to develop, would more accurately reflect the state of the environment in the provinces across the country?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

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

Towards the end of the report there's an indication that Environment Canada intends to proceed with a similar report on an annual basis and that this was to be a preliminary report in order to get to that, or perhaps spur Environment Canada into doing something similar on a yearly basis. Yes indeed, if necessary, we can help them improve their report in future years.

It states that an expanded base will allow us to refine our analysis in the future and we agree. It continues by saying that additions of the report cards will allow us to ensure a more fair and accurate treatment of all

Friday, 15 March, 1985

the agencies involved, and again, we agree. So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can develop, as various provinces of Canada, criteria whereby we can judge the state of our environment. Surely it's not based strictly on the total amount that one province spends.

I know of course that Ontario has the possibility of spending a great deal more, but that does not necessarily state that the environment in Ontario, especially in Southern Ontario, is in any better condition than Manitoba. I, for one, can answer that question, that it isn't.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley and the amendment thereto proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Minister of Business Development has 20 minutes remaining.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to be able to conclude my remarks.

I began yesterday in a somewhat critical vein. It was suggested by members opposite that I was fed bashing; it certainly wasn't my intention to fed bash. I simply wanted to put on the record the fact that the Federal Government, in the course of its very short tenure, a matter of six or so months, has through neglect or intention done a number of things that have been detrimental to the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

My question was, because of the impact, and the impact ranged in the hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of their negative effect and the obvious concern of members' opposite for the economy of the province, why there had not been a more concerted effort, a concerted voice on the part of members opposite to voice their objections to the activities of the Federal Government in terms of their effect on Manitoba's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I outlined those yesterday and they need not be repeated. Let me say, however, that they are substantial and while they may not be concerned about what the impact of what the Federal Government is doing, we certainly are and other Manitobans are.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity in the last month to visit and meet with over 500 small businessmen in the Province of Manitoba and they are critically aware of the actions of the Federal Government; and while members opposite may not be voicing their displeasure, individual businessmen and people in all parts of the province are voicing their concern.

Mr. Speaker, for the remaining time I would like to focus on two different aspects of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's speech in response to the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition had said that the government's sole response to the question of economic development, to the question of economic growth, had been one word and that was Limestone. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite may be

opposed to the orderly development of Limestone. Manitobans, by and large, are not. They recognize that the Limestone project represents the utilization of one of our most important resources, if not the most important resource that we have.

Mr. Speaker, for us to ignore a project that is the largest single development on the North American Continent, in the Throne Speech, would have been folly. For members opposite to downplay the impact of that project on the province is tantamount to neglect of their duty. Mr. Speaker, it is an important project, but the Leader of the Opposition implies that this important project, this mega project is the only leading tool, the only tool that the government is using to spur economic development. He should certainly know better and if he believes that then I suggest that, as others have suggested, that he improve his research capacity.

In the last two years, one of the most obvious tools that we have used is the Jobs Fund. Mr. Speaker, they like to comment that the Jobs Fund was there to create short-term jobs and to make-work jobs. Mr. Speaker, we argue that the contributions made from the Jobs Fund to the creation of community assets created jobs and assets.

It's also incorrect to say that the Jobs Fund was only used to create community assets. Mr. Speaker, there have been and there are a number of other vehicles that the province is using to create economic development. We could talk about the Venture Capital Program which was offered through the Department of Business Development and Tourism. The Venture Capital Program was initiated two years ago; it used approximately \$1 million of capital to spur approximately \$3 million of private investment. That program was increased to \$4 million last year.

Mr. Speaker, I met with the Venture Capital Board, the private sector board which administers, in effect, this program. Mr. Speaker, in less than two years, the Venture Capital Program has created or maintained approximately 650 jobs. That in itself is a mega project; that is a mega project. We have done it by using a vehicle that incorporates risk capital from the private sector, capital from the government, into different ventures in the province. It has been a tremendously successful program, and I say again that those 600 jobs or 650 jobs are in themselves a mega project and it was funded through the Jobs Fund. It was another tool that the government is using to promote economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, in my meetings in Thompson, in Carman, in Brandon, the Venture Capital Program was mentioned and applauded by both the private sector and the councillors and municipal officials that I met with.

The Interest Rate Relief Program, which was pooh-poohed by members opposite, has saved 600 small businesses - 600. Mr. Speaker, that represents another major mega project, in terms of the jobs it has saved for this province. I should say that one of the most interesting things about my feedback from business people, people who had used the Interest Rate Relief Program, was that they not only appreciated the timely assistance, but more importantly they appreciated the counselling, the business management skills that they gained from being involved with the very dedicated and professional consultants that our department employs.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about another weak spot, one that the Member for Sturgeon Creek is fond of

discussing, the weak spot in terms of manufacturing - I'll discuss where manufacturing is going in the province. But we did something in the last Budget, we introduced the manufacturing tax credit. Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Canadian Manufacturers Association only a few days ago, they indicated that that particular incentive had been invaluable, that it had been used and it was creating jobs for Manitoba. So, we are aware that there are a number of vehicles that we can use to promote economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Budget as well, the payroll tax was removed, the health and post-secondary education tax levy was removed from 67 percent of the businesses. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology is using the Jobs Fund, using public funds to invest in new companies and to promote the growth of the movement of companies from other parts of the countries, other countries of the world, to create jobs in Manitoba. I know that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology has already announced in this House, continuing agreements to promote the growth of our economic base.

Mr. Speaker, the development of the InfoTech Centre - the contributions that are coming from some of the major computer hardware and software developers in the world are now investing in the Province of Manitoba. We have IBM, we have Burroughs, and we have Sperry. Mr. Speaker, those are significant developments, developments in an area that we all acknowledge, I think, is the wave of the future.

Mr. Speaker, programs like Careerstart and the Jobs-In-Training Program offered by the Department of Employment Services are supportive of small business and they are recognized as being supportive. They have created jobs for students and young people.

So, Mr. Speaker, the government is not using Limestone as its only initiative. It is a major one, but there have been and there will be others. Mr. Speaker, we could talk about the Housing Program. Over the last two or three years, 6,000-7,000 jobs have been created at the same time as we create tremendous spin-off benefits in the suppliers and the building material suppliers throughout the province.

We had another announcement today which I know, and I think members opposite know, is going to be a tremendous spur to the creation of employment and to the growth of our economy as a province.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk about the agricultural incentives, the agricultural initiatives, that have been taken by the Minister of Agriculture, all of which have been designed to promote the growth, the development, the stabilization of the agriculture sector.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur, the previous Minister of Agriculture, had four years in which he twiddled his thumbs while the farming community went from disaster to disaster. He decimated the Beef Stabilization Program which could have, which should have been a factor in maintaining the packing plant industries in Manitoba. Instead, we saw two of them disappear. What we have now is a consolidation occurring from places like - I think it's Calgary or Edmonton to Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, all of these initiatives combine to lead everyone to one inescapable conclusion. The reason that we have the lowest unemployment rate year-over-year in the Province of Manitoba is because we have done things; because we

have taken the initiative; because we have been creative; because we have been prepared to invest in Manitoba. We've invested, as I've said, in a number of vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, the doom and gloom that's promoted by members opposite is frustrating, of course, on this side. I suppose it's even more frustrating because it isn't supported by any kind of factual base. My colleague, the Minister of Finance, put it on the record, I think, in a clear and concise way, the fact that in comparative terms - the Member for Tuxedo, the Leader of the Opposition, in his juvenile analysis says what about how it was doing in 1981. Mr. Speaker, anyone with half a mind - and I give the Member for Tuxedo credit, I think he has half a mind - know that the only fair way to do that kind of analysis is on a comparative basis. Where are the other provinces?

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rossmere, the Minister of Finance, indicated where we stand, indicated which government has done the best job in relative terms of creating an atmosphere that will enhance investment. He put on the record the fact that the period from 1978-81 was not all roses, that Manitoba was actually doing poorly in comparative terms. He also put on the record the fact that from 1982-85, the province has done remarkably well in comparative terms. We have a nice comparison - a term when the Conservative Government was in power in the Province of Manitoba and there were the majority of other Conservative Governments, and their government was incompetent; their government has a dismal record in comparison to other governments - then we have a change, and from 1982-1985, we have a government whose record is second to none.

Mr. Speaker, the government isn't going to rest on its laurels, which I clearly outlined. There are a lot of other things that need to be done. In my department, in the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, in the Department of Employment Services, there will be things done. We're not going to sit and twiddle our thumbs. We're not going to adopt a "look, ma, no hands approach" to government. Mr. Speaker, we are going to do things.

Mr. Speaker, we are able to do things. Mr. Speaker, whether members opposite like to believe it or not, whether they like to join with some of the nay sayers in the province, some of the nattering nabobs of negativism, there are things happening in this province. Whether you like to believe it, groups like the Manitoba Homebuilders Association and other groups who are investing in the Province of Manitoba support the things that we're doing.

Mr. Speaker, one of the areas that has caused me a good deal of concern, and probably one of the most legitimate concerns that has been raised by members opposite and by the Leader of the Opposition, is the question of confidence, the question of creating that kind of climate, that optimistic climate, that climate of confidence that's required to build Manitoba. They talk about it a lot.

The question is, Mr. Speaker, how do you define that confidence? It's easy to say to say, well, the business community has no confidence. I'm a social scientist and I want to quantify that lack of confidence. How do I quantify it? I only have a number of tools at my disposal, a number of ways to quantify that lack of confidence. One of the ways to quantify confidence,

obviously, is the willingness to invest. I've already said that under the Venture Capital Program, we are having no trouble finding Manitobans who are willing to invest in Manitoba ventures. We have a mega project on our hands in that program alone.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Tuxedo sat in his seat and he chirped and chirped about the fact that the Conference Board was negative. Well, Mr. Speaker, March 13th, Statistics Canada says total in capital investment is going to grow in Manitoba by 11.4 percent; capital investment in manufacturing is going to grow by 21.6 percent; private capital investment is going to grow by 8.3 percent; public capital investment is also going to grow, showing our confidence in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of total capital investment, a measure of confidence, the confidence that people have in the Province of Manitoba, we have the largest increase shown by any province.

So, where is the confidence question? It's there in dollars and cents. The people of Manitoba are putting money where their mouth is, not like some members opposite who preach doom and gloom but don't know the facts.

Mr. Speaker, one of the favourite targets of the Member for Sturgeon Creek has been manufacturing and I give him credit. Manufacturing has been a weakness, but not in the last three years. Manufacturing has been a weakness, has been declining in terms of real investment in Manitoba since 1972. Mr. Speaker, there has been a decline. We recognized that and we said we're going to do something about it. We did something about it, Mr. Speaker, through the tax system, providing the tax credit system.

For the information of the Member for Sturgeon Creek, this is the second consecutive year, Mr. Speaker, this is the second consecutive year that manufacturing investment has shown significant increase. We have the fourth highest increase of any province in Canada this coming year projected by Statistics Canada. Mr. Speaker, the member is shaking his head — (Interjection) — shipments, we're talking about investments, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's only if we invest are we ever going to ship it. So, Mr. Speaker, if we look at some kind of objective criteria of what of whether the business people in this province have confidence, we have to answer, yes they do.

Mr. Speaker, another measure of confidence obviously has to be the question of whether businesses are relatively doing better, whether corporations are paying more tax and the answer is, they are. Mr. Speaker, bankruptcies according to the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs are down 22.8 percent, the second consecutive year when there's been a marked drop.

Mr. Speaker, we have to move on to go beyond investment. There are other indicators of confidence, why people should be confident, an indication of whether they are. Certainly the population increase, people don't come to a province because they don't have any confidence. We've had the largest population increases in decades.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing our population expand. Mr. Speaker, we have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the opinion of

members opposite and we are tremendously conscious of the sensitivity of raising taxes, we are in the middle of the road. We are not alone with our payroll tax or its equivalent. Mr. Speaker, I have a tremendous response when I sit down with businesses and I explain the truth to them. When I put on the record the fact that we are not "leading the pack" in terms of taxes, that we are in the middle of the road, Mr. Speaker, there is some appreciation for the fact that we're conscious of it and it's important that we remain conscious of it.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of businesses incorporated in 1984, over 8,500 in the last three years - Is that a lack of confidence? - Mr. Speaker, 2,500 in 1984. Mr. Speaker, labour relations - is that not a measure of the confidence? Mr. Speaker, other than Prince Edward Island, we had the lowest number of days lost of any province in Canada. Prince Edward Island has a population of 20 percent of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, and over our three years the labour relations climate has never been better, and the "doom and gloom" sayers who say that this labour relations amendments are disruptive, the increases to minimum wage are disruptive, is nonsense, patent nonsense. Mr. Speaker, the figures, the facts don't bear them out. They don't bear them out on any kind of objective assessment. They don't bear them out by the population coming to Manitoba or the investment of the private sector in Manitoba, or the history that we have had in terms of labour peace.

Mr. Speaker, we're not prepared to say, in their terms, that we're abandoning working people in this province. We believe that we have created a relatively harmonious relationship between labour and management. We know that statistically and factually people are investing in Manitoba and we're not abandoning working people. There is a rule for government to play in ensuring that working people have a fair deal and that business investors have a fair deal, and we've found the fine balance, nay sayers not to the contrary, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say the facts are on our side, history is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Minister's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like, Mr. Speaker, to wish you well in your capacity as Speaker for what we all expect will be the final year of this government's term.

I'd also like to offer my congratulations to the Member for Fort Garry who has newly joined us. We're looking forward with confidence to his contribution to the debates of this House.

I'd also like to congratulate the Member for The Pas who has been elevated to the rank of Cabinet Minister. He has demonstrated yesterday and today that he is both fallible and an honourable man in his apology to this House. He may not be too comfortable where he is.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to offer my sympathy and best wishes to the Member for Kildonan, the former

Minister of Labour, as she wages her personal fight against cancer. We miss her presence very much and wish her well.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981, the New Democratic Party were elected to office on the slogan, "A great people, a great future, Manitoba and the NDP." They swept into office, Mr. Speaker, with flags flying, a confident group of Social Democrats pledged to turn the economy around. They were going to turn the economy around with their interventionist approach to economic management. Well, let's look, Mr. Speaker, at the great future promised by the NDP and compare that great future with what has actually happened, because I would not want them to be judged by any other standards than their own.

One of the first promises of the great future that that government made, Mr. Speaker, was jobs, not welfare. Three years to the month after that government was elected, there were 15,000 more unemployed in this province. Mr. Speaker, there were only 11,000 more people employed. Within only two years after being elected, and I only use two years because these are the most recent statistics available, the numbers of people drawing unemployment insurance in this province had risen to 40,135 from 20,439. In two years, a doubling of the number of people on unemployment insurance. Mr. Speaker, the number of people on welfare, the amount of money paid in welfare in only two years went up by 43 percent, over \$50 million more paid in welfare. Jobs, not welfare, that was the great future that this NDP group promised to the people of Manitoba. They promised no business, no home, no farm, would be lost as a consequence of high interest rate.

What do we have, Mr. Speaker, three years after this government is elected? We have record numbers of farm bankruptcies, business bankruptcies, mortgage foreclosures. That wasn't the great future that they promised to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. They promised to turn the economy around in this great future and they took an economy that was growing at 4.7 percent in 1981 that ranked third in Canada, that was above the national average and they've taken it to the point where in 1985, it's predicted to be growing by the Conference Board at 1.6 percent, tied for dead last with Prince Edward Island and below the Canadian average, and that, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the government has their illusory Jobs Fund and despite the fact that they intend to proceed with the construction of Limestone. Those factors are in the projection, Mr. Speaker. That's the great future of turning the economy around that the people of Manitoba have received from this government.

They said that they wouldn't be dependent on multinationals for the economic development of this province. Not only do they continue to negotiate with Alcan, but they rushed to embrace Alcoa. They rushed to embrace that huge multinational corporation, Alcoa, to try and bring them to this province for economic development. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, we find this government trying to bribe, trying to buy - I shouldn't use the term "bribe" - trying to bring the multinational Pratt and Whitney to Manitoba, with the offer of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. But they said that they wouldn't be beholden. They wouldn't use multinationals. They wouldn't depend upon multinationals for the development of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, their sole hope for re-election lies with the construction of Limestone. How ironic it is that the First Minister, when he was interviewed and reported in the December 19th, 1981 issue of the Financial Post, he was asked, "Is a new generating station at Limestone contingent on these other projects such as the Alcan Smelter"? He said, "No, it's not. We must not become dependent on decision-makers outside this province," and the major plank, the major possibility, the major hope for this government's re-election, Mr. Speaker, hinges upon a deal with a huge and profitable energy company in the United States, Northern States Power, that made \$183 million worth of profit in 1983.

Where does that leave the First Minister's commitments? Mr. Speaker, the government, the NDP promised the people of Manitoba they would not be dictated to by the moneylenders in New York and Zurich, and what do we find? We find today a government fighting to preserve their credit rating from a second lowering, Mr. Speaker, and we find them imposing economic policies in which they do not believe. Talk about being beholden to the moneylenders in New York and Zurich, because this government has been forced to change their entire approach to government.

Let me give you a further quotation, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that this is precisely what the government has been forced to do by the moneylenders is to change their policies, because when the First Minister was reported in the Globe and Mail on December 31st, 1981, he said and this is a quotation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a quotation from the First Minister, "I believe the policies of restraint are worsening the debt and if we are going to try to reduce the debt, we must move away from acute protracted restraint." That's what he believed, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He said he wouldn't be beholden to the moneylenders and today they're grovelling in New York in front of the moneylenders to try and save the credit rating of this province and they're being forced to implement economic policies in which they don't believe.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP said that they would encourage small business and what have they done for small business? They've raised the payroll tax, Mr. Deputy Speaker; they've raised the sales tax; they've raised Workers' Compensation costs by up to 60 percent; they've imposed labour legislation that makes it much more difficult for a small business to operate; and they've raised the pension costs to small businesses. Those are the kinds of things they've done to help small business. That's the great future that was promised. That's the great future that's come about and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they said they wanted to be prudent fiscal managers.

Once again, in the Editorial Page of the Financial Post from December 19th, 1981, there's a picture of the Premier, smiling, and it says below, "Pawley Wants to Show NDP are Good Managers." He wants to show the NDP are good managers. Well, he established quite a challenge for himself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and what have they done? What have these good managers done? They have doubled the direct debt of this province for direct government programming in just three years. In the entire history of this province, the debt for direct government programs came to \$1.334 billion and in their first three years, they will have more than doubled it.

We will have had the credit rating reduced at least once, hopefully not twice, but that's a threat. This government has seen spending increases go up by 42 percent, while the economy was growing by 24 percent. Was that the great future, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the NDP promised the people of Manitoba? Were those the good managers that the Premier talked about?

They said they would restore the health care system and social services. This was part of the promise of the great future - Manitoba and the NDP - and under the management of this government, Mr. Speaker, the waiting period for elective surgery in major hospitals in this province has gone from weeks to months, and sadly, people are dying because of the fact that they are not able to get the health care that's needed, when they need it.

They took support for the Child Related Income Program away from approximately 1,000 families in this province. A year ago the Minister of Economic Security - or whatever he is - the Member for Brandon East, stood in this House and said that the level of services under that program would be maintained and within months 1,000 people had been cut from the rolls of that program. Was that part of the great future that the NDP promised the people of Manitoba in 1981?

They have been reduced to the situation where we had the Minister of Education having to go out and organize to get donations of clothing for kids who don't have parkas in this city. Is that the great future that the NDP promised the people in 1981?

They said they would ease the property taxes. They would ease the burden of property taxes, and what's happened? The property taxes in the City of Winnipeg on the average have gone up by 40 percent already and they're going up further again this year. Another example of the great future under the NDP.

They said they would preserve rural communities. They even had a special paragraph in an election document dealing with that, which I'd like to read into the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He said, "Bring in a package of policies designed to make sure that people in small communities have the kind of access to government services that people in larger centres have. Our villages and towns must be preserved." And what did they do? Immediately, on coming into office, they stopped the decentralization of people in the Department of Natural Resources who were going to be moved to Steinbach to be in the same area with the people that they serve. No, they stopped that decentralization, Mr. Speaker, and then what did they do?

They have shut down the Land Titles Office in Boissevain, a service that's been in that area for over 100 years. It's been in Boissevain since 1903. They did that without a word of consultation, without a word of consultation with the local government authorities. That's the equivalent of over 2,000 jobs in the City of Winnipeg, without a word, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they did it. And they said that they would listen, above all, they said that they would listen to the people and what's happening today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is they're not listening, they're not talking. They didn't consult with the people in Boissevain before they shut the Land Titles Office. They weren't listening to the people of Manitoba over the French language issue. All that they hear, all that this government hears is what they want to hear.

I've talked to people who have consulted with the Minister of Finance as he goes around the province trying to convince them that what he's going to do is right. I've talked to people who have spoken with him and his mind is closed to everything, except what he wants to hear. And just as that led to the defeat of Schreyer's Government in 1977, it's going to contribute to the defeat of this government as well.

That's the great future that the NDP promised to the people of Manitoba and that's what the NDP has delivered in three years. That's the great future and the thing they didn't tell us, that they didn't tell the people of Manitoba in 1981 was that they wouldn't be able to govern because of Ronald Reagan and high interest rates and the Federal Government; and we hear them today, or in recent days in this Throne Speech Debate, stand and say their hands are tied because of these things that are happening over which they have no control. They didn't tell the people that in 1981; they didn't tell them that at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have before us a government today that has failed on every major economic promise that they made to the people of Manitoba and on most of their other promises as well. Some of the areas where one could say they've had some success are those where they have been able to impose their will on other people at the expense of other people. It hasn't been the kind of program that the government had to implement on its own through its own good fiscal and economic management.

We have before us a government that has confronted its people as no government in the history of this province has ever confronted its people before, and that of course has to do with respect with to the language question that was handled so badly by this government.

We have a government that has abandoned its discredited socialist economic theories. They came into government full of great expectations. The First Minister appointed the Member for Osborne to be Minister of Economic Development and she came into this House and she came into committees and she travelled around this province and she outlined the socialist economic theories of this province; she likened their management to a scrub football game with the government being the quarterback, as the way they saw the economy in the province working.

Within a couple of years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of course the First Minister removed the Member for Osborne as Minister in charge of Economic Affairs in this province. That was one of the first indications of their recognition of the failure of these discredited socialist economic policies; and since that time we have witnessed some extremely interesting reversals on the part of this government, some of them large and some of them small; such things as offering millions and millions of dollars to multinational corporations to come and locate here in Manitoba, but perhaps the most interesting ones are on the other end of the scale, things that the former Minister of Natural Resources did when he finally realized that when the public sector couldn't afford to do something, turn to the private sector.

When they couldn't afford the cost of maintaining roadside parks, the former Minister of Natural Resources turned to the private sector, but did they

do that for the security in this building, Mr. Deputy Speaker? No, they didn't. They knew it was going to be cheaper, they knew it was going to cost a couple of million dollars more to have those people incorporated under the government payroll but they did it nevertheless; but that was in their early days. Since that time, they've obviously had a reversal of their thinking with respect to what they can do and how the economy of this province functions.

We had a government that, when they came into power, believed that they were in charge of events; they had their idealistic goals of where they intended to go and what has happened, after three years, is that we have a government that has lost control of events. Far from being in control of what's happening, we have a government that is being buffeted and being swept along on the tide of events, on the tide of problems and they are grasping at anything that might be of some assistance to them to stay alive. A government that has reached that condition is a government that has lost its mandate to govern. They have lost their mandate to govern; they are directionless and of course the consequences of that, we're all aware of.

What we have here today is not a brave band of idealistic social democrats embarked on trying to improve the economic and human condition, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What we have instead is a disorganized gaggle of socialists interested in one thing only and that is the retention of power. Those high ideals that this group held when they came into power are gone. What they are interested in now is holding on to power and, to that end, they are prepared to engage in a duplicitous campaign of propaganda and Orwellian doublespeak, aided and abetted by a cadre of socialist hacks who have been inflicted upon an otherwise competent and caring Civil Service. They are prepared to pick the taxpayers' pockets to try and convince them through the use of propaganda that indeed this is a great future that we have, despite what the facts would indicate; because in two years only they've added 124 new image polishers to the staff of the government; they have raised the budget for advertising from \$2,797,000 in 1981 to \$4,757,000 in '84 and we know it's going through the roof from here, because last December, for the year we're in, they voted themselves another \$590,000 for advertising. This wasn't for kids' parkas; this wasn't increased social allowances. This was for advertising, image advertising.

This, from this pack of incompetents who, when they first came to power, stopped Alcan from advertising in Manitoba; they stopped them from advertising. They know how vital advertising can be. They recognized it right then and they didn't want Alcan to have a good image in Manitoba and so they stopped them, but they're prepared to spend millions of the taxpayers' money now to promote their own image.

Let me provide you with some examples of the doublespeak and double dealing that this government is engaging in. Let's deal first of all with the financial statements of this province. This Minister of Finance has brought the province to the brink of financial disaster, financial crisis, and what's his response to it? He cooks the books; he changes the books so that the Provincial Auditor, who is a servant of this Legislature, will no longer approve of the bookkeeping of this Minister of Finance. What response do we get from

the Minister of Finance? He says, I don't keep the books for an accountant; I keep them for the people. Well, he keeps two sets of books; he keeps two sets of books. That's what this Minister of Finance does. That accountant that he speaks so demeaningly of happens to represent the people of this Legislature and the people of this province. So, the one set of books that the Minister of Finance keeps, he tells the people of Manitoba the deficit really isn't that large because we're buying a lot of assets, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it's really not that important, but that isn't what he tells the money lenders.

When he went to Europe to try and borrow some German Deutsche Marks, he didn't try and peddle those cooked books to them. In March of 1984 — (Interjection) — No, no, that's where they tell the truth because it's not influenced by the political agenda of the Minister of Finance and his government. That's the duplicity, that's the double dealing that we get from this government. A classic example of the doublespeak.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Education called a press conference awhile ago and said that the government was going to move towards 90 percent funding of education, raised the expectations of the public again. A couple of weeks later, what does she do? She comes out with an announcement that funding to Education is going up 2 percent, less than half the rate of inflation. Tell the people that you're going to raise it. Tell them that you're going to move to 90 percent funding and go exactly the opposite way. That's doublespeak.

The other thing, another example. The Minister of Agriculture calls upon the private sector, the credit unions, the banks, the federal farm credit. He says lower the interest rates to 8 percent. What's he doing? The exact same day as he's calling on them to lower the interest rate to 8 percent, his own agency is sending out letters to the people of Manitoba saying that they're going to raise their interest rates to 13 percent, Mr. Speaker. That's doublespeak, that's duplicity.

If he had really wanted . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Order please, order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . to get co-operation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from those banks and from those credit unions and from those other lending agencies, the Federal Government, and the other provinces, he would have put his money on the line first of all. He would have said, we are going ahead, we are going to reduce our interest rates to 8 percent in MACC. Now, won't the rest of you come and sit down and talk about what we can do for this broader problem that members on this side of the House have been talking about for years.

I stood up in the supplementary supply bill debate two years ago and warned the Minister about this. That's the way he could have gained the confidence and respect. Instead, of course, his credibility was blown and what they have tried to do now is salvage that credibility with the expenditure of \$6 million but, unfortunately, he has lost the opportunity to gain wider co-operation.

A further example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the doublespeak and double dealing of this government -

the Minister of Energy and other members of this government travel around this province and speak consistently of a \$1.7 billion profit that's going to be made from Manitoba Hydro. Aside from all the considerations of whether or not capital costs are involved, let's just look at what that \$1.7 billion is. It's not really \$1.7 billion, not in the terms that people would speak of it today. It's \$402 million in 1982 dollars. It's not \$1.7 billion.

Do you know what the deficit of this province will be in 2005, if you make the exact same assumptions as they've made with respect to that profit, and that it doesn't change because of increasing or decreasing revenues? Just on inflation alone, the deficit will be \$2 billion 63 million by the time they get this so-called \$1.7 billion profit. That's the kind of double dealing and doublespeak that's being used to try and hoodwink the people of this province.

A further example of the two-bookkeeping system and the duplicity, is that they try and tell the people of Manitoba now that they're going to take the profits from Manitoba Hydro and use it to maintain services in Manitoba. That can be the subject of a whole debate itself, but just the fact that they're telling the people of Manitoba that, once again, as my former Leader would say, as they go rattling their tin cup in New York, Zurich, and Germany, they're telling the lenders that the profits from Crown corporations, the profits from Hydro go to Hydro to service the debt, Hydro. When they borrow money that is going to help build the assets of Hydro, and they tell those lenders that the profits are going to help to service that debt, then they'd better go to help them service that debt or this credit rating won't have seen anywhere near the bottom yet.

Then, the ultimate - what's left? The ultimate admission of this group of people across the way, the ultimate admission of their defeat, that their record will not stand on its own, is that they are once again resorting to their time-honoured base tactic of spreading fear through the hidden agenda theme that they have used so successfully in the past. There is nothing in the record of that government that will lead to their being re-elected. There is nothing that this government has done . . .

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Waiding: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . or holds as policy that the people of this province need fear, so what they do is go and talk about the hidden agenda. We know all about that. Ask the Member for Ste. Rose what the people in the senior citizen's home in Ste. Rose were told during the last election, the people on the Indian Reserves were told during the last election. That's the tactic that the Member for Thompson and his colleagues intend to resort to. They will be telling the people what they want to tell them about the horrid things that those Tories are going to do, because they will not be able to campaign on their own record, because their own record is dismal. They went there once - NDP, great people, great future, Manitoba and the NDP. It worked once, now what are they going to do? They have nothing positive to offer to the people of Manitoba. What we have seen from the Member for Thompson is the kind of tactics they are now going to resort to.

We'll tell the people what we're going to do as we move up to the election, as we go into the election, Mr. Speaker. We'll tell the people what we're going to do. When we come back into this House as government, we will deliver on what we're going to do. We will not tell the public one thing and do another. We will not engage in duplicity, and doublespeak, and double dealing, such as this government has done to hoodwink the people of the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, my position is that this government has lost its mandate. This government has simply lost its mandate; they are adrift; they are being buffeted by events; they admit themselves that they are unable to govern because of outside influences. Their record of performance is dismal, there is really only one option open for a government that has lost its mandate, and that is, Mr. Speaker, they should go to the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me congratulate the Member for Fort Garry. I believe that he will serve his constituents well, albeit in a lost cause. I note that he worked at one time for the Department of the Attorney-General; so did the Minister of Finance when the Premier was the Attorney-General. We still can't figure out whether making him Minister of Finance was reward or punishment.

I'd like to also congratulate the Member for The Pas. He had quite a baptism of fire this week, his first question period, which he came out of very well. But earlier in the week he, together with myself, attended a meeting of Ministers of Justice, Attorneys-General, on aboriginal rights in Toronto, together with the Minister of Justice for Canada and the Minister for Indian and Northern Development, and there he encountered, for the first time I believe, at least in that number, a number of senior Tory politicians across this country and he said to me, they seem so different, this lot, from ours. They're so sensible. And of course, he was right, they are different. There is the difference between night and day between the kind of Conservatives that you see, some of them in the leadership of the Federal Government, some of them in portfolios across this country who approach problems logically, who are well-researched, who attempt to define public policy in decent terms. Compared to that bunch across the floor of this House, there is a difference between night and day.

And congratulations to you, Sir. Welcome back for yet another season. I suppose had you known when you were appointed Speaker what you now know, you would have asked for danger pay. It certainly seems to me in this House it's a requisite and if I were serving on the Legislative Management Committee, I might even suggest that.

And to the Assistant Clerk, again, welcome, as others have done. Good luck. I regret to advise you that in this Chamber, what you see is what you get. — (Interjection) — Well, not always, that's true. Not always.

Mr. Speaker, listening, as I have done over the last few days, reading, because I was away for the first couple of days, the various contributions in the debate on the Throne Speech, and rising to speak to it, I do so partly in sorrow and partly in anger. Sorrow and

genuinely so, because the magnificent effort which ordinary Manitobans, working together with their government, have made to overcome the worst effects of the recession, has been the subject of carping criticism based on inadequate research or no research, the subject of monumental doom and gloom.

In anger, Sir, because as a Manitoban, I for one am proud of our province; I'm proud of its achievements; I'm proud of its people and, yes, proud of its government and its vision and its work for social justice. And like most Manitobans to whom I speak, I'm angered when the Leader of the Opposition can do little better than catalogue closures, counting them like so many steps on the way to the political heaven about which he dreams in vain. What a testament of doom, what a testament of political failure, when that's all he can do. The Member for Thompson did us a service, doing the kind of research which he can do so well, when he pointed out that in approximately 135 paragraphs in that speech by the Leader of the Opposition, 105 or 110 of them were completely negative. And that was his whole approach. He dreams in vain of that political heaven to which he aspires, because I can tell him and his colleagues now, that the ordinary people of Manitoba who are proud of their province and who feel good about their province, don't need and don't want his counsel of despair.

Sir, I'm angry for another reason, a personal reason about which I must say a few words. It deserves no more. On Tuesday, when I was absent from the House, and it's usually done in that way and compounds the felony, the Member for Sturgeon Creek chose to accuse me - and it's on the record - of an impropriety, he chose to drag in a family member, that's the lowest of the low, and Sir, what is even worse, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, in order to lend credit to a palpable falsehood, stated to this House and to all his colleagues on both sides of the House that "a record of a payment," and I quote his words, "to a close relative of the Attorney-General in connection with the Somerville-Belkin case could be found in the Public Accounts". He told this House that, that palpable falsehood, knowing as he must have known, or at least being reckless about the means of knowledge which was available to him, that there was no such record, because there was no such payment, and there was no such payment because there was no such retainer, knowing as he must have known. He not only attacked me, but he chose to drag in a member of my family.

For the record, Sir, the outside counsel retained by myself at the time when we were looking at the legal problems engendered by that same Member for Sturgeon Creek and his careless handling of the province's affairs, we retained Ray Taylor, Q.C. of the firm, Taylor, Brazzell and McCaffrey, and we received advice from Brian Squair, Q.C., of our own department. That is the legal advice upon which we relied in coming to a judgment in a matter which is now before the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I will say no more about that sordid event than this. I knew full well when I ran for office that, when elected - and I knew I would be elected, I know I'll be elected again - that I was moving into a fishbowl. But I was naive enough to think that decent people did not attack their political opponents through their families. Well, I suppose that still is true of decent people.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wolseley, in her very fine speech in moving acceptance of the Throne Speech, dealt in part with equality issues, particularly, but not exclusively as they touched on the problems of women in our society. It may seem like gilding the lily to address in part some of the concerns that she did, but I do want to touch on some of these matters from the perspective of the Attorney-General.

In the Throne Speech, we dealt with some of the policies that have been put in place by my department with respect to the prosecution of spousal abuse, with respect to the prosecution of obscenity, and in the policy directive that I issued on the latter of those policies dealing with legal obscenity, I said, in appropriate cases, particularly where material alleged to be obscene concentrates on sexual violence and human degradation, the Crown will proceed by way of indictment, and I said that those who peddle pornography do so at their own risk. And I note, Sir, that when we announced our policy with respect to the classification of videotapes, some video distributors were saying, well, we don't know what's in these tapes or we don't know what the guidelines are, would you please tell us. More and more, Sir, Canadian courts are making a clear and well-understood distinction between erotica on the one hand, about which there is a considerable level of tolerance in our society - whether that's good or bad is another question - and the exploitation of sexual violence, of dehumanizing material of that kind.

And I say it is not difficult for the distributors to make that same distinction, and in entering into that business and seeking to profit on the distribution of that kind of material, they have the duty to ascertain what the law is, and to follow the law. We will not become censors. The reason why we will not is that to do so is to put that kind of judgment into the hands of political appointees. We believe in the integrity of the courts, in the ability of the courts to develop the kind of legal standards to assess the levels of community tolerance and to make judgments in that way. An independent judiciary is best suited to deal with a sensitive area such as this and it ought not to be left to political appointees to censor. So we reject that approach, but we do say that we will enforce the criminal law vigorously in this area. We do say to those who are in the business, you are so at your risk and you must take care.

Incidentally, Sir, statistically, the number of charges laid in the City of Winnipeg under the obscenity provisions of the Criminal Code - in 1982, there were 10; in 1983, there were 20; in 1984, there were 100. We are doing more than talking about it; we are acting.

With respect, Sir, to spousal abuse - members are aware of government policy announced early in 1983, while the implementation of that policy is not free from difficulty, in my judgment, it has been an outstanding success, combining as it does, Sir, a prosecutorial policy which removes the onus for laying charges from the victim to the police; combines that with a network of support services including safe houses to which abused women can turn in their hour of need.

Again, some statistics with respect to this, Sir. In 1984 the Winnipeg Police Department and the RCMP combined, laid over 1,662 charges under that policy. The RCMP, for example, attended 891 calls, laid 699 charges, obtained 373 convictions. The policy, as I say,

Friday, 15 March, 1985

is not free from imperfection. There are more things to be done; there are counselling services to be provided, but it is working.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to both obscenity and spousal abuse, women are the primary victims. But on a much wider scale, they are the primary victims of a great deal of social and economic justice. In the Speech from the Throne, we announced a number of programs to continue our efforts to deal with this injustice, particularly as those efforts in this Session will relate to implementation of the requirements of Section 15 of the Charter, which comes into force on April 17, 1985, and with respect to moving forward on pay equity.

Our commitment to fulfill the mandate of the Charter is more than a vague promise, more than the publication of glossies such as the Federal Government indulged in, and the Government of Saskatchewan - expensive publications - here's what we're thinking about doing. We have acted and we were the first to act. We had a study commissioned in 1982 under Professor Gibson of the Law School and we immediately began to act on some of the recommendations.

In 1982 we passed in this House an Equality of Status Act, for example, in which we abolished a number of antiquated court actions which treated women as though they were the property either of their husbands or their parents. Those were abolished. In 1984 - and here I'm dealing with a very significant piece of legislation - we passed the Pension Benefits Act which came into force on January 1, 1985. Under that act, no pension plan shall provide or permit a rate, a pension or options with a sex differential, or exclude anyone from a pension plan on the basis of sex. We lead the country in that respect. It has become another shining example of Manitoba's leadership with respect to family legislation, with respect to equality legislation - another reason, I say, to be proud to be a Manitoban, another reason to reject the kind of carping criticism that we heard throughout this week.

In this Session, Sir, we will introduce a charter compliance bill which, among other things, will deal with problems raised by - I should say, opportunities created by - Section 8 of the Charter with its prohibition of unreasonable search and seizure and by Section 15, the equality rights section.

But most important, we will be bringing in significant legislation with respect to pay equity. Now the Leader of the Opposition spoke about pay equity. He chastised us for not supporting, and I quote, "equal pay for work of equal value." First of all, two observations about that - first of all, that's what pay equity means. Pay equity means equal pay for work of equal value - that's what it is designed to achieve. Secondly, to the extent that what he said seemed to be - and it certainly sounded like - support for pay equity, I say, welcome aboard. Mind you, I'm not sure that the Leader of the Opposition fully realized what he was supporting, but that of course would be characteristic of him. I raise this question, and I want it on the record, whether or not the Leader of the Opposition is in the House, and that is, will his apparent commitment to pay equity persist after Keith Godden of the Chamber of Commerce gets ahold of him? I doubt it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, his speech really did show remarkable confusion on his part. Page 41 of Hansard for Monday, March 11, 1985 from the speech of the

Leader of the Opposition in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I quote in part, "Mr. Speaker, pay equity is a cop-out on the part of this government. It's not a commitment to equal pay for work of equal value; it's not a commitment to employment equality." Well, first of all, let me repeat that phrase from that quotation when he said "it's not a commitment to employment equality." Mr. Speaker, employment equality is of course not the same thing at all as pay equity. Employment equality deals with hiring practices; pay equity deals with pay practices. So it's clear he doesn't even know what he's talking about. Employment equality or equity deals with affirmative action and hiring practices.

Now, again, let me welcome his support to the extent that that was support for affirmative action. But last night the Member for Niakwa bitterly attacked affirmative action in this House. Don't they discuss these matters in their caucus? What do they discuss in their caucus? You know, who ordered what topping on the pizza? Here you have the Leader of the Opposition - let me underline it - saying in effect that he supports affirmative action in employment, because he talked about employment equity. He even quoted Judge Rosie Abella and her report on that and said, here, we support that. Then the Member for Niakwa stands up there and in the most vigorous part of his speech denounces, with every fibre of his being, affirmative action. Now, if their whole caucus can't get together to discuss the issue, perhaps those two can find time to sort it all out.

We would like to know exactly where the opposition stands on equal pay for equal work, whether or not the apparent commitment in the Leader of the Opposition's speech is indeed a commitment that will withstand the criticisms of Keith Godden of the Chamber of Commerce. We want to know whether they are solidly behind our program, for example, of affirmative action in connection with the Limestone project. We want to know that. Because if what the Member for Niakwa said is indeed their policy and their line, then the Leader of the Opposition better tell the people of Manitoba that they're opposed to affirmative action for the people of Northern Manitoba with respect to the Limestone project.

Affirmative action, Mr. Speaker, does not mean excluding people from the south. It does not mean that. And it is mandated specifically by the second Section of Section 15 of the Charter that says in the first part, equality, and in the second, notwithstanding that, affirmative action is a social policy which is endorsed constitutionally.

Let me then try and spell it out again for the Leader of the Opposition. I want it on the record because maybe he'll get a chance to read it and to think about it. Employment equity deals with hiring practices, i.e. affirmative action, affirmative action for women, affirmative action for Natives; affirmative action for visible minorities. That's what that means. Affirmative action for the physically handicapped; that's what that means.

Pay equity, equal pay for work of equal value deals with wages and salaries after hiring. Two different things, conceptually. And further, pay equity is not as the Leader of the Opposition seemed to suggest, the same as paying men and women the same money for the same job - that's already guaranteed by law. If you

have a man and a woman doing the same job but being paid differently, that is prohibited by The Manitoba Human Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, what emerges from our programs, from our legislation, from the Throne Speech, is a clear notion of the linkage between our social and economic programs being castigated by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, a few moments ago the Member for Turtle Mountain, about our economic development programs. They're trying to interpret them as some conversion, some latter-day conversion to Conservative orthodoxy and, of course, nothing could be further from the truth because our economic development approach is closely integrated with our social policies, for example, affirmative action.

So let me just deal with that for a moment to illustrate the point that I'm making. We introduced rent control legislation, badly-needed rent control legislation shortly after assuming office, and we needed it in the face of the inadequate - to put it charitably - policy that had been developed by the now Leader of the Opposition. Now, Mr. Speaker, that rent control policy, a social policy, is coupled with the RentalStart Program - a second stage of it was announced in the House today - and that RentalStart Program is the other side of the coin. The two are integrated: a social policy with respect to affordable shelter in rent control and in certain degrees of subsidized housing, and an economic thrust with respect to the building of houses, affordable shelter under the Homes in Manitoba Program, the building of rental units. A program which again is an outstanding success in Canada, never mind measured in Manitoba terms, an outstanding success and it has been one of the most successful programs that we have initiated. But there you see a combination, as I say, of social and economic programs.

So too, in looking at the development of our power resource in, let me say, a very carefully measured way - and all of the carp and criticism of the opposition will not denigrate from the significance of what is being done. We're talking about, first of all, obtaining a significant, uninterrupted sale of power, and on the basis of that and a careful assessment of Manitoba's own needs - one incidentally which is not based on the counsel of despair but sees Manitoba growing - that is what they lose sight of. We are looking as well at the domestic market. We see Manitoba growing in terms of population; we see Manitoba growing in terms of industrial expansion; we see Manitoba growing in terms of industrial investment; we see Manitoba growing and we bring that factor, as well as export sales, into the calculus when we look at the development of the power potential of Manitoba.

The notion that I found expressed either in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition or one of his colleagues, that you wait until the moment when you need it and then you start building, is so patently ridiculous and all of their vain puffery about how great they are as economists - you know, I do something just short of giggling, because giggling is more the type of thing that the Member for Pembina engages in - when I listen to the Member for Sturgeon Creek puffing himself up as an economic wizard - you don't know anything about economics, go back to the law school - and so on. And the Member for Morris - is it Morris or Emerson or wherever he comes from? - Clayton Manness, where does he come from?

A MEMBER: Morris.

HON. R. PENNER: Morris, the Member for Morris, he's got his Economics degree; he sits back there on great heights you know, and if anybody on this side purports to talk about economics and economic development, and does so as well as, for example, the Member for Thompson does - ho, ho, ho, what do you know about economics? By definition, because you have a social democratic ideology, you can't possibly know anything about economics. Why look at the economics wizards in B.C. Look at these wonder boys and their economics. Those are their ideological cousins.

Now there's been a lot of talk, incidentally . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, the Member for Lakeside endorses the policies of the Government of British Columbia. There's been some talk — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'll wait till the Member for Inkster allows me to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, the Member for Lakeside wholeheartedly endorses the economic policies of the Government of British Columbia. Now there's been some talk about the so-called hidden agenda. What's wrong with that is it's not hidden. It's open. Let's talk about their open agenda, and we don't have to really look very far afield to see it in action in B.C. Look at the budget brought down by that wizard of economic brilliance in B.C.

A MEMBER: Known as the Sheriff of Nottingham.

HON. R. PENNER: That's right - rob the poor and give it to the rich - oh yes, we know that philosophy. And what do they do, first of all, after the dismal failure the likes of which Canada hasn't seen since R.B. Bennett, another Tory, another Bennett with exactly the same kind of policy - the next thing you know you'll be seeing Bennett buggies in British Columbia - so what does the Minister of Finance bring in, after the failure of their policy, the utter failure of their policy, the tearing apart of the social safety net, the adversarial way in which they have dealt with social policy, a billion dollar gift to big business?

First of all, they said, we have developed this trickle-down theory of economics, the kind that the Member for Morris is deeply in love with, and if we just sit back and create the conditions by focusing entirely on the deficit, the deficit will go away and big business will have confidence in British Columbia; they'll come in and they'll invest. Well, big business did not come in and invest in British Columbia, because they saw a government that could not manage. They saw a government that pitted class against class. They saw a government that tore apart the social safety net and they were not amused, to put it mildly.

Now having decided, in the first instance, to leave it up to the marketplace, the much valued and loved

marketplace of the Member for Morris and that economic wizard, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, they've decided that maybe they were wrong, that they ought to tinker with the market but how are they tinkering with the market by a \$1 billion gift? Boy that's economic wizardry; that's economic brilliance. And at the same time, as I read it, the Minister of Finance in the Globe and Mail today, their presentation of the Budget - about which the Member for Turtle Mountain, who castigated you in unparliamentary terms, incidentally, while you were out of the House - presents their deficit as an operating deficit and a capital deficit. Can you imagine?

A MEMBER: Where did they do that?

HON. R. PENNER: In British Columbia, in British Columbia. So we're not talking about a hidden agenda, and while I'm at it - and I may say for the first time in a week, enjoying myself - talking about a hidden agenda, is it so hidden about what they propose to do to rent controls, to which I adverted a few moments ago, I hear you asking. It's on the record now, once or twice. First of all, the Leader of the Opposition, then an unimportant person, merely the Member for Tuxedo, said, we will have user fees with respect to the rent control mechanism. There's a brilliant idea, you just think about it, how that's going to work. Then, in his first principal speech after becoming Leader of the Opposition what did he say? I've got it and I want you to know I'm keeping it for the election, and I want you to know I'm going to use it in the election. Who says they're going to get rid of rent controls?

I'll tell you what that means to the people of Fort Rouge who I represent, it means disaster, and we will not allow that disaster to happen. The people of Winnipeg will not allow that disaster to happen; and the people of Brandon will not allow that disaster to happen; and the people of St. James will not allow that disaster to happen, because we know, and they know, what rent control has meant for them in terms of . . . (Inaudible) . . .

It's not a hidden agenda, and we will spare nothing in bringing home to the people of Manitoba exactly what it is that they have in mind as the Government of Manitoba.

Look, hidden agenda - week in and week out, speech after speech, the one sort of specific - God, you can comb through those speeches time and again and look for specifics, talk about vague generalities and buffoonery. What is the specific they're going to get rid of the health and post-secondary levy. There's why, that's it, the great bonanza for the people of Manitoba, right? For the people of Manitoba - what do you mean the people of Manitoba? It's the employers who are paying it - (Interjection) - yes, it is, they're paying it, so they remove with one fell blow 120 to 130 million dollars of revenue, right? And what will they substitute for it? I'll tell you what they'll do, because it's the only alternative if they're going to carry that through and not destroy the social safety net, is a couple of points on the sales tax.

Well, my gosh I have to be careful, I agree we shouldn't be talking in this area at all, right? But we know what they're going to do. They've announced

what they're going to do and that's about the only thing we can depend upon with respect to that bunch of losers on the other side of the House, is that they will do that and they will follow - because they said they will follow their ideological cousins in British Columbia - and we will have another province in Manitoba, in which, in fact, unlike what has happened in '83 and '84 in Manitoba, the manufacturers will not invest in because they will not come to a province, whether it's here or British Columbia, regardless of the ideological stripe of the government where, in fact, the government cannot manage but can only produce social dissension, the like of which we haven't seen in a long time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have chosen in speaking to the Throne Speech Debate, to talk in the main about the question of equality. The thing in my mind that most clearly distinguishes us as a social democratic government from any other government in Canada is our commitment to social justice; and our commitment to social justice necessarily carries with it - we know that - the requirement of the kind of economic development which will produce first of all the jobs because that alone is a profound social policy when you take people, particularly young people, particularly Native people, off the unemployed rolls and you put them to work. That in itself is not merely an economic measure; it's a profound social measure, but on that basis there is also produced the extension of the tax base so that within the kind of tax policy which is acceptable in this particular kind of period in which we're living, you can't produce the revenues, not only to preserve the social safety net but to extend it. So we do have a coherent policy; we do have a vision.

When you, Sir, put on the list, as we will, as we are, and as we will do, in the forthcoming election, our Rent Control Program, our Day Care Program, our pension legislation, our labour legislation - which has brought industrial peace to Manitoba - then the people of Manitoba will know that we have a social democratic government that is not some fuzzy wuzzy, ideological mismanaging bunch of economic dummies as they are attempting to portray us.

If you look objectively - and that's all we say is necessary - at all of the economic indicators and everything that has happened to bring Manitoba out of the recession, then you come back to the point that I made at the very beginning of my speech and I repeat it. I am proud to be a Manitoban and I for one will not dump on Manitobans and their achievements. I am proud of the way in which ordinary Manitobans have taken the bit between their teeth and under the leadership of this government have moved Manitoba ahead; and I resent the kind of carping criticism and prophecies of collapse and doom that bunch of losers on the other side has burdened us with all of this week.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I deem it a privilege and an honour to follow the Chief Law Officer of our province in this Throne Speech Debate and while I didn't learn very much about where this government is going to carry the people of our province, he did give us some indication that he was

Friday, 15 March, 1985

going to throw his hat in the ring for the next election. That kind of disheartened me, Mr. Speaker, because if you listened to the Honourable Member for Elmwood here the other day and some of the words that's passing around in the halls of this building, it appears that the honourable member would be well advised to take that opportunity to sit at the bench, rather than pursue a political career, because I think he's treading on rather rocky ground if he thinks he should throw his hat into the ring again.

Mr. Speaker, he talks like the typical socialist. They talk about social justice as if this crowd of misfits that are over there are the only people that have a conscience, are the only people that understand the social needs of our people and are the only ones that can possibly resolve the social problems our people are facing. It historically comes up time and time again that they are the only ones that can fix this problem.

Mr. Speaker, may I wish you well during the Session and if another Session is coming I hope the affairs of the House as they have in the past in your guidance and that we don't create any untold problems that stirs up the animosity of this House and yourself, Mr. Speaker. We wish you well.

I extend my greetings to the new Pages that are here; I wish them well in their deliberations, the new Assistant Clerk that sits at the table.

Mr. Speaker, I noted the other day the death of the former Sergeant-at-Arms from this Legislature, who was here when I arrived in '66, the late Frank Edwin Skinner. I think that I would like, on behalf of, I'm sure our caucus and likely the House and those that knew Mr. Skinner, extend our deepest condolences to the family. He was quite a man, this Skinner, Mr. Speaker, a big strapping man, First World War vet, founder of the Duke of Kent Legion, I understand, in this city; was awarded the Meritorious medal, I think, in '52 and he handled the Mace - I've never seen another Sergeant-at-Arms ever that could throw the Mace around like this man, Skinner. He flipped it around just like a toothpick in his place and when it hit that table, when he laid it on the table, Mr. Speaker, this Chamber almost shook, the way he did it. He was an artist and a master of drill and he brought a lot of decorum to this Chamber and he made a lot of friends.

Mr. Speaker, I also regret the Provincial Auditor has left us. He was born and raised in my constituency and I'm sure we're going to miss him. He left under most difficult circumstances because of the type of Minister of Finance we have in this province, who the Auditor refused to sign the report and condone the type of recordings and the carryings on of this Finance Minister; I don't think the way that a Minister and an Auditor should try and conduct the affairs of the House. Mr. Ziprick is gone and he served this province with distinction and was the people's Auditor and he did a very good job and I was sorry to see him leave under such difficult circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech, this document that has been passed out to us the other day, I've seen quite a number of these in my time here and this one is the one I think I could say is the least substantive of any that I've ever read. It's the signs, the omens, the words that spell out to me, this Pawley Government, they're tired, they're worn out, they're broke, their cupboards are barren of policies or solutions that they

thought they had to deal with the affairs of our province and our people and it's a tragedy, the nature, the seriousness of some of the problems that we're facing in our province, that this government still has not been able to address themselves to it; like the one of the unemployment which was their No. 1 priority - and I'll get back to that when I go through this famous document they released to the people of our province in 1980 - but a government, Mr. Speaker, who are facing 48,000 people are unemployed today, 20,000 more than when they came to office.

They have got to be ashamed of their conduct. They've got to be ashamed of the way they pledged and promised that they were going to deal with these matters, that it was their No. 1 target; so, Mr. Speaker, they have failed us in the House, they have failed the people of this province miserably.

Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech tells me that this government, faced with a tight budget, and according to the First Minister's comments, we're going to see sales tax increases, property tax, or whatever tax increases are going to be in the Budget next week. They have been unwilling, since the day they took office, to screw up their courage and put their character on the line and make the tough decisions that are needed to govern this province, Mr. Speaker. We've seen it all through their deliberations, starting from the way they mismanaged and handled the language debate in this House. It was a black mark that will never leave this government. It's a black mark that was imposed upon the people of this province that the NDP Party itself will never revive from. The animosity, the hatred that this government has brought into our people divided our people, created anxieties, concerns and animosities that should have never ever been raised, Mr. Speaker, will not go away.

Mr. Speaker, there's other kinds of tough decisions that this government has never been able to measure up to, nor have they been able to maybe get it through Cabinet as we try and deal with some of the problems that's required of a government.

Instead, what do we get, Mr. Speaker? We get a laissez-faire attitude of social tinkers and social fixers to try and solve some of the problems that should be dealt with by government in our province, Mr. Speaker. There's a ream of them out there, Mr. Speaker. I can certainly vouch for the people in my constituency. While I do, at this time, congratulate and express my gratitude to the mover and the seconder of the motion, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that neither the mover or the seconder actually know what's going on in rural Manitoba because, if they do, they certainly didn't express it in their comments.

I'll give just one classic example. They never mentioned the problems of the small businessman in our province. It's not in here in this document either. Those are matters or problems, Mr. Speaker, that I think that a government that had any vision, had any dream, had any understanding, or would live up to the promises and pledges that they made in this "Clear Choice for Manitobans" which they provided to the people in this province in '80, they should have dealt with that.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say they have been a dismal failure. Now, a dismal failure, Mr. Speaker. We are now today asked to digest reams and reams of propaganda

Friday, 15 March, 1985

that's being cranked out by this 250 or 300 propaganda specialists that brought into this government, at the expense of the local taxpayers, to try and prop these people up as they face another election, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that's fair, Mr. Speaker, and for the people of this province to be asked at this time to spend those kind of dollars, those kind of taxpayers' dollars to prop up a sick, weak government that can't govern or to try to put an image on a leader, a Premier that can't lead.

This Premier and this government surely doesn't need \$5-7 million to prop up their image to the people of this province and try and tell us something good that you've done because basically, Mr. Speaker, it hasn't worked. I don't know how far that this crowd of misfits, as some people call them, Mr. Speaker, can expect the people of the province to digest all this propaganda. This document itself is propaganda for the most part, Mr. Speaker. It is propaganda. There's nothing creative about this Throne Speech.

There's no visions in here as how we're going to deal with the economic problems that our people are facing. There's nothing in here that tells us where this government's going to move with the other provinces of Canada and with the Federal Government on agriculture, which used to be the No. 1 industry in this province, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, agriculture is no longer the first industry that we have in this province and that has happened during the regime of this government, Mr. Speaker, manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I took a quick opportunity to glance through the editorial excerpts of some of the papers in our province. Mr. Speaker, they see it the same as I do. The local Winnipeg Free Press said it's a Throne Speech from another government from another province. I don't think I have ever read any government in this province getting such a black mark for its efforts in a Throne Speech as that one that came out of the Winnipeg Free Press.

Mr. Speaker, the Brandon editorial goes on and tries to tell about the rosy outlook that's painted in the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, I would think that likely the highlight, and the most exciting thing that happened on the day that the Throne Speech was delivered in this House, was the big rally out in front of the building by the anti-abortion people who were marching, 3,000-4,000 of them, expressing their concerns and their anxieties regarding the way that this matter has been handled by this government, Mr. Speaker.

I stand here today fully in support of the amendment that was presented to the Throne Speech by my leader, and, Mr. Speaker, I think he spelled it out about as nice as anybody could as to where the real problems of this province are at this time.

Mr. Speaker, when you go through this "Clear Choice for Manitobans", with the First Minister's picture there, stern, and his pencil in his hand, and the paper there and he says that Manitobans are great people. Together we can build a great future; that's a promise we can guarantee. I'm starting to get ill, Mr. Speaker. I start to quiver, I start to wonder if I'm in a different world than these people across the way because, Mr. Speaker, while the Premier went tearing around Roblin-Russell Constituency previous to the opening of this House, backslapping with people, and he makes sure now with all these propagandas with him that he's got a big smile

on his face all the time, and he gets this picture into the local rural papers now and there he is with a big grin, but it's not the same kind of a face that you see on this document when he told us what was going to happen.

So, what does he do? Mr. Speaker, I've been on the Premier's back for months about this pledge of potash development in Western Manitoba, which he has committed himself and committed this government to since the day they took office. Mr. Speaker, he has thrown the ball away. I've handed the ball to him by letters; I've asked him to come out and tell the people out there. Let me get all the local entrepreneurs, bank people, the investors, the businesswomen, the businessmen from that area to sit around with him and put his plan on the table so that they fully understand what he's talking about. First of all, how he's going to do it and when it's going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, he has failed those people miserably. He goes tearing around the other day and he's in such a great haste. The House is opening up and he has very little time to discuss this important matter which is so important to that area, Mr. Speaker. Well, he said there's some problem in China that they don't need potash and the Indian Government doesn't have a policy for the purchase of potash, etc., etc., etc.

I wonder about Canamax. Where is this Canamax Corporation? I've looked at the Land Titles Office. They don't own any property rights in that area. There's a lot of Crown land in there that the First Minister is likely intending to lease them. Mr. Speaker, I don't think this government is committed to the development of potash in Western Manitoba at all. It's propaganda; it's a smoke screen and it isn't going to happen during the regime of this government. It's not. He's talking now about 1990. My gosh, 1990. That's not what he said when he hit you with this document, Mr. Speaker, that's not what the First Minister said. He said, "Manitoba's natural resources could provide us with economic security for generations to come, but this can only happen with resource development for Manitobans, not resource giveaway." And he goes on and he says, "The New Democratic Government would encourage the processing of natural resources where the resources are extracted."

When are they going to extract them? In 1990, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, why doesn't the First Minister and his Energy Minister, with the two gentlemen for Saskatchewan, Messer and Dombowsky, tell the people of Manitoba that they have misled Western Manitoba and they're not going to develop that potash mine. They have no intentions of developing it, Mr. Speaker. It's a smoke screen; it's a dream; it's what I call misleading the public through propaganda. They are artists, Mr. Speaker, at cranking out propagandana.

I suggest, and I'm sure the people of Western Manitoba understand now, that these guys are not real. They are known to mislead, tell half-truths or quarter-truths, get your hopes and your courage built up and then they just drop you like a ton of bricks. Because I'm sure that people out in Western Manitoba, what the Premier told them the other day, don't expect anything till 1990. As far as his government is concerned, they've got to feel let down; they've got to feel that they were misled; they've got to feel that the propaganda machine took them in and they are the

ones who are going to have to pay for it, whenever they screw their courage up to call an election, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that must have been a great trip that the First Minister, with his crowd of burned-out Socialists, took to the Orient to run around and talk about potash, because I don't know what they did over there. They spent a lot of money; they did a lot of travelling. Maybe it was just one of those quiet holidays, Mr. Speaker, at the taxpayers' expense for this province, because I see no evidence, as I stand here today, that they have brought anything back in the form of a concrete deal or a proposal that's on the table, signed. As far as potash in Western Manitoba is concerned, it does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister, someday, will admit that he hasn't got the Cabinet around him; he doesn't have the staff; he doesn't have the ability to handle his portfolio and that we should go to the people at the earliest possible date. It's an interesting thing, too, as I raised this, Mr. Speaker, in the question period the other day - how come the Premier now and this Cabinet are prepared to sell some of our resources to Communist China, and yet when the Alcan thing was here, no dice, no. We're prepared to deal with offshore people, with multinationals, but, Mr. Speaker, not this crowd.

I wonder why, Mr. Speaker, this window dressing and propaganda that they tell us now about this new office that's opening up in Hong Kong. I hope some day we'll have to put an Order for Return in or get the First Minister or his Energy Minister to tell us what the phone number and the location of this new office in Hong Kong is, because I wouldn't mind having a chat with them someday to see what they think about this new thrust to economic development that this government has come up with, that we're going to work through the Hong Kong office now and see if we can't stimulate the business community of our province. I think it's propagandized. I think it is. I think the people in Roblin-Russell constituency - one chap told me the other day, it's window dressing, Socialist window dressing, the Hong Kong office - likely there's a pencil there and a desk and a piece of paper with somebody to come in, or maybe an answering service, because there's nothing that's actually going on there at all. Now maybe some of the members opposite can correct me on that but, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's true.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture. Let's deal a few minutes with agriculture, and again, the mover and the seconder, unfortunately, didn't address themselves to that subject matter, and there's very little in the Throne Speech as to where we are going as far as agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say I don't know of any constituency in the province where there's a firmer and stronger agricultural base than there is in Roblin-Russell. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, there are few urban centres in Canada that have so much an agricultural activity, moreso than this capital city, in which we are sitting right here, like this one. Mr. Speaker, one can stand out here at the front of this building and literally you see the offices of many large and important agribusiness organizations, just across from the front of the steps of this building: the Wheat Board; the Pool Elevators; Grain Growers; Cargill; Pioneer; the Canadian Grain Commission; the Canadian Grains

Council; the Transportation Agency; the agricultural departments of the banks; the large banks; the Canadian International Grain Institute; the Winnipeg Commodities Exchange; the two national railways that serve our province and our country, Mr. Speaker, and a variety of dozens and dozens of business establishments such as legal, accounting, commuter firms which have a substantial investment in the agriculture-related activities of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder how many times this Minister of Agriculture that's sitting across there, has called for that group of people, all that wisdom, all that wealth, all that experience, to come over and assist him and his staff to try and come up with some solutions to agriculture and the problems that are related?

Mr. Speaker, all these organizations that I mention in my remarks here this day are an integral part of this agricultural industry in this province, this industry that was at one time our No. 1 industry, and unfortunately now has fallen to No. 2. They all have and they all will contribute in a most significant way to the creation of the jobs and to come up with solutions to the problems that are facing us as I stand here this very day, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Minister has not done that, because first of all, he doesn't believe to go that route. He believes this sort of tunnel-vision approach to agriculture that he's pointed out so skillfully in the last few weeks, where challenging banks and ministers of agriculture from across Canada to get your interest down to 8 percent. What does he do, Mr. Speaker, at the same day he's inviting them to come here and join him in a conference, he jacks the MACC interest rates over his hand, up to 11 and 13 percent.

Now is that the character, is that the quality of a Minister of Agriculture that we have in this province, that's guiding the future destiny of our farm community, our No. 1 industry in this province, Mr. Speaker? It is, that's the man. What does he do? Mr. Speaker, he goes and draws \$6 million out of Cabinet this past week - now we call him the Six Million Dollar Man - and lowers the interest rate to 8 percent. Mr. Speaker, who can trust this kind of a Minister of Agriculture? Who can trust him?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Nobody, nobody!

MR. W. McKENZIE: Nobody! Would you as a farmer, Mr. Speaker, trust that kind of a Minister of Agriculture to guide the industry in this province, when he himself doesn't even know what he's doing?

Mr. Speaker, we have the case of the "henocide" now; we have the chickens in this province - "henocide" - the farmer now can no longer have no more than 99 chickens. They've cut it from 499 down to 99 chickens. Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. McKENZIE: I know the Minister is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm having some difficulty hearing the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

Friday, 15 March, 1985

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is well acquainted with this problem because I addressed it to him several months ago.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.
The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell raised a matter dealing with some "henocide", Mr. Speaker. I raise it as a matter of privilege, so that the honourable member would be aware that it was his Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Arthur, who in fact passed that regulation in this House allowing for the killing off of chickens and paying farmers for the slaughtering of those chickens in 1981, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. That was not a matter of privilege. The Minister will have the opportunity to put forward his opinion at a later time.
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. J. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe it wasn't "henocide", I know it'll be "Uruskicide", because the regulation has gone out, the regulation has gone out

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.
Members of the House should be addressed by the office they hold, or by the constituency they represent. Members' names should not be used.
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. J. McKENZIE: I withdraw the remarks and shall try and correct my interpretation of what kind of Minister of Agriculture that we have here.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we have the problem of small family farms that used to be able to get 300, 400 or 250 chickens on their farms, and the chickens laid some eggs and they sold some eggs in town. Mr. Speaker, they can't do that anymore. This Minister of Agriculture says, "No, no, as of now on, you are not allowed to have more than 99 on your farm."

MR. H. ENNS: Does that include the rooster?

MR. J. McKENZIE: Well, I'm not sure about where the rooster stands, he could be over and above that.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, in times such as this when we have all these problems in the agricultural community that we're experiencing today, why would a Minister of Agriculture come at this time, and say "Look, you little farm people, from now on no more than 99 chickens on your farm." That's the big, heavy hand of Socialism where they know better than the average farmer, at least they think they do, and say "Look, you get up in the morning and bow to the state and when you go to bed, you bow to the state and we'll look after you all day long," and try and make sure that you get all of these social benefits that they're talking about Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't put food on the table.

We also have the Minister of Agriculture now coming out on the new regulation on the disposal of a dairy herd and the quota, which came out yesterday, another black mark on the farm communities of this province. A young dairy producer that needs bucks and maybe wants to sell off ten of his cows, Mr. Speaker, he can't do it now unless the quota goes. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, is some of the serious problems that we have to deal with in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know, I don't know. The tragedy of all this is that the First Minister does not have anybody else from the farm community to sit in that portfolio. There's nobody over there with any farm background, other than the Minister himself. Nobody that understands the problems of agriculture, and they think that they're a government of the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, that they have the talent and the skills and the ability to deal with these problems that we're bringing here, Mr. Speaker. I regret it. I regret it very much, the conduct of this Minister and this government as it's related to agriculture.

As my colleague, the Member for Arthur, has written letters, he's had press conference, he's pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the problems that we're facing in agriculture in this province, and it is regretful the conduct of this cabinet, this First Minister, and this Minister of Agriculture have not come up with any solutions as yet except some window dressing, or some changing of putting on a different coat on a different day to deal with a different farm group, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, some have called it a "gasping" government. Some have called it a government that should never have been in office in the first place because they misled the public, they said they could carry on and do all these things. Mr. Speaker, they promised and they pledged and the Premier guaranteed, in relation to agriculture, that no family would be squeezed off their land that they had developed, cultivated, and sweated over for generations. That's his pledge, Mr. Speaker.

He goes on, Mr. Speaker, that unless decisive action is taken now and this is four years ago, Manitoba's family farms and the rural commands that serve them are simply going to vanish, and they're vanishing right before your eyes, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, as we stand here this day, and what have you done about it? What have you done about it? What kind of wallop have you in the Cabinet of this government? What kind of key have you got for the First Minister's Office, Mr. Minister? You talk about dealing with the matters. I don't think you have much wallop at all, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I don't think that you have much wallop at the table, because you have pledged, you have sworn, and you promised to the people of this province that these matters would be dealt with. They have not been dealt with. You have failed us, the Premier has failed us, and your government has failed us. Why was this, Mr. Speaker? All because of this propoganda that you spread all over this province, this garbage, this uncalled for . . . the Premier didn't have to go around and tell the people of this province and take that kind of an oath. They didn't ask him to do it. He did it voluntarily. Well, by jinx, in this place, Mr. Minister and Mr. First Minister, when you make those kind of allegations, and charge it to the people of this province, you better deliver; or if you don't deliver it, you better have a good

excuse, why you haven't. I say you have not lived up to the promises and the pledges that you made to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it's a tragedy. I just went through a little leaflet and some of the problems like the Riverton area had last year. That's right in the Minister's backyard. Who had to come to the rescue of the Mennonite community - the Mennonite community? Yet, if there was farmers in the neighbouring constituency to me, if I was the Minister of the Crown that had a problem such as they had, why couldn't the Minister react and go over and say, "Look, I'll give you all the resources and the talent of my department and see if we can solve your problem." Mr. Speaker, no, he didn't do it, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, his name will likely go down in the record as this Six Million Dollar Man that Manitoba saw as the Minister of Agriculture at one time. A Minister that we need \$6,000,000 to prop up his image to try and bail him out of the financial fiascos of the way he misled the people of this province, how he's misguided us and failed to deal with our . . .

Mr. Speaker, there are such a long list of things that I hope to bring to the attention of government in the days ahead and I'm won't get into the Limestone debate at this particular time, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House, you have failed the people in Roblin-Russell constituency of your explanation of this Limestone project to date, because they do not understand what you're talking about, they don't trust you, because we've been misled on two or three occasions already by this government and why should we trust you now? You have not got your message across; you have not been able to explain it out there; and you had better come up with a lot better answers and more understandable answers for the hydro users of this province before you proceed.

I look forward to the debate when it arrives in this Chamber with keen interest, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely hope that we'll get more information than we got from this Energy Minister yesterday when he spoke in this House, because he didn't tell us anything new at all, nothing, absolutely nothing.

I just wonder why not give us three-phase power all across rural Manitoba, if you want to do something to make this province boom and grow? They're dealing with Nebraska. Nebraska's got three-phase power. Why can't we have it? If Hydro is so keenly interested in moving and developing rural Manitoba especially, why not? I think I'll likely bring a resolution in during the course of this Session and see if I can get the government's consent to develop three-phase power. I'd like it very much.

Mr. Speaker, we have another problem. This House Leader here, when he was sitting over in this chair as the assistant clerk, he drew constituency boundaries for the Roblin-Russell constituency, Mr. Speaker, that are an absolute nightmare. We, in our constituency, now have a mountain going right through the constituency and the trouble is there is no road from north to south. You can't get across the mountain. He was the man that was the author of the boundaries and whether he did it by error or whether he didn't understand - but he must have understood because I appealed it at the time - it was unfair to the people of Roblin-Russell constituency to have to deal with that kind of a problem. It's not fair. This is a big province,

Mr. Speaker. It has a wide area of land. Now why would anybody ask the people of my jurisdiction to have to live under those conditions, when the people from the north can't get to the people of the south if you want to call a meeting? They either have to go around by Dauphin or drive all the way around Roblin to get around.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to bring in a resolution on that subject matter into the House and see if I can get the author who screwed up our boundaries to admit that he either made a mistake or he didn't understand what he was doing and at least apologize to the people from Roblin-Russell constituency for the uncalled for hardships that they have had to put up with, with these crazy boundaries that we have for the constituents. There's no constituency in this province that has to deal with an unfair problem such as the people of Roblin-Russell. We have got to do something about it and we have to see if we can't rectify it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also wondering if the Minister of Energy or the First Minister has any intention of putting the hydro into the Blue Lakes in the Duck Mountain National Park? There's the most beautiful opportunity to bring more tourists in because you can provide them with better services. They can be more courteous to these people. It's a big tourist area, Mr. Speaker. I don't see anything about this kind of development in the Throne Speech at all. I don't see the mover or the seconder mentioning such little things. It wouldn't cost a lot of money, but certainly it would bring some revenue into this province because if you're going to have social justice in this province, as the Attorney-General, somebody has to pay the bills. We are not doing the things that we should be doing to create a climate here for more people to spend more dollars.

The parks, the lake of the prairie parks, Mr. Speaker, has been extremely badly managed by this government. Now, of course, the Minister of Natural Resources has moved on to another department, so he cannot accept the blame or the responsibility for the mismanagement of that park. It has been badly managed. Today, Mr. Speaker, it is classed likely as one of the best pickerel fishing grounds in all of Western Canada. It's not the best, it's in the top three. What are we doing? There's not even anybody on the gate out there to pass out a pamphlet to these people that come to visit that area.

Mr. Speaker, I see that you're chomping at the bit for me to sit down. I thank you for the opportunity, and I hope this First Minister and this gang of misfits over here will call an election at the earliest possible date, so we can run them out of here and put them out of office.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think before I begin my remarks, the first one I want to congratulate and wish him well in his retirement is the Member for Roblin-Russell. I certainly will miss his flamboyance and I would say good cheer in this House and we wish him well in his retirement, even though most of the time he's full of puff and smoke and no substance, but we certainly wish him very well.

Friday, 15 March, 1985

To you, Sir . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . to you, Sir, Mr. Speaker, I want to again congratulate you in having the difficult task of guiding the decorum and the proceedings in this House and making sure that most of us at least attempt to stay on line within the framework of rules that we have established here over many years.

To my colleagues, the Member for Wolseley and the Member for Riel, I wish to congratulate them as well on their excellent addresses in moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne.

Welcome, as well as many others have given, to the new Deputy Clerk of the House. We'd like to welcome her to this Chamber and hope that we don't drive her into the ground as sometimes we may push the Clerk to the brink of — (Interjection) — As we have done, I'm sure, pushed the Clerk of the House on previous occasions to test his ingenuity and his advice to you, Sir.

I'd like to, as well, extend my very best to my colleague, the Member for Kildonan, who is, one can put it very clearly, fighting for her life. I know that all of us here would want to extend - and I say this sincerely - our love to her because we do love her as a colleague in this Chamber and wish her the very best in fighting cancer and hope that that fight can be won, Sir. We certainly want to express that feeling to her.

In listening to some honourable members on the other side of the Chamber, Sir, in dealing with agricultural matters, one would think that this province and this government has really not done a thing in the last four years. In fact, every program that was introduced, Sir, the members opposite got up and berated every policy and every program of this government. I want to deal with that question. I think it's a good area to look on and examine in terms of the way that this administration has governed and the whole question of leadership in the whole area in dealing with provincial concerns and provincial matters.

Sir, I can only put it this way, what a difference seven months makes. The honourable members opposite are maybe wondering what I am getting at. Well we've had a federal election. You know, for the first three years we were in office, I was berated by the Member for Arthur and members on the opposite side, why we were not going after the Federal Government, who were derelict in dealing with agricultural policy in this country, whether it be on stabilization, whether it be on marketing, whatever it is.

Sir, we've had our first Session, and you know the only time that the member got up to raise a question was when I was out of the House. He raised it when I wasn't in the House so it couldn't be responded to; otherwise they sat quiet. They haven't raised boo, Mr. Speaker. What a difference seven months makes in terms of who is in office and what we should do.

The Member for Arthur even had the gall to get up and say that we should not criticize the Federal Minister of Finance for the report that came out because it was a bureaucratic report in terms of the farm financial

situation in this country. Mr. Speaker, who runs the show there? They were elected with the biggest majority anywhere, in terms of a Federal Government, the largest . . . Mr. Speaker, who is running the show with respect to the Federal Government? Is it the bureaucracy or is it the Ministers and who will stand up there and take the responsibility for this kind of malicious attack on the foundation of this country?

Mr. Speaker, you can't even analyse the contents of that report to make some sense of it, but who did they attack? They attacked the agriculture industry. Did we hear anything from the members opposite? No, they said look, don't criticize the Minister of Finance in the Federal Government; don't criticize, but criticize the bureaucracy. It's really the bureaucracy's fault. What did the Member for Morris do this morning, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a board who allowed some money to be granted to an institution at arm's length through the Minister of Culture? What did he do? He said, look, you're responsible for this board and, Mr. Speaker, I accept that; we are. We have to stand up her and be accountable and be responsible, but for members of the opposition to now get up in this House and say, no, we are not responsible for what we put out, don't blame the Minister, blame the bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, when they call farmers the "fat cats" of agriculture, of Canadian society, when they say that farmers make more money, are wealthier, nine times than the average Canadian, they are tax dodgers because they pay less income tax and they make great profits from their investments, Mr. Speaker.

What a malicious misrepresentation of the agricultural industry in this country and they're going to stand up and say, don't blame the Federal Government and don't blame the Minister of Finance on this one issue, we have to work with the Federal Government.

We haven't heard boo from the Conservatives when the Federal Government cut back \$8 million from the budget of Agriculture last fall.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris on a point of order.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister would submit to a question please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: I will submit to a question if there's time remaining when I finish my remarks. I will be pleased to answer all the questions that the honourable member has.

Last fall, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government cut back \$8 million, in terms of agriculture spending. Did we hear anything? What we've heard — (Interjection) — not in the House. Mr. Speaker, you're right, we weren't in the House so everything was swept under the carpet; we didn't hear a thing. This year we're cutting \$60 million. We're transferring \$400 million from other departments to bolster the basic number in agriculture but we're cutting \$60 million. The Federal Government is doing that. Do we hear anything from the Conservatives? No, the Member for Arthur, their agriculture spokesman, says don't attack the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, you know what they're doing and going around the countryside, they're saying, look, we're not cutting agriculture as hard as we've cut other departments so we're nice guys; we're really good guys. There is - I have to admit - that there is an attitude in this country amongst Conservatives and amongst the population that they expect Conservatives to cut to the bone, even when it hurts. Lo and behold, if it should be some other measures from some other government, it can't be withstood. People do expect Conservatives to be harsh on society. They are prepared to be harsh on society.

Mr. Speaker, that \$60 million cut - \$33 million of that cut will be made up by increased fees. Did we hear anything from members opposite in terms of fees? I was criticized, Sir, heavily when we raised water rental rates for communities which wasn't done for many years, to try and get them when the end of the agreement expires, to be on par with other communities, when we raised it 50 cents from, I believe, \$4 to \$4.50 per 1,000 cubic feet. I was berated in this House for these massive increases in fees.

Just listen to what they're doing to the seed growers of this country. Mr. Speaker, seed purity and germination tests were increased and they were presently at between \$9 and \$28 a sample test. You know what they're going to, Mr. Speaker? \$50 to \$150, a five time increase, 500 percent. Talk about helping an industry and expanding an industry in this province where this province, the heartland of this country, is one of the major purebred seed producing provinces in this country. It will hurt the Manitoba producers more than anything. That's five times - 500 percent.

A MEMBER: What did they say about it?

HON. B. URUSKI: Not a thing, but that's not all, Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard from the members opposite. The inspections per acre - they were presently at \$10 an acre, Sir, to inspect — (Interjection) — I'm sorry, 10 cents an acre; you're right. Ten cents an acre was the inspection fee on acreage inspection. That 10 cents is going to \$1.10 an acre, 1100 percent increase. Is that really what it is?

They are the friends of the farmers, Sir. They certainly are, Mr. Speaker, from 10 cents an acre to — (Interjection) — with those kinds of friends, as the Member for Ste. Rose says, who needs enemies? But that's not all - seed grain. In terms of tagging, grading and sealing, the costs were 1.5 cents per 25 kilogram bag. They're going from 1.5 cents a kilogram to 22 cents for a 25 kilogram bag. Mr. Speaker, a 1500 percent increase, in terms of fees by the seed growers alone. Talk about fostering a climate for development.

Mr. Speaker, our budget in Agriculture in pure terms, year in and year out, has been going up and we have been criticized for not doing enough and we have, in fact, — (Interjection) — they're not final? Oh, they're not final, so let us see what will happen, but we've announced it. Have we heard from the members opposite? No, we hear from the Member for Arthur saying don't criticize the Federal Government.

I want to quote in Hansard, the honourable members opposite say, no, he didn't say that. I quote, on Monday, March 11th, not to bring - and I'm partially quoting -

“. . . not to bring forward the kind of criticism of the Federal Government when we need their support to solve the problem.”

Mr. Speaker, we have a problem. We've got a \$33 million problem in this country of imposed fees on the farmers when farmers are going bankrupt. What kind of action, what kind of double talk are we getting from the Conservatives? Actually, we here in this province, we have an opposition in hiding. I know it isn't February, Groundhog Day, but we do have an opposition that is in hiding. They have gone underground, in terms of federal-provincial relations, Mr. Speaker.

I will quote one more statement. The Honourable Member for Morris says he didn't say that and I quote again on March 11th, Page 27, “I would suggest that he change his attitude in dealing with the Federal Government and not criticize the Minister of Finance.”

The Member for Arthur made that statement on behalf of his caucus and he's the agricultural spokesman.

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

MR. C. MANNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister to withdraw that. I didn't say that the Member for Arthur didn't say that; I said that the Member for Arthur had indicated in an article in the Co-Operator that he was opposed to the statement that was released by Minister Wilson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the record in this House doesn't show that and I accept the member's comments, in terms of what he had read. I had not seen those . . .

MR. C. MANNES: He attributed a statement to me, that's why.

HON. B. URUSKI: I accept the honourable member's comments, but certainly it's clear what a difference seven months makes. Members opposite have talked about leadership and talked about how problems should be approached. Well, Mr. Speaker, this ministry has consulted with the farmers of this province on every major issue, and where did we find members opposite? Nowhere.

When I went around to discuss the financial situation and the plight of farmers and what proposals we were putting forward, that they had a hand in scuttling, Mr. Speaker, and I accused them of that. They had the hand in scuttling that meeting, Sir, and let them get up and deny it. — (Interjection) — Pardon me?

A MEMBER: It was your own stupidity.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think I have struck a chord that they don't like, Sir, because the meetings were going to go ahead and then the telexes and I

Friday, 15 March, 1985

believe the phone calls started flying. But the thing that came out was that — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, when members of the opposition are carbon copied with telexes between governments, you wonder who is doing the dealing. Is it another government in the opposition or is it government-to-government discussions?

A MEMBER: Don't make any allegations, say what you got to say. What is it you want to say?

A MEMBER: Tory-to-Tory, that's what it is.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if they didn't like our proposals, the three proposals that we put forward, to deal with the insane interest rate policy of this country, why not put something else on the table? Why not put something else on the table and say, we don't agree with you but there is a better way of dealing with the question, Sir?

There hasn't been one concrete suggestion coming out of the opposition in three and a half years, not one concrete suggestion from the opposition in three and

a half years, Sir, when we introduced the farm lands legislation. What did they do? They criticized us all over and, Sir, I venture to say that they will go around to the farmers and say, look at what happened to land prices because of this legislation. You will see that before the next election, there will be ads in the paper saying that land prices have plummeted on the basis of this legislation. Mark my words, that that will be part of their campaign material, Sir. But, Mr. Speaker, at least the Conservatives in Saskatchewan had more integrity in not removing or amending the legislation, because they have the very same legislation that we have in this province and that won't change the fact, Sir, that many farmers, many young farmers who had to compete with non-farming interests did get into trouble and the meetings, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 1:30 p.m., when this matter is next before the House, the honourable member will have 22 minutes remaining.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday.